I. Opening: Meeting was called to order at 4:35pm

1. Approval of the Agenda for the August 2, 2018 Board Meeting.
   The Board unanimously approved the agenda for the July 19, 2018 meeting.

2. Approval of the Minutes for the July 19, 2018 Board Meeting.
   The Board unanimously approved the minutes for the July 19, 2018 meeting.

II. Board Comments: None.

III. Public Comments: None.

IV. Public Hearing:

1. Classification Notice No. 1571 – Human Services Operations Supervisor & Manager

   Lori Schumann, Senior Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Classification No. 1571 to amend the Classification & Pay Plan by creating two new classifications, Human Services Operations Supervisor at pay grade A-809, and Human Services Operations Manager at pay grade A-812, while abolishing the classifications of Eligibility Supervisor and Outreach Case Coordinator Supervisor.

   In April 2017 and August 2017, the Board approved the annual Pay Survey Market Analysis and Pay Survey Market Analysis amendment, which upgraded the Eligibility Technician series by two pay grades for positions at Denver Human Services (“DHS”).

   As a result, subsequent compression and career pathing issues were identified with DHS employees in the city-wide classifications of Operational Supervisor I (A-808) and Operational Supervisor II (A-810). When the Eligibility Supervisor (A-809) and the Outreach Case Coordinator Supervisor (A-809) were upgraded to pay grade A-809, the Operational Supervisor I became subordinate to both positions. The Operational Supervisor I and the Eligibility Supervisor both report to the Operational Supervisor II.

   It is proposed to create two new classifications, Human Services Operations Supervisor and Human Services Operations Manager, to restore the full staff-to-management career pathing within DHS, while abolishing the Eligibility Supervisor and Outreach Case Coordinator Supervisor classifications to allow for these employees to be reallocated to the new classifications.
NEW CLASSIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Classification Title</th>
<th>Proposed Pay Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809 ($58,433-$75,963-$93,493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Operations Manager</td>
<td>A-812 ($71,382-$92,797-$114,211)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASSIFICATION ABOLISHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Code</th>
<th>Current Class Title</th>
<th>Pay Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA2691</td>
<td>Eligibility Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2692</td>
<td>Outreach Case Coordinator Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed classifications will reallocate employees in the Eligibility Supervisor (A-809), Outreach Case Coordinator Supervisor (A-809), and Operational Supervisor I (A-808) classifications to the Human Services Operations Supervisor (A-809) classification. All three of these positions are similar in responsibility characteristics, essential duties, decision-making, level of supervision received and exercised, and span of control.

It is proposed to place the Human Services Operations Manager in pay grade A-812 to follow the standard compensation practice of a 15% pay grade distance between classifications in a series, and to keep the relative worth and alignment with classifications at DHS that have similar scope and assignment.

The proposed classification and pay grade was compared to other A-812 classifications at DHS that are similar in scope, assignment, and responsibilities. The proposed pay grade of A-812 keeps the relative worth and internal equity in line with the current career pathing at DHS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Code</th>
<th>Current Job Title</th>
<th>Current Pay Grade</th>
<th>Proposed Job Title</th>
<th>Proposed Pay Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA2313</td>
<td>Operational Supervisor I</td>
<td>A-808</td>
<td>Human Services Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2691</td>
<td>Eligibility Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809</td>
<td>Human Services Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2691</td>
<td>Outreach Case Coordinator Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809</td>
<td>Human Services Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>A-809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2314</td>
<td>Operational Supervisor II</td>
<td>A-810</td>
<td>Human Services Operations Manager</td>
<td>A-812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These changes will impact a total of fifty-seven (57) employees at DHS. Fourteen employees (14) will be reallocated from Operational Supervisor I to Human Services Operations Supervisor. Eight (8) employees will be reallocated from Operational Supervisor II to Human Services Operations Manager. Twenty-nine employees (29) will be reallocated from Eligibility Supervisor classification to Human Services Operations Supervisor. Six (6) employees will be reallocated from Outreach Case Coordinator Supervisor to Human Services Operations Supervisor.

Two (2) employees in the Operational Supervisor I classification and two (2) employees in the Operational Supervisor II classification will receive a pay increase to bring their salaries to the minimum of the new pay ranges. The budget impact is $4,555 for 2018 and $13,665 annually.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Classification Notice No.1571.


Lauren Locklear, HR Compliance Officer, and Nicole de Gioia-Keane, Director of Classification & Compensation, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 581 regarding proposed revisions to Career Service Rule 9-Pay Administration.
Ms. Locklear noted the intent is to create a modern pay administration framework to allow agencies and departments to have more autonomy and flexibility when setting pay. OHR also desires to move away from requiring agencies to set pay based on employees’ current salaries, instead considering enumerated pay factors and the salary range. In addition, there are other minor changes and revisions proposed as part of the overall review. Ms. Locklear began reviewing the summary table of proposed changes to the Rule.

Board Member Karen DuWaldt asked why eliminating salary history from the list of pay factors is appropriate under Section 9-5. Ms. Locklear noted two primary reasons: (1) the upcoming conversion of the City’s recruiting function to Workday will eliminate disclosure of salary history from candidates, and (2) the nationwide trend is to bar salary history from consideration when setting pay to avoid discrimination as certain protected classes have historically been paid less. Board Co-Chair Patti Klinge commented she thought this was a good change.

Ms. Locklear noted Section 9-33(a) will require agencies to consider the noted pay factors and the pay range of the position when an employee voluntarily demotes, rather than limiting the decrease in pay to 8%, which often causes pay inequities among other employees. Karen Niparko, Executive Director of OHR, suggested Ms. Locklear give an example to illustrate the current impact for the Board.

Ms. Locklear outlined a scenario where an employee making $80,000 decides for personal reasons to voluntarily demote to an Administrative Support Assistant II role. Under the current rules, OHR can only reduce the employee’s salary by 8%, whereas the average current salary for employees in the ASAII role is $47,000, resulting in significant pay inequity.

Board Co-Chair Neil Peck asked if this scenario frequently occurred. Ms. Locklear noted there were 47 voluntary demotions in 2017, however, she was uncertain if any resulted in subsequent pay inequity. Ms. Locklear noted there have been a few instances this year where OHR has used the pay equity rule to correct a demoted employee’s salary to the lower pay range, noting this was a workaround situation and not what the rule was intended to address.

Mr. Peck stated he was wondering if the proposed change was a solution in search of a problem. Ms. Locklear replied the proposed change is a solution to address a problem, noting in the seven months she has been with the City, the situation has come up at least three times.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane noted Classification & Compensation often encounters a situation where an employee voluntarily demotes and receives an 8% salary decrease per the current rule, prompting the agency to seek a pay equity review for other employees in the classification to receive a salary increase. Ms. de Gioia-Keane stated changing the rule will alleviate unnecessary analysis and review in these scenarios.

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked if changing the rule would discourage employees from taking voluntary demotions. Ms. Locklear responded she thought not, as discussions with employees that fall into these situations often confirms they have a genuine desire to take the role, and are disappointed when the current rule makes it difficult to reduce their pay within the new salary range.

Mr. Peck commented an employee may want the role, but wondered if they want to take a $33,000 pay cut. Ms. Locklear noted there are situations where employees take the demotion, knowing their pay will be subsequently decreased more than 8% through a pay equity review to reduce their salary to within the range of the new pay grade.

Ms. DuWaldt clarified it seems that employees’ current pay can be an issue when applying for other positions internally. Ms. Locklear noted this can be a factor for internal promotions as well. Cindy Bishop, Deputy Director, responded there have been recent situations where a manager rescinded an offer to an internal candidate due to the rule creating a pay equity issue, resulting in disappointment for everyone involved.
Ms. Klinge asked who will be responsible for pay-setting with the revisions to the rule. Ms. Locklear stated the hiring manager, working together with the recruiter and the Classification & Compensation team, will continue to set pay.

Ms. Locklear noted the proposed revision to Section 9-51(c) regarding shift differential has been tabled due to the need for additional discussion with the agencies involved.

Board Member Patricia Barela Rivera asked how many people would be affected by the change to Section 9-93(a)5, limiting snow removal overtime exception eligibility to classifications below the level of Director. Ms. de Gioia-Keane responded there are eight directors at DIA affected by the change, which was prompted by the airport’s rapidly increasing snow removal expense and the need to reduce this cost.

Ms. de Gioia-Keane noted Classification & Compensation conducted a survey of other airports to review whether overtime compensation exceptions were granted to director-level staff for snow removal operations, which indicated they did not.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 581, excluding the proposed revision to Section 9-51(c) which is removed from consideration.

V. Director’s Briefing:

1. OHR Marketing & Communications Update – Diane Vertovec

Karen Niparko, Executive Director of OHR, noted the stronger focus since 2014 on communications and marketing within the City’s HR community. Ms. Niparko stated this focus was designed to increase awareness of OHR’s programs and initiatives as well as to ensure employees are aware of all the benefits and activities in the City.

Diane Vertovec, Director of OHR Communications & Marketing, and Wade Balmer, Marketing & Communications Specialist, presented an update on OHR’s marketing and communications activities. Ms. Vertovec stated she has been building out OHR’s full-service marketing team since 2015-2016 and her primary goal has been to expand the channels and ability of OHR to communicate its activities throughout the City.

Ms. Vertovec presented the marketing dashboard and reviewed various metrics for effectiveness in reaching employees and honing the agency’s message. Ms. Vertovec also updated the Board on the new Citywide intranet project, Denver Hub, and noted the marketing team received over 2,000 requests in 2017 for assistance and support.

Ms. Vertovec stated the spring citywide recruiting campaign was delayed due to the pending implementation of Workday Recruiting, shared the status of the team’s recent projects, and noted the Colorado Open Records Act (“CORA”) requests coordinated through her team with other city agencies.

A video was shown of Mayor Hancock and Eulois Cleckley, Executive Director of Public Works, boarding the light rail, promoting public transportation and the use of RTD EcoPass.

The Board thanked Ms. Vertovec and Mr. Balmer for their presentation.

VI. Pending Cases:

1. 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.

2. 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.
3. **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.

4. **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.

5. **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.

6. **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.

**VII. Executive Session:**

The Board went into executive session at 5:30pm.

The following cases were re-considered in compliance with a ruling by the Colorado District Court regarding the powers of the Career Service Board to re-impose discipline in appeals:

1. **James Johnson vs. Denver Sheriff’s Department, Appeal No. A024-17A**
   The Career Service Board reversed the Hearing Officer’s decision and remanded the case back to the Hearing Office for reconsideration of the discipline, written order to follow.

2. **Carlos Hernandez and Bret Garegnani vs. Denver Sheriff’s Department, Consolidated Nos. A025-17A and A026-17A**
   The Career Service Board reversed the Hearing Officer’s decision and remanded the case back to the Hearing Office for reconsideration of the discipline, written order to follow.

3. **Robert Mancuso vs. Denver International Airport, Appeal No. 76-17A**
   The Career Service Board reversed the Hearing Officer’s decision and re-imposed the Agency’s discipline, written order to follow.

The following case was adjudicated:

1. **Virgil Fergerson vs. Denver Sheriff’s Department, Appeal No. A064-17**
   The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer’s decision, written order to follow.

The Board re-convened the meeting at 6:17pm.

**VIII. Adjournment:** Adjournment was at 6:19pm.