



Career Service Board Meeting #2352

Minutes

Thursday, January 17, 2019, 9:00am

Webb Municipal Building

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

Karen DuWaldt (Co-Chair)

Neil Peck (Co-Chair)

Patricia Barela Rivera

Tracy Winchester

I. Opening: *Meeting was called to order at 9:03am*

1. Approval of the Agenda for the January 17, 2019 Board Meeting.

The Board unanimously approved the agenda for the January 17, 2019 meeting.

2. Approval of the Minutes for the December 6, 2018 Board Meeting.

The Board unanimously approved the minutes for the December 6, 2018 meeting.

II. Board Comments: *None.*

III. Public Comments: *None.*

IV. Public Hearing:

1. Classification Notice No. 1581 – Airport Planner Series

Blair Malloy, Senior Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Classification Notice No. 1581 to amend the Classification and Pay Plan by creating the new classifications City Planner Staff (E-810), Airport Planner Staff (E-811), Airport Planner Associate (E-813), Airport Planner Senior (E-815), Airport Planner Principal (E-817), Manager Airport Planning (E-819), Manager City Planning (E-819), and Director City Planning (E-821). The proposal includes changes to the title and/or pay grade of various associated classifications.

This study is the result of a request to create a new classification series of airport planners for Denver International Airport (“DEN”), as these employees are currently classified in the City Planner series. Because of changes in the professional planning industry and the resulting organizational impact, Classification & Compensation decided to review all professional planners’ pay grades across the City (“CCD”).

Agency leaders have expressed challenges with attracting and retaining talented planners to work for the CCD. The CCD employs a variety of professional planners who specialize in various fields, such as community planning, land use, historic preservation, urban planning, transportation planning, airport planning, and other related areas of specialized planning requiring advanced education and experience. In addition to DEN, these classifications are also used by Community Planning & Development (“CPD”) and Public Works (“PW”).

The purpose of this study was to: (1) create a new classification series specific to airport planning; (2) review the existing City Planner and Development Project Coordinator classifications, and related organizational structure, to ensure they reflect current needs; and, (3) review market data to provide competitive pay ranges for the new and revised classifications.

Classification & Compensation's research concluded that airport planning is a separate niche in the planning profession. Currently, all planners in the city are classified together under the title of City Planner. However, to remain competitive with the market, it is proposed to create a new classification series specific to airport planning, which is supported by management at DEN. The existing classification series for City Planners would remain and continued to be used by other agencies, as these employees perform other types of specialized professional city planning work.

This study proposes the following five recommendations: (1) update the titles of existing classifications as described in the report to better represent the type and level of work; (2) create a new airport planning classification series; (3) create three new classifications, City Planner Staff, Manager City Planning, and Director of Airport Planning, in the city planner classification series; (4) establish the grades and ranges for the new and existing classifications in the airport planning series; and (5) change the pay grades for the current classifications and establish the pay grades and ranges for the new classifications in the city planner classification series.

This proposed change also abolishes certain grades and adjusts the pay grades of certain classifications.

NEW CLASSIFICATIONS

<u>Proposed Class Title</u>	<u>Proposed Pay Grade & Range</u>
Staff City Planner	E-810 (\$55,452-72,088-88,723)
Staff Airport Planner	E-811 (\$59,278-77,088-94,845)
Associate Airport Planner	E-813 (\$67,740-88,062-108,384)
Senior Airport Planner	E-815 (\$77,411-100,635-123,858)
Principal Airport Planner	E-817 (\$88,462-115,001-141,539)
Airport Planning Manager	E-819 (\$101,091-131,419-161,746)
City Planning Manager	E-819 (\$101,091-131,419-161,746)
City Planning Director	E-821 (\$115,523-150,180-184,837)

CLASSIFICATION TITLE AND PAY GRADE CHANGES

<u>Current Class Title</u>	<u>Proposed Class Title</u>
Associate Development Project Coordinator	Associate Development Project Administrator
Senior Development Project Coordinator	Senior Development Project Administrator
Development and Planning Supervisor	City Planner Supervisor
Principal City Planner	City Planner Principal
Principal City Planner Hourly	City Planner Principal Hourly
Director Airport Planning and Noise	Director Airport Planning

<u>Current Pay Grade & Range</u>	<u>Proposed Pay Grade & Range</u>
E-810 (\$55,452-72,088-88,723)	E-812 (\$63,368-82,379-101,389)
E-812 (\$63,368-82,379-101,389)	E-814 (\$72,414-94,138-115,862)
E-815 (\$77,411-100,635-123,858)	E-817 (\$88,462-115,001-141,539)
E-815 (\$77,411-100,635-123,858)	E-816 (\$82,752-107,578-132,403)
E-815 (\$77,411-100,635-123,858)	E-816 (\$82,752-107,578-132,403)
E-819 (\$101,091-131,419-161,746)	E-821 (\$115,523-150,180-184,837)

CLASSIFICATION PAY GRADE CHANGES

Current Class Title

City Planner Associate
City Planner Associate Hourly
City Planner Senior
City Planner Senior Hourly

Current Pay Grade & Range

E-811 (\$59,278-77,088-94,845)
E-811 (\$59,278-77,088-94,845)
E-813 (\$67,740-88,062-108,384)
E-813 (\$67,740-88,062-108,384)

Proposed Pay Grade & Range

E-812 (\$63,368-82,379-101,389)
E-812 (\$63,368-82,379-101,389)
E-814 (\$72,414-94,138-115,862)
E-814 (\$72,414-94,138-115,862)

Ms. Malloy noted a custom survey was conducted in July 2018 for the City Planner classification series to obtain local and municipal pay data. Data from the 2018 ACI survey of large/category X airports was used to review pay for the proposed Airport Planner classification series.

Ms. Malloy stated the current challenge with the existing planning series classification is the position encompasses a wide range of specialties, including community planning, land use, historic preservation, urban planning, transportation planning, and airport planning.

Classification & Compensation believes creating a new career path for airport planning is appropriate due to the specialized experience requirement. Ms. Malloy stated the education requirements for the two planning classification series are similar.

Board Member Tracy Winchester asked what education is required for the Planner position. Ms. Malloy responded a degree in planning is usually necessary. Janice Cornell, Director, CPD, clarified the agency also accepts Architects, as well as degrees in Urban Planning and Construction Management. Ms. Cornell stated the degree is the starting point, however, the candidate's specific experience is the most important factor considered.

Ms. Winchester asked if there was an entry-level planning position being created, to which Ms. Malloy noted was one of the requests and was addressed by adding the new Staff City Planner classification.

Jennifer Hillhouse, Planning Director for PW, stated the agency currently has a difficult time transitioning graduating interns into open permanent positions, as there is no entry-level classification to do so. Ms. Hillhouse noted having the new staff level position will help create additional depth. Ms. Malloy stated the airport planning series would also have an entry-level classification.

Board Co-Chair Neil Peck asked for clarification to the rationale for creating a separate Planner classification series for the Airport Planning specialty. Mr. Peck also questioned whether someone with five years of experience working as a City Planner in PW, for example, could then work in one of the other specialties, such as land use, or if separate classifications for each specialty would need to be created.

Board Co-Chair Karen DuWaldt commented it would be helpful to the Board to understand what factors regarding the airport planning specialty warranted creating its own classification.

Ms. Hillhouse stated City Planners working in PW or CPD could work in any of the other specialties, such as Land Use, and the two agencies work holistically together on many of the same projects.

Jeanette Hilaire, Manager of Planning & Design for DEN, commented the education requirement for airport planners usually requires a degree in aerospace technology or planning, and the experience and skills needed are quite different than what PW or CPD would typically look for in candidates.

Ms. Malloy explained the new career path created by the Airport Planner classification series, as well as the changes to the existing City Planner classifications to further define the career path for those specialties.

Ms. Malloy reviewed the pay grades created for the Airport Planner classification series as well as changes made to the City Planner pay grades, noting there was a need to provide some parity between the two series in the intermediate positions, of which the airport classifications will be one grade higher.

Board Member Patricia Barela Rivera asked whether the pay is comparable between the two classification series. Ms. Malloy noted the pay survey data indicated the Airport Planner management classifications should be two grades higher than the current City Planner series, however, one grade is appropriate for the intermediate positions.

Ms. Winchester asked for clarification regarding the funding of salaries and benefits for employees at DEN, noting her understanding was the airport was an enterprise fund, and not funded by the general fund, to which Ms. Malloy confirmed was the case.

Ms. Winchester asked if one pay grade higher for the Airport Planners was considered fair, given the airport generates its own revenue. Ms. Malloy confirmed the analysis confirmed one grade is appropriate, as the differences in responsibilities with City Planners is minimal.

Mr. Peck asked if the difference between the responsibilities for the classification series was significant enough to justify the higher pay grade. Ms. DuWaldt commented the market data for compensation seemed to be driving the justification for Airport Planner more than the specific responsibilities, which Ms. Malloy confirmed was correct.

Ms. Malloy reviewed the budget impact of the changes in classifications, noting a total of 90 employees in the current Planner series, three of whom will have their pay adjusted to the new grade minimum for an annual cost of \$6,649.

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Classification Notice No. 1581.

2. Public Hearing Notice No. 593 – Prevailing Wage: Custodian

Alena Duran, Classification & Compensation Analyst, presented Public Hearing Notice No. 593 to adopt a change in the pay and/or fringe benefits of the wage classification series, “Custodian” in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code.

Based on this review, the following pay and fringe benefits revision was proposed, based on the contractual rates provided by the Service Employees International Union (“SEIU”):

	<u>Current</u>			<u>Proposed</u>		
	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Base Wage</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Custodian I	\$15.08	\$5.43 (Single)	\$20.51	\$15.53	\$6.46 (Single)	\$21.99
					\$9.63 (Children)	\$25.16
		\$9.07 (2-party)	\$24.15		\$10.34 (2-party)	\$25.87
		\$11.72 (Family)	\$26.80		\$13.52 (Family)	\$29.05
Custodian II	\$15.43	\$5.49 (Single)	\$20.92	\$15.88	\$6.51 (Single)	\$22.39
					\$9.69 (Children)	\$25.57
		\$9.13 (2-party)	\$24.56		\$10.40 (2-party)	\$26.28
		\$11.78 (Family)	\$27.21		\$13.58 (Family)	\$29.46

The Career Service Board unanimously approved Public Hearing Notice No. 592.

V. Director's Briefing:

1. Denver Employee Volunteer Program – Shannon Flanagin & Hannah Cronin

Karen Niparko, Executive Director of the Office of Human Resources (“OHR”), noted today’s briefing would present a proposal for the Employee Volunteer Program.

Shannon Flanagin, Senior HR Business Partner at Denver Human Services, and Hannah Cronin, HR Special Projects Intern, introduced themselves. Ms. Cronin started last week as the new Intern in OHR for special projects and the Board welcomed her.

Ms. Niparko noted the proposed volunteer program is a “best place to work” benefit, provided by many large companies for their employees. Mr. Peck clarified volunteering would be during the work day, which Ms. Niparko confirmed, noting she believes this is a win-win solution for the City as it helps get the work done, involves employees in the community, and encourages teamwork, all of which are activities to encourage.

Ms. Niparko noted many agencies had expressed a desire to start their own volunteer programs for employees, which OHR had requested they hold-off until a citywide program could be developed, with the exception of the uniformed services (Civil Service & Deputy Sheriffs).

Ms. Cronin noted participation is voluntary and intended to motivate and empower employees to serve the community. Many companies struggle to put a return on investment in allowing employees to volunteer during work time, however, the benefits in boosting morale are significant. Millennials now comprise most of the City’s workforce and the Denver Metro unemployment rate remains very low. Statistics show that having a volunteer program can be a differentiator when millennial candidates choose an employer.

Ms. Cronin summarized the benefits to the program including: (1) placing the STARS values into action by connecting employees with volunteer projects delivering immediate benefits to the community; (2) making the City a “best place to work” by increasing employee engagement; (3) provides professional development by encouraging employees to learn more about the city and how it operates, thus increasing collaboration, teamwork, and morale; (4) ensures additional City projects are completed by alleviating some lower priority items; (5) addresses the long-held desire of some agencies to start an employee volunteer program.

Ms. Flanagin noted the importance of having paid volunteers available to help complete some projects on various agencies lists’. Board Co-Chair Karen DuWaldt asked for some examples, to which Ms. Flanagin responded one is trail maintenance, such as removing trash from the Cherry Creek Trail, while another is removing graffiti.

Board Co-Chair Neil Peck asked who would identify and select potential projects, which Ms. Flanagin noted would be covered in greater detail shortly. Jack Davies, HR Manager for Parks & Rec, commented Parks & Recreation currently has a volunteer program which illustrates the type of projects. Mr. Davies noted in 2018 Parks & Rec had 12,000 volunteers who contributed 45,000 hours of time, saving the City \$918,000 in labor costs.

Ms. DuWaldt asked whether the volunteers are mostly citizens, in addition to employees. Mr. Davies responded most of the current volunteers come from various work, school, and community programs as well as people signing up via Denvergov.org. Projects include helping place mulch around trees, branch removal, assisting the community centers with setting up various events for seniors and children, community golf events, and trail maintenance.

Board Member Patricia Barela Rivera asked how the public volunteer information is communicated, as she knows many people who would love to volunteer, in addition to hearing the details about the employee volunteer program. Ms. Flanagin noted today’s presentation was not covering that, however, Mr. Davies stated he would e-mail the Board more information on the public’s options for volunteering at Parks & Rec.

Ms. Flanagan stated OHR would administer the employee program by posting the various opportunities available, which will be coordinated with the Denver Employee Volunteer Organization ("DEVO"), an independent, 501(c)3 charity developed by city employees, as well as Denver 311 and the Mayor's Office.

Ms. Flanagan explained the procedures needed to track employees' time in Kronos for Payroll, how teams would be formed to complete a particular project, and managers' role in approving the time off and providing coverage while the employee is volunteering. Team leaders will be responsible for verifying managers' consent and employees' attendance at the event, as well as the number of hours.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if employees are required to participate as part of a team, or may also pursue an individual project. Ms. Flanagan responded the program is designed to encourage employee collaboration, however, individual opportunities might be considered at a later point. Ms. DuWaldt commented individual projects can also be difficult to monitor and verify.

Ms. Cronin noted City employees cannot donate time to an individual non-profit while being paid. Ms. Niparko stated Brendan Hanlon, the Chief Financial Officer, pointed out that any paid time would have to be reported as income by the non-profit under the City's municipal financing rules, therefore, only city-sponsored projects could be included in the program.

Mr. Peck stated he wanted to ensure participation in the proposed program is strictly voluntary and employees would not be penalized for their non-participation in a performance review. Mr. Peck stated it was also important that leaders understand they cannot attempt to influence employees to participate.

Ms. Flanagan responded there was no intention to include any aspect of the volunteer program in performance reviews and acknowledged that some employees, due to the nature of their work schedules, would be unable to participate.

Ms. DuWaldt emphasized Mr. Peck's point, noting situations in other organizations where managers pushed for 100% employee participation for a particular cause or event, which became problematic.

Ms. Flanagan stated there would be clear guidelines for both managers and employees regarding participation, and projects that accommodated employees with any kind of disability would also be included. Ms. DuWaldt stated it was important that managers' guidelines be very explicit regarding employees with disabilities, particularly what is acceptable, or not acceptable, to ask of them.

Ms. Flanagan noted additional details regarding employee eligibility and conditions, and Ms. Niparko stated the Board should contact her if they had additional questions.

Ms. Flanagan summarized the implementation plan, noting a rollout communication campaign is being developed with the OHR Marketing & Communications team. Diane Vertovec, Director of OHR Marketing & Communications, explained the proposed campaign and communication rollout to socialize and promote the new program. Ms. Flanagan noted live informational sessions would also be planned to answer managers' and employees' questions.

Ms. Barela Rivera asked if participation would have any positive impact to an employee's performance review, to which Ms. Niparko replied would not be permitted. Ms. Niparko reiterated an employee could volunteer for one day a year, as part of a team, for a city-approved project, however, their performance rating could not be impacted by their participation, or non-participation, in the program.

Mr. Peck asked why only one day per year is allowed, to which Ms. Niparko stated was a first step to ensure agency leaders and Finance were comfortable with the program and managing agency workflows.

Ms. DuWaldt asked if there was an estimated cost for covering the employees who are volunteering for the day. Ms. Niparko stated one of the criteria for participation is no overtime or back-fill of employees to accommodate the time-off. Ms. Niparko noted managers and supervisors will not be able to approve their employees' participation if this was required.

Ms. Cronin also noted the program is designed to increase collaboration, therefore, all project teams would comprise employees from different agencies, rather than populated from the same agency.

Ms. Winchester asked if a list of all available projects for the entire year would be made immediately available upon rollout in April. Ms. Flanagan responded there would be an initial approved list of projects, which would be added to throughout the year.

Ms. Winchester commented it would be helpful to agency leaders in planning for their employees' participation by having a calendar of projects to coordinate with their critical priorities for the year. Ms. Flanagan replied she thought this was a very good idea to incorporate as the program rolls out.

Ms. Flanagan summarized the rollout schedule and next steps, with a goal of launching by the second quarter of 2019. The Board made some additional comments and thanked everyone for the presentation today.

VI. Pending Cases:

1. Matthew Hammernik & Daniel Trujillo vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Consolidated Nos. A041-17 & A042-17
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
2. Leonard Fazio vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. A014-18
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
3. Pasquale Tamburino vs. Department of Safety, Appeal No. A040-17A
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
4. Donald DeMello vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. 012-18A
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
5. Darrell Jordan vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. A021-18
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.
6. Emina Gerovic vs. General Services-Facility Management, Appeal No. A077-17
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.

VII. Executive Session:

The Board went into executive session at 10:09am. The Board Co-Chairs reviewed the 2018 performance evaluations of Karen Niparko, Bruce Plotkin, and Federico Alvarez. The Board then discussed and approved 2019 merit increases. In addition, the following appeal was adjudicated:

1. Edward Keller vs. Denver Sheriff's Department, Appeal No. 47-14
The Career Service Board affirmed the Hearing Officer's decision, written order to follow.

The Board re-convened the meeting at 10:30am.

VIII. Adjournment: *Adjournment was at 10:31am.*