



Career Service Board Meeting #2340
Minutes
Thursday, July 19, 2018, 9:00am
Webb Municipal Building
201 W. Colfax Ave, Fourth Floor, Room 4.G.2

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

I. Opening: *Meeting was called to order at 9:05am*

- 1. Approval of the Agenda for the July 19, 2018 Board Meeting.**
The Board unanimously approved the agenda for the July 19, 2018 meeting.
- 2. Approval of the Minutes for the June 21, 2018 Board Meeting.**
The Board noted a correction to the term "intimidating" in two paragraphs under Public Hearing Notice 580, noting the correct word was "imitating", otherwise unanimously approving the minutes for the June 21, 2018 meeting.

II. Board Comments: *None.*

III. Public Comments: *None.*

IV. Public Hearing:

- 1. Classification Notice No. 1569 – Director of Recreation**

Nicole de Goia-Keane, Director of Classification & Compensation, presented Classification No. 1569 to amend the Classification & Pay Plan by increasing the pay grade of the classification of Director of Recreation from A-814 to A-815.

The Department of Parks and Recreation requested the Office of Human Resources to analyze the market rate of pay for the Director of Recreation to ensure internal equity with other director level classifications within the department. Based on an internal comparison of duties and responsibilities with the Director of Golf, it is recommended that the Director of Recreation's pay grade be changed to the A-815 pay grade.

PAY GRADE CHANGE

Current Pay Grade

A-814 (\$81,572-\$106,044-\$130,515)

Proposed Pay Grade

A-815 (\$87,200-\$113,360-\$139,520)

Local and national market data was reviewed, indicating the Director of Recreation is appropriately compensated in comparison to the market. Market pay data was collected from two survey sources: (1) the Employers Council, which is a local survey source, and (2) a custom survey of over 50 cities and counties throughout the United States, whose data was geographically adjusted to Denver.

Both survey sources indicated that the Director of Recreation is appropriately paid per market indicators; however, as a compensation practice, both market data and internal pay factors are considered when making compensation recommendations.

The basis of this pay recommendation is internal equity between the Director of Recreation and the Director of Golf. The Director of Parks (a comparable classification) was considered, but the focus of the Director of Parks is operational, where most employees consist of semi-skilled and skilled trade workers who repair and maintain parks facilities and grounds. The Director of Recreation and the Director of Golf both have similar business models in serving a retail customer base.

Both the Director of Recreation and the Director of Golf have similar duties and responsibilities regarding business and operational oversight of public facilities, span of control, and both positions report directly to Deputy Directors of Parks & Recreation.

The sole Director of Golf oversees seven golf courses and associated golf programs, while the three Directors of Recreation divide responsibility for 26 recreation centers and associated recreational programs, which is approximately eight recreation centers per incumbent. The Directors of Recreation directly supervise second level recreation supervisors that oversee the recreation facilities and associated programs.

The primary distinguishing characteristic between the two business operations is the golf course operation has a single director, while the recreation centers are divided among three directors. In addition, the golf course is an enterprise fund, whereas the recreation centers draw funding from the general fund.

An enterprise fund is considered more complex due to budget administration and the constraints of allocating funds and expenditures, which restrict business operations and makes it difficult to ensure profitability and sustainability. Enterprise funds present unique complexities and challenges in that they place limits on growth, employment, and resources due to available streams of revenue.

As a result, it is recommended that the Director of Recreation be placed one pay grade below the Director of Golf for the following reasons: (1) golf course operations are an enterprise fund, (2) the Director of Golf is a single point of focus; whereas there are multiple Directors of Recreation, and (3) the recreation centers derive their funding from the general fund, which lessens the degree of financial complexity in comparison to operating the golf courses.

PAY GRADE COMPARISON

| <u>Classification Title</u> | <u>Pay Grade</u> | <u>Pay Range</u> |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Director of Recreation | A-815 | \$85,336 - \$110,937 - \$136,538 |
| Director of Golf | A-816 | \$91,224 - \$118,591 - \$145,958 |

Ms. de Goia-Keane noted three employees currently in the classification will be moved to the new pay grade. There is no budget impact as the incumbents are paid within the range of the new grade.

Board Member Karen DuWaldt asked what the significance was in the fact there is only one Director of Golf versus several Directors of Recreation. Ms. de Goia-Keane stated the Director of Golf is responsible for seven golf courses whereas the three Directors of Recreation share responsibility for 26 recreation centers and associated recreational programs.

Ms. DuWaldt clarified she is asking why the Director of Recreation is one grade lower than the Director of Golf when the responsibilities are essentially the same. Ms. de Goia-Keane noted the Director of Recreation is currently at pay grade A-814, which is two grades below the Director of Golf, and the proposal is to increase the pay range by one grade.

Ms. de Goia-Keane noted the difference in complexity of financial operations between the two classifications, as the golf operation is expected to generate a revenue stream as an enterprise fund, whereas the recreation centers are funded through the general fund.

Board Co-Chair Neil Peck clarified the Director of Recreation is not generating income in the same way as the Director of Golf is. Ms. de Goia-Keane stated the Directors of Recreation are not expected to, whereas the Director of Golf is held accountable for doing so.

Ms. de Goia-Keane noted both positions serve a customer base, but the financial model under which they operate is different. Mr. Peck clarified this is the justification being cited for the pay range being one grade lower, to which Ms. de Goia-Keane confirmed is the recommendation being made.

Karen Niparko, Executive Director of the Office of Human Resources (“OHR”), asked if Happy Haynes, Executive Director of Parks & Recreation (“DPR”), had any additional comments she would like to make. Ms. Haynes introduced herself to the Board and stated she would like to elaborate on Ms. de Goia-Keane’s point regarding the comparable duties for DPR’s Recreation management team.

Ms. Haynes noted each Director manages seven or eight recreation facilities, in addition to having responsibility for two citywide programs relating to either the sports program or aquatic operations. Ms. Haynes stated one Director manages all 31 pools, in addition to the seven or eight facilities they are responsible for, while another also manages a program for disabled members.

Ms. Haynes noted the scope of responsibilities is comparable to the Director of Golf, however, the golf operation is an enterprise fund, which is budgeted very differently and all expenses are expected to be covered by the revenue generated. The Directors of Recreation are responsible for collecting membership and activity fees, however, the recreation centers are funded by the general fund and not required to generate a profit.

Mr. Peck stated he understands the difference, however, in looking at the actual responsibility of a Director of Recreation, in which one individual is responsible for managing 31 swimming pools plus seven recreation centers, Mr. Peck said that sounds like a very heavy load to him.

Mr. Peck stated it is difficult to draw a distinction between that level of responsibility and managing seven golf courses, even with the additional financial complexity handled by the Director of Golf. Mr. Peck noted he believes these are distinctions without a difference in terms of responsibility, as the three Directors of Recreation seem to have very heavy workloads based on the description provided by Ms. Haynes. Ms. Haynes responded she agrees the workload is significant.

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked how much revenue the Director of Golf generates annually, to which Ms. Haynes estimated was \$1 million plus, all of which is retained by the enterprise fund and used to fund capital improvements and cover expenses. Ms. Winchester noted the Director of Golf generates over a million dollars, while the difference between the pay grades, as proposed, is only \$6,000 to \$10,000.

Ms. Haynes stated the difference between the two operations is people must pay fees to use the golf courses whereas the recreation centers, while they do charge fees, do not generate enough revenue to cover the cost of operation like a private fitness center does. Ms. Haynes noted certain members of the public, such as youth or seniors, pay a discounted rate, and the recreation centers are required to be accessible to all levels of income in the community. As such, the recreation centers are supported and funded through the general fund.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if all the Directors of Recreation report to Ms. Haynes, to which Ms. Haynes replied they report to one of two Deputy Directors. Ms. Haynes stated the Director of Golf reports to the Deputy Director of Parks, while the three Directors of Recreation report to the Deputy Director of Recreation.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if Ms. Haynes was comfortable that the recommendation to classify the Director of Golf position one pay grade higher than the Director of Recreation position was fair and equitable.

Ms. Haynes replied she appreciates the work Classification & Compensation did to analyze the two positions and there may be internal precedents for how positions that manage enterprise funds are compensated versus positions that do not. Ms. Haynes stated that from her perspective, the two positions are very similar in the level of responsibility and duties.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if there would be some turmoil in the organization if the Directors of Recreation are paid one grade lower than the Director of Golf. Ms. de Goia-Keane noted the Directors are already paid two grades lower, which Ms. Haynes stated was the original catalyst for the request to review, as the Deputy Director for Recreation felt there was no reason for a large pay range difference between the two positions. Ms. Haynes asked if Ms. de Goia-Keane wished to add anything to her comment.

Ms. de Goia-Keane replied the market data indicates the current pay grade of A-814 was appropriate for the Director of Recreation classification, stating there is always a blend of art and science when reviewing pay, which validates the approach of looking at internal equity as well. Ms. de Goia-Keane stated the recommendation to move the pay grade up one level is appropriate to the analysis result and the comparative worth of the two positions, as the required financial complexity is quite different between them.

Mr. Peck stated he is not entirely comfortable with the recommendation, to which Ms. Niparko asked if Mr. Peck feels the proposed pay grade for the Director of Recreation is too low. Mr. Peck replied that Ms. Haynes' testimony has clearly validated the two positions are very similar, and he does not understand why someone who manages seven recreation centers and 31 swimming pools would not be paid the same as an individual who manages seven golf courses.

Ms. Niparko asked Ms. Haynes how many swimming pools each Director of Recreation manages. Ms. Haynes stated it was not evenly split among the Directors, as one Director manages the City's aquatics program, while another Director manages the athletic programs.

Jack Davies, HR Manager of Parks & Recreation, noted market data may not accurately reflect the role in Denver as titles do not necessarily align with the responsibilities. Mr. Davies noted another municipality, such as Austin, may have a Director of Recreation position, however, the responsibilities may encompass only one or two centers versus Denver's position managing seven or eight, plus city-wide programs.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if market data was also used to review the pay grade for the Director of Golf, to which Ms. de Goia-Keane replied in the negative, noting that was not part of the request. Ms. DuWaldt stated she is not concerned whether the market data is accurate as much as she is concerned about internal equity.

Ms. de Goia-Keane stated she agreed, noting the recommendation is to increase the pay grade by one level to A-815, bringing parity to the Parks & Recreation management team, as there are other directors in the agency also at A-815, which is a good starting point.

Mr. Peck asked Ms. de Goia-Keane if she anticipated having to return in a year with another Notice increasing the pay grade. Ms. de-Goia Keane stated the annual pay survey is required every year by ordinance, and if market data indicated a change was necessary, then the change would be made, as pay ranges are reviewed carefully.

Mr. Peck clarified market data is not the only factor to consider, as internal factors are considered as well, to which Ms. de Goia-Keane replied in the affirmative.

Ms. DuWaldt asked where the incumbents currently fall within the pay grade. Mr. Davies responded one of the employees has been with the City for thirty years, which Ms. Haynes stated places that employee very high in the current pay range.

Mr. Davies noted two Directors were hired relatively recently, with salaries in the first or second quartiles of the range. Mr. Davies stated the new pay grade will provide some additional range growth.

Ms. Niparko asked how difficult the recruiting was for the recent Director of Recreation vacancies, and if it was difficult, whether that was related to pay. Mr. Davies asked Ms. Haynes if she wished to respond.

Ms. Haynes stated she was not directly involved in the recruiting, however, one of the incumbents was a high-performing Parks & Recreation employee who was promoted into the position. The other vacancies were posted for quite some time, which Mr. Davies noted was for several months, including a reposting, as they were not attracting the right candidates for the role. Mr. Davies noted Workforce Readiness would be important going forward to ensure an adequate talent pool for future openings.

Ms. Niparko stated the reason for the question is to clarify for the Board whether the recommended pay grade will be adequate to recruit qualified candidates in the future given the decision to place the role one grade below the Director of Golf. Ms. DuWaldt noted if a long-term incumbent is about to top out at the current range, that is also an indication an adjustment is necessary.

Mr. Davies asked Ms. Haynes for her recommendation regarding placement of the Director of Golf at pay grade A-816 and the Director of Recreation at pay grade A-815. Ms. Haynes stated she did not see a significant difference in the scope of responsibilities between the two roles, however, she did not perform the compensation study.

Ms. DuWaldt asked Ms. Haynes if the new pay grade for the Director of Recreation provides sufficient range to pay what she thought candidates would expect. Ms. Haynes reviewed the new pay range and current salaries of the incumbents with Ms. de Goia-Keane. Ms. Winchester noted there is a difference between the responsibilities of managing an area under an enterprise fund versus one that does not, to which Mr. Peck responded he felt was a red herring.

Ms. Haynes noted there was a \$15,000 difference in pay for the top of the range of grades A-814 and A-815, giving enough room for a long-term incumbent to receive future increases. Ms. DuWaldt asked if Ms. Haynes felt comfortable with the new pay range, to which Ms. Haynes replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Winchester asked whether the status of the golf operation as an enterprise fund, while the recreation centers are funded through the general fund, should have any impact on the pay ranges.

Ms. Haynes responded there has been an ongoing discussion among City officials for many years as to whether the golf operation should be subsidized in the same manner as the recreation centers, however, the practice in other municipalities is golf is not subsidized and the fees charged are expected to cover all of the expenses.

Ms. Haynes stated recreation centers are operated for the benefit of the public's health and well-being, in addition to providing a social environment for the senior population as well. The general philosophy is these facilities must be accessible to all members of the community and are usually supported with funding.

Mr. Davies noted the golf courses also offer youth programs and other community-based programs, but the recreation centers serve a much larger population and are in high-demand.

Mr. Peck asked how the Board wished to proceed. Ms. Winchester responded she would like to make a motion to approve the Notice, which Ms. DuWaldt seconded.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Classification Notice No. 1569.

2. Classification Notice No. 1568 – Arts & Venue Coordinator

Blair Malloy, Senior Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Classification No. 1568 to amend the Classification & Pay Plan by changing the pay grade of the classification of Booking Coordinator from the current exempt pay grade of A-810 to the proposed non-exempt grade of A-620.

Denver Arts & Venues requested OHR review the current classifications of employees working in booking events into the city operated and owned facilities. Existing employees are classified in general titles, but the existing classification of Booking Coordinator describes the work at the type and level performed by employees coordinating booking activities at Red Rocks Amphitheatre, Denver Coliseum, McNichols Building, and the Denver Performing Arts Complex.

This is a request to change the exemption status of this currently vacant classification, which requires changing the pay grade from the current exempt pay grade of A-810 to the proposed non-exempt pay grade of A-620. This change is appropriate based on the duties of this classification. Additionally, this will provide a clearer career path for employees performing this type and level of work.

As there is no market data on the Booking Coordinator, internal equity was used instead. It is proposed to establish a pay relationship to the Events Coordinator, at pay grade A-807, which is a benchmark class.

This pay relationship is recommended since the Booking Coordinator is responsible for scheduling tenants and booking events into city owned venues, whereas an Events Coordinator is responsible for coordinating events and administrative and logistical support during all events.

It is recommended to change the pay grade of the Booking Coordinator from exempt to non-exempt, A-810 to A-620, and establish a pay relationship of +0, the closest non-exempt pay grades to the Events Coordinator, an exempt grade of A-807. This is a 1.1% difference between the pay grade of A-807 and A-620.

There is no budget impact as two employees who are currently classified as Staff Assistant at Denver Arts & Venues will be reallocated into the new class at pay-to-pay.

Board Member Karen DuWaldt asked how long the class has remained vacant without an incumbent, to which Ms. Malloy replied was five years.

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked how many hours the position is expected to work and whether there will be a maximum since the classification is becoming non-exempt. Ms. Malloy stated the two employees who will be reclassified are also non-exempt and there should not be any impact. Ms. Malloy noted Mark Heiser of Arts & Venue was present and could elaborate on the operations.

Mark Heiser, Chief Operating Officer for Arts & Venue, introduced himself to the Board. Mr. Heiser stated the principal difference between the two positions is in the day-to-day duties and their relative responsibility for an event. Mr. Heiser noted overtime is still a requirement of the position. Ms. Winchester clarified she was concerned whether the overtime would be excessive, to which Mr. Heiser replied in the negative as the positions are managed by a supervisor.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 1568.

V. Director's Briefing:

1. Workday Recruiting Update – Cindy Bishop

Cindy Bishop, Deputy Director of OHR, Chris Longshore, Director of HR Technology & Innovation, and Jordan Dullea, OHR Project Manager, presented an update to the Board on Workday Recruiting.

Ms. Bishop stated today's presentation would outline why the City is implementing Workday Recruiting, some of the key significant changes versus the process today, the key stakeholders, and a summary of the hiring process. Ms. Bishop noted the change management plan would also be outlined, and a quick demo shown of the candidate and manager experience.

Currently, the City uses a recruiting system called NeoGov, while the human resources, finance, and procurement functions have all migrated to Workday, making it important to migrate recruitment management as part of the City's technology enterprise strategy. Ms. Bishop noted OHR is currently managing two different systems, which is inefficient and provides conflicting data. Once the migration is completed, the employee cycle of hiring through retirement will be handled on one system.

Ms. Bishop stated another attraction of Workday Recruiting is it will be mobile-ready, enabling candidates to apply for positions on their smart phones, tablets, and other similar devices. Workday will also make it easier to provide role clarity for each recruiting function (i.e. the recruiter, the hiring manager, the onboarding coordinator) and to review for efficiency.

Ms. Bishop noted the project timeline has been adjusted from the original go-live date of July 30th, to August 27th due to the need for additional configuration modifications and time for the rollout team to prepare revised training materials as testing continues. Ms. Bishop reiterated the importance of the rollout team being available to give hands-on training and support to the hiring managers once the system goes live.

Ms. Bishop highlighted some of the key changes with Workday Recruiting, including: (1) job requisitions will feed a job posting; (2) separate application process for internal and external candidates; (3) automatic disqualification of candidates who do not meet minimum qualifications; (4) automatic notification of disqualification throughout the hiring cycle; (5) full integration of all assessments and testing; (6) rolling review of candidates instead of waiting for job opening to close; (7) recruiter's role in reviewing qualifications and compensation will be strengthened and centralized in one system.

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked if candidates who are automatically disqualified are given any level of review, to which Ms. Bishop stated they are not. Ms. Bishop noted the qualifiers of a college degree or years of experience are minimum requirements and candidates who do not meet the minimum cannot be considered for the position. Ms. Bishop noted this is expected to occur in a very small portion of candidates applying.

Board Member Karen DuWaldt asked if candidates are notified when they are disqualified, to which Ms. Bishop replied in the affirmative. Ms. Bishop highlighted that Workday will provide an automatic communication to candidates who are disqualified at any point during the hiring cycle, which does not take place today.

Ms. Dullea gave the Board an overview of the change management plan, noting the training would focus on role specific impact to ensure maximum effectiveness and preparation. Ms. Dullea reviewed the four areas of planning, including stakeholder engagement, communication, training, and support, highlighting the specific initiatives in each.

Ms. Bishop and Ms. Dullea showed a demo of Workday Recruiting, demonstrating the system through the candidate experience and the manager experience.

Ms. Winchester asked if there would be a difference in the portal experience for civil service candidates versus career service candidates. Ms. Bishop responded the system will be the same for both groups, noting at present the civil service using ICMS for applicant tracking, not NeoGov, and the qualification process is very different due to their positions. Ms. Bishop asked Chris Longshore to comment on the position posting process.

Mr. Longshore stated the process would be very similar, noting the civil service mostly posts academy training openings for the Police and Fire Departments, which is far less frequent than the career service openings. Mr. Longshore stated the primary benefit will be having the data on one system, making it easier for compliance and reporting purposes.

Karen Niparko, Executive Director of OHR, asked Ms. Bishop to summarize for the Board the difference between where OHR is today with recruiting versus the past. Ms. Bishop noted eliminating having two different systems and unifying the candidate experience is a huge benefit, as well as having enhanced reporting and tracking of applicants, will be far more efficient. Ms. Bishop noted the City fills an average of 3,300 positions annually, including seasonal roles, and receives over 150,000 applications.

Board Co-Chair Neil Peck asked if seasonal employees are required to go through the same process as candidates for permanent positions, to which Ms. Bishop replied in the affirmative. Ms. Bishop stated there is also a rapid rehire process for candidates who are returning to seasonal positions such as lifeguard, which streamlines and eliminates some of the pre-hiring steps.

Ms. Winchester asked if candidates who create an account and apply for a position are then flagged for other potential positions. Ms. Bishop clarified that does not happen automatically, however, a candidate will receive prompts to apply for other positions they may be qualified for. Ms. Bishop noted the recruiting team can also review the candidate database and contact potentially qualified individuals.

Ms. Niparko noted the enormous impact of the Workday Recruiting project as there are different recruiting requirements and methods for the various agencies, creating a significant level of complexity for Talent Acquisition and HRIS in getting buy-in and implementing the system. Ms. Niparko commented the project has been very challenging, but commended the team for doing a great job and noting the benefit to the City's recruitment process will be tremendous.

The Board thanked OHR for the presentation.

2. Bloomberg-Wellness Initiative – Heather Britton, Gillian Christie, Natalie Triedman

Heather Britton, Director of Benefits & Wellness, introduced Gillian Christie and Natalie Triedman, Harvard Graduate Student Interns who have been working with OHR over the last six weeks as part of the Bloomberg-Harvard City Leadership Initiative focusing on wellness.

Ms. Britton stated OHR is in the third year of the three-year plan for wellness, and is now ready to move on to the next phase, which will be greatly helped by the work done by Ms. Christie and Ms. Triedman. Ms. Britton noted they would give a short presentation to share information about the program and proposed next steps.

Natalie Triedman introduced herself to the Board and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present an update on the program. Ms. Triedman introduced Gillian Christie, noting she has five years of corporate experience and is working on her Doctorate of Health. Ms. Triedman stated she has experience in the health policy analysis field in Colorado and is working on her MBA/MPA degree.

Ms. Triedman stated their work has been part of a broader program under the Bloomberg-Harvard City Leadership Initiative, in which Karen Niparko, Heather Britton, and other OHR leaders were chosen to participate in an executive training program in New York City. Ms. Triedman noted Mayor Hancock had selected wellness as the focus of Denver's initiative in the program.

Ms. Christie highlighted several key statistics, including the City spent \$111 million in 2017 on healthcare claims, a 10% increase over 2016. Ms. Christie noted a review of the health care conditions suffered by city employees indicated 8 out of 10 are related to obesity, including diabetes, hypertension, and back pain, with the remainder relating to mental health, particularly depression.

Ms. Christie stated a review of emergency room visits showed that 1 in 3 were for non-urgent conditions that could have been treated by a primary care provider. Ms. Triedman noted they also conducted interviews with 30 city leaders and staff to understand some of the challenges in implementing a more effective wellness initiative.

Ms. Triedman noted the top three challenges were: (1) there is no overarching culture of wellness at the City, even though there are numerous classes offered, awareness and attendance was low; (2) employees are generally skeptical of authority, a common attribute of a government workforce; (3) middle management is a barrier to participation in health and wellness.

Board Co-Chair Neil Peck asked in what respect middle management is a barrier. Ms. Triedman replied many employees commented they do not always receive permission to participate in a wellness initiative or leave early for a doctor's appointment during their work day, keeping in mind some agencies, such as DHS or Safety, flexibility is difficult to grant due to the nature of the position. Ms. Triedman stated one goal is to determine how to design sufficient flexibility to allow all employees to participate.

Mr. Peck asked how the city compares to the private sector, particularly those organizations that have a proactive culture of health and well-being. Ms. Triedman responded that most of the best practices and early adopters are from the private sector and municipalities always have a challenge due to the huge diversity of positions in the workforce, making it a challenge to find a customizable solution. Ms. Christie stated Kings County in Washington and New York City are two examples of municipalities with robust programs.

Mr. Peck stated the Board is aware many new employees being hired by the City are of the millennial generation, noting that his local gym is filled with millennials morning until night. Mr. Peck asked if there is something different with the City's workforce of millennials.

Ms. Triedman stated the issue is not so much millennial employees, noting the average age of employees in the City is 45, indicating an older workforce. Ms. Triedman stated as more millennials join the City, there will be more demand for wellness programs.

Ms. Christie noted there are two opportunity goals to focus on after reviewing the research and data: (1) increasing employee engagement in wellness; (2) designing activities and initiatives to mitigate loss. Ms. Christie stated the blueprint being refined for presentation includes eight areas to encourage change.

Ms. Triedman highlighted four integrated factors that contribute to overall health and well-being, including mental health, financial well-being, professional well-being, and physical health, which will help bring clarity to employees and a focus for leadership.

Ms. Christie noted immediate opportunities for change mostly focus on employee behaviors, stating that many of the current wellness initiatives are focused on these factors. The challenge is to create some environmental and policy changes across the City and its agencies.

Ms. Triedman stated the three areas of success would focus on measuring whether the City is moving the needle on key health and well-being indicators, looking at the healthcare cost curve, and whether the right people are being reached. Ms. Triedman noted they are looking at creating some low-effort methods of measuring and tracking these trends.

Board Member Tracy Winchester noted the City's very diverse workforce and asked how the team is planning to integrate these initiatives among employees who do vastly different jobs, for example a person sitting at a desk versus someone on a tractor in Parks & Recreation.

Ms. Triedman responded one area of opportunity in the current data was to review insurance claims experience from the City's carriers by agency to identify high-risk versus low-risk employees. Ms. Triedman stated this data will enable the team to create customized recommendations for each agency, and enable OHR's Wellness Coordinators to work with each agency as consultants in developing grass-roots action plans.

Ms. Britton concluded by noting Ms. Triedman and Ms. Christie would present their findings and recommendations to the Mayor on August 31st, with a separate readout scheduled to the eight executive leaders who attended the Bloomberg-Harvard City Leadership Initiative training in New York City.

Ms. Britton stated she is particularly enthusiastic about the changes for the wellness staff, who will take on a more consultative role with the agencies, rather than just scheduling and creating initiatives. Ms. Britton noted the Mayor's endorsement is critical to successfully reducing the barriers in middle management to engaging more effectively in wellness.

Karen Niparko, Executive Director of OHR, stated the City had been very fortunate to have Ms. Triedman and Ms. Christie to perform this critical work and provide recommendations with their expertise. The Board thanked Ms. Triedman and Ms. Christie for the excellent work.

3. Hearing Office Activity Report – 1st and 2nd Quarters

Bruce Plotkin and Federico Alvarez, Career Service Hearing Officers, and Laura Hammock, Operations Coordinator, presented an activity report for the Hearing Office for 1st and 2nd Quarters to-date.

Mr. Plotkin noted the Hearing Office received 47 new appeals from the period of January 1, 2018 through June 30, 2018, and issued 20 decisions in an average of 58 days, with half being timely, mainly due to the vacancy of the Career Service Hearing Officer position, which was filled in April.

Mr. Plotkin noted he is pleased to report that with the addition of Mr. Alvarez as the new Career Service Hearing Officer, everything is now being issued timely, and Mr. Alvarez's extensive judicial background enabled him to hit the ground running with very little guidance, allowing the Hearing Office to catch-up on issuing all decisions and orders.

The Hearing Office closed 66 appeals and issued 194 orders, exceeding the BMO goal of 95% issued within two days. The average hearing was for five hours and 59 minutes, with five witnesses and 20 exhibits. The Hearing Office met the goal of setting all appeals for hearing within 77 days after the date of Notice of Hearing and Prehearing Order, pursuant to Career Service Rule 19.

Mr. Plotkin reviewed the appeals activity by agency, noting the Board had expressed interest in the trend with the Denver Sheriff's Department. Mr. Plotkin stated ten cases were received from the Sheriff's Department year-to-date, seven from Public Works, and six from Denver Human Services.

Denver Board Co-Chair Neil Peck asked Mr. Plotkin to elaborate on the point made on several occasions that some of the cases from the Sheriff's Department could have been mitigated with additional training.

Mr. Plotkin stated he has initiated a monthly telephonic meeting with Jess Vigil, Deputy Director of Safety, to discuss case trends, which Mr. Vigil has expressed as being very helpful in highlighting areas for further inquiry and additional training.

Mr. Plotkin used the examples of door flap related incidents, erroneous releases, and mandatory drug & alcohol testing under XO 94. Mr. Peck stated the Board appreciated Mr. Plotkin's observations.

Ms. Hammock noted an increase in mediation requests to 63 this year, with the Sheriff's Department at a 33% acceptance rate, an improvement over last year. Ms. Hammock highlighted the acceptance rate among other agencies has declined.

Ms. Hammock noted she and Steve Charbonneau had recently met with the Employment Law Section of the City Attorney's Office to discuss the statistics. Mr. Plotkin commented it is difficult to determine the analytics behind the decline in acceptance, noting the answer is likely to be complex and very individualized, and stated he is unsure if it is a trend yet.

Board Member Karen DuWaldt asked if mediation requests are received more often from one party versus another. Ms. Hammock replied the requests always come from the employee in one of two ways: (1) when filing an appeal to the Hearing Office, a request for mediation can be made, and (2) a direct request for mediation, of which 67% have both pending, and the remaining 33% relating to employee-to-employee issues.

Karen Niparko, Executive Director of OHR, noted Patti Klinge, Board Co-Chair, had asked for additional information regarding mediation activities involving OHR. Ms. Niparko stated she had asked Marti White to research and complete a report on the status of mediation, noting Ms. White had met with the Hearing Office, various agencies, and OHR managers. Ms. Niparko stated she would review the final report and update the Board as well.

Ms. Hammock replied it would be helpful if the Hearing Office could review the report as well, noting a survey was done a year ago asking employees what they knew or thought about the Hearing Office or mediation, with 49% expressing interest in knowing more about mediation.

Ms. Hammock and Mr. Plotkin noted they had met with the City Attorney's Office ("CAO") and would like to expand their discussion to other agencies as well. Ms. Niparko recommended they also meet with HR Directors, Managers, and Business Partners as they are closest to the issues that often come up. Mr. Plotkin agreed this would be very helpful.

Mr. Peck asked Judge Alvarez if he had anything to add to the report, now that he has been in his role for three months. Mr. Alvarez thanked the Board for hiring him and expressed his congratulations to Mr. Peck on his retirement from Snell & Wilmer, to which Mr. Peck thanked him.

Mr. Alvarez stated his general observation is the Hearing Office is benefitting from being fully-staffed, and expressed confidence the current length of time for decisions issued will be halved by the end of the year.

Mr. Alvarez noted he also expected to see significant progress in summarizing the notes and uploading information to the website, as well as positive impact from his experience, using the example of updating the evidence book, which was ten years old, and correcting information and various links.

Mr. Alvarez also noted there was an opportunity to further review the Rules and perhaps reduce the currently long turnaround times allowed for various aspects of the appeal process, stating he would like to further research the matter and discuss with the CAO. Mr. Peck stated the Board would like to hear more when the Hearing Office is ready to present a proposal.

Board Member Tracy Winchester commended the Hearing Office's presentation and noted the significant improvement in the statistics and congratulated them for greatly improving their operation.

VI. Pending Cases:

1. James Johnson vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. A024-17A
The Career Service Board reversed the Hearing Officer's decision and re-imposed the original discipline, written order to follow.
2. Eric Givens vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. A037-17
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
3. Carlos Hernandez and Bret Garegnani vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Consolidated Nos. A025-17A and A026-17A
The Career Service Board, in a 2-1 decision, reversed the Hearing Officer's decision and re-imposed the original discipline, written order to follow.
4. Erika Gajarszki, Dawn Havens, and Iwona Meaney vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Consolidated Appeals Nos. 30-17A, 32-17A, and 033-17A
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
5. Cristella Rodriguez vs. Denver Parks & Recreation, Appeal No. 60-17A
The Career Service Board modified the Hearing Officer's decision, re-instating the appellant to a non-supervisory position without back pay, written order to follow.

VII. Executive Session:

The Board went into executive session at 11:53am.

The following matters were adjudicated:

1. Motion for Clarification on CSB 6/21/18 Order Denying Agency's Interlocutory Appeal – Michelle Lee Tenorio vs. Office of Economic Development, Appeal No. 34-16
The Career Service Board issued an Order to clarify its decision issued on June 21, 2018.
2. Ryan Bosveld vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. 53-16A
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
3. Emina Gerovic vs. General Services-Facilities Management, Appeal No. A077-17
The Career Service Board denied the Agency-Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, written order to follow.
4. Robert Mancuso vs. Denver International Airport, Appeal No. 76-17A
The Career Service Board reversed the Hearing Officer's decision and re-imposed the original discipline, written order to follow.
5. Timothy Applegate & Justin Tomsick, Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal Nos. 46-17A/47-17A
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.

The Board re-convened the meeting at 12:35pm.

VIII. Adjournment: *Adjournment was at 12:40pm.*