



Career Service Board Meeting #2317
Minutes
Thursday, August 3, 2017, 4:30 p.m.
Webb Municipal Building
201 W. Colfax Ave, Fourth Floor, Room 4.G.2

Gina Casias (Co-Chair)
Patti Klinge (Co-Chair)
Neil Peck
Patricia Barela Rivera
Tracy Winchester

I. Opening: *Meeting called to order at 4:30 p.m.*

- 1. Approval of the Agenda for the August 3, 2017 Board Meeting.**
The board unanimously approved the agenda for the August 3, 2017 meeting.
- 2. Approval of the Minutes for the July 20, 2017 Board Meeting.**
The board unanimously approved the minutes for the July 20, 2017 meeting.

II. Board Comments:

Board co-chair Gina Casias announced her resignation from the Career Service Board, but said she will continue to serve for the near term until her replacement is confirmed.

Board co-chair Patti Klinge nominated Neil Peck as co-chair in light of Ms. Casias' resignation.

The board unanimously approved the nomination of Mr. Peck to co-chair.

III. Public Comments: *None.*

IV. Public Hearing:

1. Classification Notice No. 1545 – Plans Review Technicians

Rory McCluster, Deputy Director of the Office of Human Resources, introduced Classification Notice No. 1545 and stated that this was one of the largest classification studies ever brought before the board. She said the two-year study involved a large amount of research and feedback from managers and employees.

Classification Notice No. 1545 was presented by the following members of the Office of Human Resources: John Hoffman, Senior Classification and Compensation Analyst, and HR Business Partners Jack Davies and Anne Carter.

The following new classifications and pay grades were proposed:

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Pay grade</u>
Permit Review Technician I	E-618 (\$21.34-\$31.16 per hour)
Permit Review Technician II	E-620 (\$23.33-\$34.06 per hour)
Lead Permit Review Technician	E-621 (\$24.39-\$35.61 per hour)

Plans Review Specialist I E-623 (\$26.66-\$38.92 per hour)
Plans Review Specialist II E-625 (\$29.14-\$42.54 per hour)

The following classification abolishments were also proposed:

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Pay grade</u>
<i>Plans Review Technician</i>	<i>E-620 (\$23.33-\$34.06 per hour)</i>
<i>Associate Plans Review Technician</i>	<i>E-622 (\$25.50-\$37.23 per hour)</i>
<i>Senior Plans Review Technician</i>	<i>E-625 (\$29.14-\$42.54 per hour)</i>

Board member Patricia Barela Rivera asked how many agencies are affected by the proposed changes.

Mr. Hoffman responded that the primary agencies affected are Public Works and Community Planning and Development. He added that there are a few agencies throughout the city, such as Parks and Recreation and the Board of Adjustment for Zoning, that will also have a few affected employees.

Board co-chair Patti Klinge asked what kind of feedback they have received from employees pertaining to the proposed changes.

Mr. Hoffman responded that feedback from employees has been mixed. He said some employees are upset, particularly those that will be placed in lower pay grades, and others feel that the changes will have no impact on them.

Ms. Klinge asked how many employees will be placed in lower pay grades.

Mr. Hoffman said they are anticipating that about 17 employees will be reallocated to lower pay grades, but emphasized that no employees will experience a reduction in pay.

Board co-chair Gina Casias asked for confirmation that the criteria for placing current employees in the newly proposed classifications will be determined by the work they have previously performed as opposed to their individual potential.

Mr. Hoffman, Ms. Carter, and Mr. Davies all confirmed that employees will be placed in new classifications based solely on the type of work they have performed.

Ms. Klinge asked what the process will be for determining which classifications current employees will be placed into.

Mr. Davies responded that discussions will take place with managers regarding the type and level of work that each individual employee has been performing. He said these discussions will determine which of the new classifications employees belong in.

Ms. Klinge asked for clarification that employees will be placed into new classifications solely based on job duties and not on individual performance.

Mr. Davies confirmed that past performance will not determine which classification an employee belongs in.

Public hearing speaker Greg Grant, Associate Plans Review Technician from Public Works, expressed concern that the proposed changes eliminate the opportunity for career growth and discourage longevity. He said longevity and the accumulation of knowledge are important in these jobs because the work is complex and the safety of citizens is at stake. Mr. Grant also provided some examples of the work performed in these jobs.

Ms. Casias asked Mr. Grant if he and the other Plans Review Technicians are involved in designing or changing the engineers' traffic control plans.

Mr. Grant responded that they are not involved in designing or changing engineers' plans.

Ms. Klinge asked Mr. Grant how he feels about the stronger career path that would result from the proposed changes.

Mr. Grant responded that he does not see a stronger career path resulting from the changes. He said if he were to promote to another position, it would require him to move to another work location, which he is not interested in.

In response to Mr. Grant's comments, Mr. Davies acknowledged that the work in these classifications is complex and that it does impact public safety. He also said there would be a good career path with the opportunity to promote through the classification series, but agreed that promoting to a new position would require employees to move to a different work location.

Mr. Peck said he did not feel comfortable voting on Classification Notice No. 1545 due to the complexity of the proposal. He said he believed the board should hear from the Executive Director of the Office of Human Resources regarding the matter and expressed concern that the adoption of the proposed changes could hinder recruiting efforts for these positions. He proposed that the board's decision be deferred to the next meeting.

Board member Tracy Winchester agreed with Mr. Peck regarding his concerns about the recruitment of applicants for the classification series.

Ms. Klinge said she felt that Ms. McLuster could address the board's questions pertaining to recruitment.

Ms. McLuster responded that the potential to attract new employees was considered as part of the classification study. She says she believes these jobs would be attractive to candidates because the pay ranges would match others in the market and that job seekers would view them as being competitive.

The board further discussed the matter.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Classification Notice No. 1545.

V. Director's Briefing:

- 1. Diane Vertovec, Marketing and Communications Manager, and Justin Wolfe, Senior Data Analyst, both from the Office of Human Resources, provided an update on the 2017 Employee Engagement Survey. Ms. Vertovec gave an overview of the biennial survey and said PwC is the third-party consulting firm used to collect and tabulate the results.*

Ms. Vertovec said the citywide participation rate for the 2017 survey was 68% and said that two agencies had 100% participation: the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Children's Affairs.

Ms. Vertovec said that, during August, survey results will be presented to the Mayor's Office, City Council, mayoral appointees and agency leadership, the city's HR community, and the Career Service Board. She said presentations will also be given to individual agencies in September and that action planning will commence in October and continue throughout 2018.

VI. Pending Cases:

1. Krishna Colquitt v. Department of Human Services, Appeal No. 34-15A
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
2. Ryan Bosveld v. Department of Safety, Denver Sheriff Department, Appeal No. 53-16A
The Career Service Board reversed the Hearing Officer's decision and remanded the case back to the Hearing Office for reconsideration of the penalty.

VII. Executive Session:

The Board went into executive session at 5:44 p.m.

The following case was discussed:

Jose Santistevan, Jr. v. Denver Parks and Recreation, Appeal No. 75-16A.
The Career Service Board deferred the decision on this case.

The Board re-convened the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

VIII. Adjournment: *Adjournment was at 6:25 p.m.*