Career Service Board Meeting #2332
Minutes
Thursday, March 15, 2018, 9:00am
Webb Municipal Building
201 W. Colfax Ave, Fourth Floor, Room 4.G.2

Neil Peck (Co-Chair)
Patti Klinge (Co-Chair) - Absent
Karen DuWaldt
Patricia Barela Rivera
Tracy Winchester - Absent

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

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 15, 2018 Board Meeting.
   The Board unanimously approved the agenda for the March 15, 2018 meeting.

2. Approval of the Minutes for the February 15, 2018 Board Meeting.
   The Board unanimously approved the minutes for the February 15, 2018 meeting.

II. Board Comments: None.

III. Public Comments: None.

IV. Public Hearing:

1. Classification Notice No. 1559: Deputy Director of Aviation

   Blair Malloy, Senior HR Professional, introduced Classification Notice No. 1559, to amend the Classification & Pay Plan by creating a new classification called Deputy Director of Aviation at pay grade A-822.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Title</th>
<th>Proposed Pay Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director of Aviation</td>
<td>A-822 ($136,136-$176,977-$217,818)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   It is proposed to create a new classification for Denver International Airport to provide an additional management level for executive support, which will be the highest level of management reporting to aviation appointees. The proposed classification, Deputy Director of Aviation, will provide a career path opportunity for airport management into senior executive levels. This position will report to the Executive Director of Aviation, who is appointed by and reports to the Manager of Aviation, a mayoral appointee.

   It is proposed to set the pay grade for the Deputy Director of Aviation at A-822, based on a review of internal equity to the Deputy Manager of Aviation, A-821. The Deputy Manager of Aviation is a benchmark classification whose pay grade is set based on market data. Although both are director-level management classifications, given the higher-level responsibility, oversight, and scope of the Deputy Director of Aviation, it is recommended to establish a relationship of one pay grade higher. Since this is a new classification, there is no employee or budget impact.

   The Career Service Board unanimously approved Classification Notice No. 1559.
2. **Public Hearing Notice No. 567 – Prevailing Wage Notice: Oil and Gas Positions**

Alena Duran, Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 567 to adopt a change in the pay and/or fringe benefits of the prevailing wage of the following classification of workers: (1) Derrick Hand/Roustabout, (2) Electrician, (3) Mechanic, (4) Pipefitter, (5) Rig/Drill Operator, and (6) Truck Driver, in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code.

Based on this review, the following wage rate revision was proposed, based on the Service Contract wage determination method:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Wage</td>
<td>Fringes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick Hand/Roustabout</td>
<td>$13.87</td>
<td>$5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>$24.90</td>
<td>$7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>$23.73</td>
<td>$7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipefitter</td>
<td>$24.65</td>
<td>$7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rig/Drill Operator</td>
<td>$21.87</td>
<td>$6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>$21.63</td>
<td>$6.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 567.

3. **Public Hearing Notice No. 568 – Prevailing Wage Notice: Quality Control & Assurance Tech**

Alena Duran, Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 568 to adopt a change in the pay and/or fringe benefits of the prevailing wage of the following classification of worker, “Quality Control & Assurance Technician”, in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code.

Based on this review, the following wage rate revision was proposed, based on the Service Contract wage determination method:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Wage</td>
<td>Fringes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control &amp; Assurance Technician</td>
<td>$21.37</td>
<td>$6.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 568.

4. **Public Hearing Notice No. 569 – Prevailing Wage Notice: Sign Erector**

Alena Duran, Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 569 to adopt a change in the pay and/or fringe benefits of the prevailing wage of the following classification of worker, “Sign Erector”, in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code.

Based on this review, the following wage rate revision was proposed, based on the Service Contract wage determination method:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Wage</td>
<td>Fringes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Erector</td>
<td>$20.19</td>
<td>$3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 569.
V. Director’s Briefing:

1. Sexual Harassment Training Update

Patti Rowe, Director of Learning & Development, and Natalia Ballinger, Senior Assistant City Attorney, presented an update on the new required training for all City employees, including appointees, for sexual harassment prevention.

Ms. Rowe noted the Mayor’s commitment to providing an overall work environment that maintains employee equality, dignity, and respect. To that end, the Office of Human Resources ("OHR") will support this commitment by ensuring the City’s policies and procedures reinforce the message and expectation that sexual harassment in the workplace will not be tolerated. As such, all employees will be required to take training in CityU.

Ms. Rowe stated the training will be applicable to all employees of the city and strongly recommended to elected officials, independent agencies, and elected official agencies. The online training course module will clearly define what sexual harassment is and explain reporting procedures for witnesses to any action. OHR will also collaborate with the City Attorney’s Office ("CAO") to identify instructor-led training for agencies and/or departments where a need for additional training is required.

Ms. Rowe reviewed the timeline for the rollout, noting an email communication had been delivered to all employees last night notifying them the training module was now available in CityU and the deadline for completion was April 30, 2018. Ms. Rowe noted a proposal would be presented to the Board at the May 3, 2018 Meeting, recommending a refresher course be required of all employees every two years.

Ms. Rowe stated newly hired Career Service employees will be required to take the training as part of the probationary training requirements, while uniformed new hire officers will receive the training through their academies and new hire onboarding. All mayoral appointees will be required to take the training, while elected officials and other independent agencies will be strongly encouraged to do so.

Ms. Rowe noted Learning & Development would track the completion of the training and report status to all department heads and appointing authorities to ensure compliance. Board Member Karen DuWalldt asked who would be monitoring to make sure supervisors and executives were reviewing status and following up. Ms. Rowe replied OHR would be following up to ensure completion for all employees. Board Member Patricia Barela Rivera asked what discipline would be imposed if the training was incomplete. Ms. Ballinger responded progressive discipline, as outlined in Rule 16, would apply in these cases.

Ms. Rowe showed the 12-minute training video to the Board, noting the training would be available for employees to begin starting today. The Board indicated it was a good video and asked some additional questions.

Ms. Barela Rivera commented a handout with all phone numbers in one place should be distributed to employees, so they know exactly where to go. Ms. DuWalldt asked if this information was easily found in a central location, such as on the City’s webpage. Board Co-Chair Neil Peck stated it would be a good idea to have one internal ethics telephone number. Ms. Barela Rivera suggested OHR could distribute a 3 x 5 laminated card to employees.

Ms. Rowe noted all the suggestions were helpful and would be reviewed with OHR. Ms. Rowe concluded by noting Chuck Passaglia, an external consultant trainer in sexual harassment, would be engaged to hold instructor-led training sessions for some agencies where OHR and the CAO agreed it would be helpful. Ms. Barela Rivera stated she would like to see the training be conducted in-person for a minimum two-hour session across all agencies, noting that in her experience it is much more effective than doing an online training.

Ms. Rowe noted there would be further discussion on this question and additional feedback would be provided to the Board at a future meeting.
VI. Pending Cases:

1. **Silver Gutierrez & Denver Sheriff Department, Appeal No. 65-11A**
   The Career Service Board denied the Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss and reaffirmed the Hearing Officer’s decision, written order to follow.

2. **Darrin Turner vs. Denver Sheriff’s Department, Appeal No. 01-17**
   The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer’s decision, written order to follow.

3. **Bridget Andrews vs. Denver Sheriff’s Department, Appeal No. 16-17A**
   The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer’s decision, written order to follow.

4. **Gregory Gustin vs. Department of Aviation, Appeal No. 02-17A**
   The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer’s decision, written order to follow.

VII. Executive Session:

   The Board went into executive session at 9:45am.

   The following case was discussed:

   1. **Rhonda Casados vs. Denver Sheriff’s Department, Appeal No. 45-17A**
      The Career Service Board denied the Agency-Petitioner’s Motion to Dismiss and affirmed the Hearing Officer’s decision, written order to follow.

      The Board re-convened the meeting at 10:04am.

VIII. Adjournment: Adjournment was at 10:05am.