

**CITY OF SPOKANE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES
November 15, 2016**

Craig Hult, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Present were Craig Hult, Phyllis Gabel, Judith Gilmore, Mark Lindsey, and Kathy Sewell,

The agenda was amended to include the addition of SPN 667 - Environmental Technician for classification adoption under Agenda Item III. The motion was put forth by Ms. Phyllis Gabel and seconded by Ms. Kathy Sewell, and the motion passed unanimously

Agenda Item I.

Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Craig Hult introduced the minutes from the regular meeting of October 18, 2016. Hearing no changes or corrections, the minutes were approved as written.

Agenda Item II.

Staff Activities:

The Chief Examiner, Ms. Gita George-Hatcher reported the following statistics for the months of November:

October:

Announcements issued:	16	Classifications revised:	2
Examinations:	29	Classifications new/deleted:	5/0
Requisitions received:	80	Requisitions certified:	41
Class Surveys completed:	5	Class Surveys in progress:	8
Requisitions pending:	4	Requisitions canceled:	1

Average days from department initiation of request to receipt in Civil Service:	2.0
Average days from requisition receipt to certification:	9.5
Percentage certified within 24 hours:	100%
Average days from department initiation to completion of hire	1.8

The Chief Examiner, Ms. George-Hatcher presented Staff Activities from October to the Commission. The Chief Examiner updated the Commission on the resolution of the 311/My Spokane issue that was on the Commission's agenda last month. A letter explaining how the Memorandum of Understanding would work was issued and signed off by both management and labor. The letter addressed the salary levels for existing Customer Service Specialists and for all new hires into the 3-1-1 program which would be as Customer Service Assistants. Customer Service Assistants would be provided with a progressive promotion to Customer Service

Specialists after one year, which would be conditional upon passing a qualifying examination for Customer Service Specialist. Ms. George-Hatcher thanked Joe Cavanaugh, Natalie Hilderbrand, Chris Cavanaugh and Carly Cortright for their help in getting this completed. The Chief Examiner stated that the resolution is not in conflict with Civil Service rules and that it does not negatively impact existing employees in the Customer Service Specialist classification. The Commission acknowledged that this resolution was satisfactory and that no further action by the Commission would be needed.

The Chief Examiner updated the Commission on the status of the Rule Review process, and that all rules had now been reviewed with a few language changes still in progress. She reported that the committee had approved the passover rule change language proposed by Civil Service, and that the rule would be brought before the Commission at its next meeting. Ms. George-Hatcher stated that a study session would be scheduled at which the entire rule book along with proposed changes and impacts would be discussed with the Commission. Ms. George-Hatcher said she would keep the Commission updated as to full completion and adoption time frames.

The Chief Examiner reported that the Biddle Training and the Police Sergeant job analysis were being finalized. She thanked all the Analysts and particularly Ms. Jerri Bjork, Exam and Class Analyst III, for taking the leadership role in completing the Analysis in the AutoGOJA (Goal Oriented Job Analysis) system and on documentation of issues. As a result, Ms. Bjork has now become the resident expert on this system.

The Chief Examiner reported that there was a budget surplus in the Civil Service budget this year due to savings from lower printing costs, lower than expected costs for Public Safety Testing, Inc., savings from assessment centers and cost of testing room furniture. Ms. George-Hatcher would be considering utilizing these savings to purchase ergonomic desks and chairs for staff, and to work with an HR consulting firm to do a Hiring Analysis for 2016. She reported that staff is also considering purchase of the Textio software program that assists in identifying stereotypical or non-inclusive language in job descriptions and recruitment announcements. She invited questions from the Commissioner on these purchases. The Commission did not have any questions or comments.

The Diversity Recruitment Committee met in October. This group is tasked with increasing diversity recruitment with members coming from various departments, labor unions and community agency representatives. The Chief examiner stated that she had provided statistics on the applicant pool for Police and Fire for one year beginning with the inception of continuous testing through Public Safety Testing. There has been some success in diversification of the applicant pool and more work still needs to be done.

The Chief Examiner also reported that last month she worked with Spokane Schools and several City departments such as Police, Neighborhood Services, Streets, Solid Waste and Water to speak to a group of elementary school children. The event was fun and successful and Ms. George-Hatcher thanked the participating department directors and staff for their cooperation.

Agenda Item III.

Classification Resolution:

Ms. George-Hatcher explained that two classifications, namely, SPN 134 – Information Systems Specialist I, and SPN 135 – Information Systems Specialist II, were inadvertently included in the packets for last month and had not been vetted with Local 270. She apologized for the oversight and stated that staff was currently engaged in discussions with the union and that the updated classifications would be provided to the Commission after concurrence of the parties is obtained.

The following classifications with concurrence from both labor and management were presented for adoption:

Adoptions:

SPN 160	Business Systems Analyst I
SPN 161	Business Systems Analyst II
SPN 162	Senior Business Systems Analyst
SPN 163	Supervisory Business Systems Analyst
SPN 667	Environmental Technician

A motion to adopt the classifications was put forth by Mr. Mark Lindsey and seconded by Ms. Sewell. The motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item IV.

Voiding Contract Compliance Officer List

Labor and Management are in concurrence to void the list for Contract Compliance Officer as a result of changed qualifications, revisions to the specifications and a title change that was adopted by the Commission in August. The two applicants on the existing list will be notified of the voiding of the list and informed that they may re-apply during the recruitment period if they meet the new qualifications.

A motion to void the list was put forth by Ms. Judith Gilmore and seconded by Ms. Gabel. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item V.

Appeal of Ms. Diane Reynolds

The Chief Examiner introduced the appeal of Ms. Reynolds and provided a background. All documentation pertaining to the appeal had been provided to the Commissioners in their packets as well as the classification specifications for Clerk II and Clerk III. Ms. George-Hatcher also provided information on the distinguishing factors between Clerk II and Clerk III.

Ms. Reynolds has been a Clerk II in Utility Billing since 1990. A job survey was recently conducted by Civil Service staff and a report prepared. In August, the Chief Examiner, after having reviewed the report, agreed with the determination that Ms. Reynolds' work was properly classified as Clerk II and sent out a letter to that effect. Ms. Reynolds is appealing the determination.

Ms. Reynolds, after being sworn in by Ms. George-Hatcher, provided her testimony.

Ms. Reynolds stated that the City is mandated to be fair and non-discriminatory. She stated that she felt that it was not fair for some to become Clerk III's and others not. She said she has been in her department for twenty years and that employees are only now being "upgraded" to Clerk III's. Ms. Reynolds said that she did not understand why all of a sudden, Clerk II jobs were becoming Clerk III jobs.

Mr. Hult responded by informing Ms. Reynolds of the role of the Civil Service Commission. He explained the job of the Commission to interpret the rules and to rely on Civil Service staff to perform job analysis and ensure that the process is followed. Ms. Reynolds stated that she believes she is doing the same type of work as the Clerk III's in her department and that this was a fairness issue. Mr. Hult reiterated his position that fairness is important and that the Civil Service Commission is tasked with upholding the rules and trusting the work of staff.

Ms. George-Hatcher added that each job survey is done individually based on the work being done by the individual employee. The questionnaire and ten day log filled out by Ms. Reynolds, and information provided by supervisors were reviewed carefully and resulted in the conclusion that Ms. Reynolds was properly classified. The Chief Examiner explained that the preponderance of the work being done is reviewed carefully in order to make a determination as to the correct classification. She stated that in the case of Ms. Reynolds' job survey, the preponderance of the work fell into the classification of Clerk II.

Additionally, Ms. George-Hatcher also reviewed the individuals within Utility Billing who had been reclassified within the past couple of years and explained the process that occurred for each of them.

Mr. Ron Nicodemus, Manager of Utility Billing was sworn in and addressed the Commission. He stated that Ms. Reynolds is a valued member of the Utility Billing team. He said that there were still seven Clerk II's remaining in the department and like Ms. Reynolds, that they also perform Clerk II work. He said that if it became necessary to survey all of those positions, then they would proceed to make that request. Mr. Nicodemus stated that he would make every effort to assist Ms. Reynolds in getting her up to speed and prepared to promote to a Clerk III position in the future when one becomes available.

Ms. Gabel stated that there was no indication of any process that was violated. Mr. Hult asked for a motion and Ms. Sewell put forth a motion to deny the appeal. It was seconded by Ms. Gabel and the motion to deny the appeal of Ms. Reynolds passed unanimously. The Chief Examiner and Mr. Mike Piccolo both stated that while the Commission's decision is the final resolution of Ms. Reynolds' appeal, Ms. Reynolds may contact staff to further discuss her survey if she would like to do so.

The Commission went into executive session at 10:04 a.m. and returned at 10:29 a.m.

Agenda Item VI.

Other Business:

There was no other business to come before the Commission.

There being no additional business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:29 a.m.



Gita S. George-Hatcher
Chief Examiner