

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
Monday, April 15, 2019

The regular monthly meeting of the City Civil Service Commission was held on Monday, April 15, 2019 at 1300 Perdido Street, 1st floor City Council Chambers. Ms. Doddie Smith, Personnel Administrator of the Management Services Division, called the roll. Present were Chairperson Michelle Craig, Commissioner Clifton Moore, Jr., and Commissioner Brittney Richardson. Chairperson Craig convened the meeting at 10:12 a.m. Chairperson Craig administered the oath of office to new Commissioner John Korn. At 11:45 a.m. on motion of Commissioner Craig and the second of Commissioner Richardson, the Commission voted unanimously to go into executive session.

At 12:12 p.m. the Commission completed its executive session and proceeded with the business portion of the meeting.

Item #1 was the minutes from the February 25, 2019 meeting. Commissioner Moore moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Item #2 was the consideration of a merit pay and equitable pay plan adjustment for Civil Service Executive Counsel Brendan Greene. Commissioner Richardson motioned to defer the item. Commissioner Moore seconded the motion to defer and it was approved unanimously.

Director Hudson stated that there was a request from the administration to move item 5 before items 3 and 4. She stated that since item 6 is related to item 5, staff is requesting to move item 6 with item 5. Commissioner Richardson motioned to modify the agenda to move items 5 and 6 up. Commissioner Moore seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Item #5 was a request from the city administration to introduce a new promotional pay policy and Rule amendments for NOPD/NOFD promotions. Stephanie Hennings, a representative of the Chief Administrative Officer, stated that they hoped to address complaints about the current system via the proposed promotional procedure. The framework encompasses three different levels: the Rules which apply to all classified employees, a new policy which applies to departments overseen by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), and departmental specific policies. She noted that the goals

for the process were impartiality, transparency, comprehensiveness, and methodicalness. Step one is that after a promotion is announced the department would be required to get CAO approval for the members of the promotional committee and the evaluation criteria. There will be a third party in the CAO's Office who will monitor these items to ensure that this is a fair and merit based process. The department then needs to distribute this information to all eligible applicants. This is so people can understand what it is they are being graded for. The promotion committee convenes to holistically review and rate each eligible applicant one by one. We came up with a rating system which has a low, medium, and high. Any rating of high or low would require additional written information explaining why they are rated a high or low and what are ways we can help this individual understand what it is they can do to perform better for the next evaluation. Ms. Hennings noted that so in this way it incorporates professional development as well. She then stated that taking the examination performance score and the promotion committee score, we would have equal weight for the composite score. We would then select candidates based on the rank of their composite score. So it is not going to be random whatsoever, there is a list from which the department must go in order. The ratings must be refreshed periodically to show improvements or if someone is not doing that well to show that too. Record maintenance has to be in accordance with records laws. She stated that via Rule VI section 6.1, we are changing the investigation process in order to establish timelines for a fair and expeditious procedure subject to review by the Commission.

Colonel Terry Ebert, Director of Public Safety and Homeland Security, stated that these public safety agencies have two missions: to accomplish their mission and to take care of their people. We currently have a system that is not working functionally well for the departments, the organizations who represent these departments, or the individuals in these departments. He asked how do we create a fair and just system that takes into consideration skills that are tested and on the other side brings in the performance based process of a group put together by the departments who has the responsibility of objectively scoring for past performance, so that we can move forward with a balance of performance and skills. There are areas that can be constantly looked at and adjusted because this process is dependent upon the organization or the pay grade of the position.

Shaun Ferguson, Superintendent of Police, stated that this is all about fairness. The prior process of just testing alone does not necessarily identify an

individual as being prepared for that supervisory position. This would allow some input from the Civil Service testing side as well as the management to identify individuals based on their performance. He stated he had met with the various union groups to identify a fair way for everyone. This is as close as we are going to come. It is incumbent upon managers to identify those future leaders. He stated he is all about fairness and wants to make sure we are all on the same page when we move forward.

Timothy McConnell, Superintendent of Fire, stated that allowing the appointing authority of the department to have some leeway in the selection process of the leadership of the department is crucial to that department's modernization and achieving innovative success. The proposed promotional process is a logical compromise from where we are. He stated he had met with the leadership of the New Orleans Firefighters Association and changes have made based on some of their recommendations. The ability of the department head to have significant input in the selection process, particularly at the higher levels of leadership, is crucial. He urged the Commission to pass the City's recommendation as a compromise from where we are today.

Richard Welch, a Sergeant with NOPD, stated that he was one of seven people who were passed over on the last Lieutenants test. People who scored below him got promoted and he did not. He stated that under the city's proposal the chiefs still get a say on who is promoted which sounds like the good old boy system is still in place. This last Lieutenants test definitely proved that with the jumping around. The tests should have a lot of weight and also what you have done on this job; the positions that you have held. There are people who work at the Academy, Headquarters and PIB that are in different jobs than what people do on the street. The people who work on the streets, especially supervisors, are held at a higher accountability rate than people who are sitting in offices. They get written up a lot more which also leads to being passed over for promotion. Those are things that need to be considered. Not just your education, but your time on the job and what you have done and where you have been on this job. We are going in the right direction in that we realize that we need changes in this promotional system. He commended Chief Ferguson for going down the line on recent promotions. We have to consider that this proposal here is going right back to what we are trying to defeat. It is still putting in the hands of the chiefs who they want to be promoted and not just test scores. The bands were a good start that can improved be improved upon; not just individual likes or dislikes of who the administration chooses.

Ms. Hennings responded that those are concerns that we hope to address via this policy memo and longer term to address via performance evaluations. She then noted that part of the evaluation criteria is looking at time on the job and looking at performance evaluations. Each individual who received a higher score will require a written reason for the basis of scoring that person over someone else. Sergeant Welch responded that the problem is that the evaluations we are doing now are insignificant to police work. They really need to be improved upon. He noted that we bring in a third party for the test. Sergeant Welch then asked that if there is a certain criteria, why couldn't the third party judge it.

Chief Ferguson stated that NOPD is working to identify an evaluation that is job and task specific to the individual officers in their various assignments. In regard to complaints or write ups with field officers verses administrative officers, we don't take that much consideration into looking at that unless it is something very egregious where it is not acceptable for an individual to be in a supervisory role.

Commissioner Korn stated to Sergeant Welch that it seems that he is advocating for just the test, but then he is talking about things like longevity or whether you are a field officer or a desk officer. Commissioner Korn asked which one it was. Sergeant Welch responded that he is for the test. He is not for a committee trying to pick and choose who is going to be the best candidate. We need to go off of the scores and off of a person's background. Sergeant Welch stated that he does not favor the good old boy system to pick and choose who you are friends with and who you are not friends with. The upper management isn't going to come out and say they favor this person because they are friends and it does happen. Commissioner Craig asked if Sergeant Welch was in favor of any percentage. He stated he is not in favor of this proposal here. We need to go back and start at the banding system and look at improving that.

Director Hudson clarified that we are talking about the promotional policy, but there was not a mention of the proposed amendments to Rule VI 3.5 and Rule VI on investigations being introduced today as well. Ms. Hennings stated that she intended on that all to be imbedded in the presentation. Director Hudson noted that there may be some people who want to comment on the Rule amendments, but those weren't really introduced. Ms. Hennings stated that this is an evolving document and we were hoping to introduce it to

begin the conversation. We welcome all feedback and really want to make this something that we can all back. The change to Rule VI 3.5 is mostly in section e where we discuss the maintaining of records, and then that appointing authorities must promote individuals based on merit or fitness and trying to ensure that appointing authorities follow a policy if there is one. She stated that they changed section 6.1 of Rule VI pretty significantly based on feedback from several groups regarding our faults in the past. We want to make sure we have timelines associated with investigations, but also are able to do them with all of the relevant information. Employees would have 30 days to file a protest form. There are timelines for all parties involved.

Commissioner Moore stated that as an employee he has a lot of concerns about this promotional proposal. There are areas where the return to a spoils system has not been closed off. He then asked Colonel Ebbert to clarify what he meant about the current and previous systems not working. Colonel Ebbert responded that employees feel they are not being treated fairly. The current system does not include a policy that was accepted by the troops. The Civil Service Commission has had issues with our current system and the court system has had issues with our current system. It is pretty well documented that what is in place now needs to be fixed. What we are trying to put in place now is a system that is based on skill set and past performance. We are open to suggestions on how to turn the subjective and get it documented so that it is fair evaluation of performance. We are straddled with the problem of not having a good past performance evaluation system. Many organizations operate on a total performance based system.

Commissioner Moore asked why we can't go back to the old system. He stated that he cannot recall any instances of the failure of the old system other than complaints that Civil Service didn't move the process along fast enough. He asked if they were familiar with the working test period. Ms. Hennings responded that she was not. She asked Commissioner Moore if the process he was referencing would be to have the full process be based on the examination. Commissioner Moore responded that the promotional process was multifaceted before the "Great Place to Work". There was a written examination and a comprehensive assessment team that was staffed by outside parties. There were not outside influences. He then asked what removing that system accomplishes. The new investigation process seems to be adding additional hurdles and obstructions to a process that was smooth and in place and that seemed to have worked. He noted that the old system produced both superintendents. That system included a test and a working test period. He

stated he did not see the purpose of such a radical change simply for the purpose of injecting some subjectivity. Chief McConnell noted that he had seen where another Superintendent was forced to promote someone because of where he was on the list and that person could not be put in a position where he had authority over field troops because they were afraid of putting him there. So the system has its good and bad. When we have made innovative changes there have been people at the highest level fighting you on those changes. It is important to put the people who can affect the changes in high level positions whether the changes are put in place by the administration or by courts or by the public.

William Goforth, a city attorney, stated that the system that is in place currently does not have any restrictions on what the appointing authority does to choose from the certified list of eligible candidates. That's what the "Great Place to Work Initiative" did. It took away the rule of three which limited the eligible employees the appointing authority could select from. The proposals today are to add to the Civil Service Rules additional requirements that govern the appointing authorities' discretion over who is selected for promotion. He stated that he wanted to clarify that the current rule is not the rule of three.

Commissioner Moore stated that he agreed with Chief McConnell that there had been failed promotions, but it is incumbent upon the appointing authority to use the working test period to make sure that person is a good fit for the position. You go through the objective process and then that is the failsafe. In the proposed process, if the panel that is selected by the appointing authority and approved by the CAO is a group that is influenced by the Chief, that is a problem from the beginning, so all of these other things in place don't really matter. If the Chief selects a person he is less likely to remove that person if he is not a good fit because it goes to his own credibility.

Eric Hessler, representing the Police Association of New Orleans, stated that these complaints are not about the banding system. They are about recent promotions that were determined by courts to have been done in an illegal manner and regarding which there have been complaints from the employees. No employees are complaining about the rule of three. The city complained in 2014 and they gave you the current system which is fraught with legal problems and morale problems. This proposal is worse than the "Great Place to Work" and that was terrible. It is worse because you still have the same subjective criteria. With the proposed reassessments they can go back and move the goal posts every six months by refreshing applicant ratings. They

can go back and change their minds and say they are going to look for this, this and that.

Ms. Hennings stated that the refreshment of the grades is not to change the evaluation criteria, it is to see if the employee has made progress in the area they were supposed to improve on. So we wouldn't be able to change the evaluation criteria or move the goalpost unless it has been approved by the Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. Hessler stated in their own document it gives you examples of the criteria the promotional evaluation committee can consider. So not only can they reevaluate, they can say they are no longer considering those anymore. Mr. Goforth responded that it is a misunderstanding. The criteria would be established in a policy submitted to and approved by the CAO. The criteria would not be changing absent a proposal that was again approved by the CAO and published to all of the employees. The point is to allow updates in the evaluations, not to change the criteria. Commissioner Craig noted that she noticed that section and wondered the same thing. She noted that if that is your intent you need to make sure you are quite a bit clearer on that. Mr. Hessler then noted that the constitution requires that, to the best of your ability, the promotions be based on competitive examination. For most of these criteria we have a whole department that creates the testing. Most of these criteria that they want to make subjective can be tested objectively. They have done it in the past under the old Civil Service Rules when you had assessment centers. Under the Home Rule Charter the appointing authority of Civil Service does not report to the CAO. They are far exceeding what they have the responsibility to do. The CAO policy is trying to usurp the Commission's power to oversee testing. This proposal is going down the same road as the "Great Place to Work" initiative. Ms. Hennings stated that the administration would welcome and appreciate any written feedback.

Michael Glasser, President of PANO, stated the reason the system needs to be changed is because we've had almost 5 years of unconstitutional practices. In 1983, the banding system was implemented as a result of the Williams Consent Decree. It was designed to eliminate bias and make the promotion system fair and equitable. That system was never successfully challenged in 31 years. It gave the proper balance by taking into consideration the test score, but within the band the appointing authority had the discretion to look at the dimension the city is talking about looking at now. Disciplinary record, time on the job, commendations, attendance record, training and education are

finite things and anyone could attach a score or weight to those things. Whether or not someone is likely to perform is an abstract idea. This is what the working test period is for. Additionally, the test is produced by the Civil Service staff, but the appointing authority has tremendous input into what that is. They produce the subject matter experts, the psychometricians, and they decide what material is tested for. They have input, but not control. That is the difference. They can't control the outcome. We use outside assessors to score the test in order to guarantee that there is no bias. We are now looking at a system that is going to make 50% of that exactly the opposite. This process is not merit based. We know that the system we have now does not work. It is unconstitutional. The appointing authority should have some input in the factors previously listed. Mr. Glasser then noted that he is really concerned about the refreshing part. He noted that under the Consent Decree, testing should take place every two years so a list should only be good for 24 months. He asked how much refreshing does it take. The appointing authority should have some input and the test cannot cover everything, but the test if done properly should be the overwhelming factor, probably more like 75%. With the working test period and those dimensions we can come up with a banding system that works exactly the same way. He asked that the Commission not consider this system and offered to work with the city and other labor groups to come up with a system we can all agree upon as being fair and equitable. Mr. Goforth noted that no court had found the "Great Place to Work" rules unconstitutional either on their face or as applied. Ms. Hennings noted that the purpose of this is to make sure that the application is constitutional going forward.

Peter Hansche, Vice President of PANO, stated that what is wrong with the post-Landrieu system verses the banding system is that under the banding system they can't just pick whoever they want. That is what this is and what the "Great Place to Work" initiative was and that is what this will continue to be. Civil Service is here to control our promotional process to avoid bias and favoritism. He stated that there was a lot of anguish among the people who are on promotional lists now. People are upset over this. People resign over stuff like this. To have this type of civil service protection is the reason why we work for the City of New Orleans as opposed to the Sheriff's Office in Jefferson Parish. All this proposal has done is take the worst parts of the "Great Place to Work" initiative and dress it up and make it the same thing. You have an appointed person making a committee out of appointed people. Nowhere does it say the committee meetings will be public or there will be a person who represents the employees. A secret committee by appointed

people will get the results that it is looking for. Commissioner Craig stated that she would like to see the changes in this policy that you all would like to see incorporated. Mr. Hansche responded that they had prepared something, but had thought that doing so would be to say that they want some portion of that policy. Commissioner Craig stated it comes down to feedback on what is proposed so that we can have all of the information about the policy itself. Mr. Hanche noted that before a document could be released his membership would be required to vote on it.

Commissioner Moore noted that while it is important to get input from both sides an agreement or compromise is not a prerequisite for the Commission to make a decision. Commissioner Craig stated that if the Commission desires that information it should get it. Commissioner Richardson stated that she thinks everyone should desire to be on the same page. She encouraged collaboration. She asked if a survey went out to be sure everyone's voice was heard. Commissioner Richardson then stated that there is still some work that needs to be done for example, on the evaluation as well as working with Civil Service staff to mitigate the concerns regarding subjective elements noted today.

James Gallagher, with the Fraternal Order of Police, noted that the size of the covered departments had been changed from 700 to 500 employees in a recent version of the policy and asked if the document applied strictly to NOPD and NOFD and to no other agencies in city government. Ms. Hennings responded affirmatively and noted that it had been changed to 500 to include the Fire Department. Mr. Gallagher noted that the very offensive criteria of "other demographics" had been removed from an earlier version of the policy. Ms. Hennings responded that after consulting with the Law Department and the Executive Counsel for the Civil Service Commission they felt like the inequity in this area was better dealt with via another vehicle. She stated that they were trying to work out how to properly incorporate the benefits of diversity, so for the time being they cannot put it in their memo. Mr. Gallagher then noted that original hire date, date of last promotion, seniority, time on the job, performance evaluations, disciplinary history, education, specialized training, are all known to the Civil Service Department. Leadership, communication skills, and problem solving skills are already tested for in the civil service process. If these are objective criteria a matrix can be developed by the psychometrician and they can be included, if they are not already, in the civil service testing process. Mr. Gallagher stated that the only reason to put together a committee is to look at subjective criteria and he doesn't know if

subjective criteria fits the term of a merit system. He then noted that he was taken aback to hear that the representative of the Chief Administrative Office was unfamiliar with the working test period which is integral to the promotional system. He recommended using the rule of three and banding with civil service testing of objective criteria.

Chris Landry, representing the FOP, stated that one of the things the Commission is hearing today from officers is the unfairness of the current system. A policy should not be based upon the integrity of one individual. It should be based upon fairness. The current proposal allows too much subjective information.

Donovan Livaccari, representing the FOP, stated that he and Aaron Mischler had come to the Commission with a proposal and the department's response was to present the new CAO policy. He asked why he had not received feedback on his initial proposal in order to find some area of collaboration. Commissioner Craig stated that she wanted to make sure we are moving in a direction that allows us to hear everything we need to hear. Mr. Livaccari noted that when the response to his proposal is entirely in another realm, it is not engaged in good faith negotiation. He stated he believes that the proposal would move the rules to where they are unconstitutional on their face. He believes that the proposal regarding Rule 3.5 is an unconstitutional delegation of authority by the Commission. The constitution gives the Commission rule making authority. They cannot give it away to anyone else. The Commission has exclusive authority and jurisdiction over promotions. These proposals effectively do that.

Chief Ferguson noted that he is willing to have whatever conversation needs to be had to come to some common ground. We have to be reasonable to do so.

Andrew Monteverde, a Fire Captain, stated that it has been four years since the Captain's test was announced and two years since the appeals regarding the promotions of Fire Captains had been heard. Ms. Hennings responded that is what they were trying to address with timelines in the proposal. Mr. Monteverde then stated that his understanding is that the new system requires employees to identify a person who was promoted and go after their job. Mr. Goforth responded that there have been different arguments about what the end result should be. He stated that our position is that the process always has been to look at whether a promotion of a certain person to fill a specific

vacancy was proper or illegal or not. It was not to decide if a person should have been promoted but to decide if a promotional decision was improper. Mr. Monteverde asked if the burden was now being placed on him to single someone out. Ms. Hennings responded that it is one of the logistical questions that they would have to figure out. They would need to decide how much personal information to give out especially on performance evaluations. They are open to feedback on that. She stated that they may shift the process so that all of the information would be under the ruling authority or board. Commissioner Moore then asked Ms. Hennings to read from the first part of Rule 6.1a regarding investigations. She read that any employee whom the department has certified as eligible for a vacant position in the classified service may request an investigation into the promotion of another candidate or employee to said vacant position by timely filing a formal protest with the department via the forms prescribed by the department for such purpose. The protest must describe with specificity how the protesting employee alleges that the subject promotion violates one or more of these rules. Commissioner Moore stated that it sounds exactly like what Mr. Monteverde's concerns were addressing. Chief McConnell stated that so much time had passed before the decision came down that the person who had received the promotion couldn't be demoted because they were out of their probationary periods. Whenever there is a promotion there are only so many positions. Everyone could be qualified, but only ten could be put into it if there are ten. The goal of this is that if it wasn't done properly, the position needs to be vacated. The process would then start over and the person who vacated the position would be replaced, not necessarily with the person who filed the appeal. Ms. Hennings added that that this is the introduction of the proposed changes and that it is a valid point that should be considered. Mr. Monteverde commented that the way it is written presents it almost as a personal challenge.

Aaron Mischler, Firefighters Association of New Orleans, stated that the procedure that has been introduced is premature since he is hearing a lot of things to be considered or changed. It seems rushed to be presented. He noted that the proposal he submitted with FOP in February is concrete. That proposal basically goes back to banding and the rule of three system. There was nothing wrong with that system when it was taken out and replaced with the "Great Place to Work." He noted that they had met with Chief McConnell regarding their proposal in order to act in good faith and try to come to an agreement. He stated their agenda is to remove as much subjectivity from the promotional process as possible. The promotional exams painstakingly designed by the city are designed to be comprehensive in order to identify the

most qualified applicants to hold these positions. This alleviates the possibility for discrimination or manipulation. The rules in place before the "Great Place to Work" initiative gave the most fair and equitable process while giving the appointing authority discretion while using the rule of three and by utilizing the working test period to demote employees who aren't up to that standard.

Director Hudson noted that Mr. Mischler's comments seemed to also cover agenda item #6 which was a request from the New Orleans Firefighters Association and the Fraternal Order of Police requesting amendments to the "Great Place to Work Initiative" (GPTW) rules. Mr. Livaccari who had also made the request with Mr. Mischler under item 6, then noted that if we were not using a system that was full of subjectivity there probably would not be any appeals or protests. He noted that the constitution requires merit to be ascertained by examination. If the Police and Fire Departments want to attract and retain employees then they have to create a career path that is concrete, fair and objective.

Director Hudson stated that staff has not commented because they would like the opportunity to meet with the administration to discuss the new policy. Director Hudson and Commissioner Craig suggested having a special meeting on this topic.

Gary Sevelle, representing the New Orleans Association of Fire Chiefs, stated that the Great Place to Work is not working. The rule of three worked well for many years, was transparent, and takes away any appearance of favoritism. We need to think about going back to that.

Christian Bolden, representing the Chief Administrative Office, stated that the "Great Place to Work" initiative provides a nationally recognized merit based workforce management framework with strong emphasis on the employee experience. This administration is committed to evolving city government and our proposed rule governed by that initiative drives us towards that goal. The NOFA and FOPs proposed amendments are incompatible with our proposal. He then noted the administration's willingness to work with the unions to find common ground.

The Commission then returned to earlier agenda items.

Item #3 was a report on delegation of authority to the Sewerage and Water Board (S&WB). Brendan Greene, Executive Counsel for the Commission, reported that during the past month representatives from S&WB and the Civil Service Department have met and discussed the Commission's directive to develop metrics on how to measure the effectiveness of delegation. The metrics have been agreed upon. He noted that it is vital that the Civil Service staff is trained on the S&WB's Human Resources Information System. Mr. Greene asked the Commission to approve the metrics. Commissioner Moore motioned to do so. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Richardson and approved unanimously.

Item #4 was a notice from the Chief Administrative Office of the suspension of merit pay for 2019. Christian Bolden stated that the administration had budgeted an additional \$6.8 million in personnel costs in 2019 due to the 10% pay increase, so therefore merit pay increases could not be funded. The administration is committed to exploring funding opportunities to implement merit based pay in the future. He stated that the earliest we could look at this is the 2020 budget.

Item #7 was a petition from the Police Association of New Orleans (PANO) to create new Rule IX, Section 1.5 relative to establishing a final disciplinary action within certain time limits. Eric Hessler, representing PANO, stated that there is no rule that governs when punishment is handed out once the discipline is sustained. He gave an example of an officer who had not been punished two and a half years after discipline had been handed down. He stated that paragraph 403 of the Consent Decree requires that the discipline be imposed within 60 days of the completion of the investigation. It is not efficient or effective. Elizabeth Robins, representing the City Attorney's Office, stated that there is a place for this, but not in this rule. The Police Officers' Bill of Rights does not address this. She offered to work with Mr. Hessler to make timelines and sharing of information a part of departmental policy as opposed to putting this in a rule under a section that involves the Police Officers' Bill of Rights. Arlinda Westbrook, Chief of the Public Integrity Bureau, stated that they are interested in working on process improvements and would be happy to work with the unions. She does not think this is the appropriate place for it. Commissioner Craig noted that what Mr. Hessler is asking for makes perfect sense and that finding a way to get there makes sense as well. Mr. Hessler offered to withdraw his proposal and submit a new one at the appropriate time.

Commissioner Craig noted that the Commission was out of time. Director Hudson noted that all remaining items would be deferred to the next meeting. Commissioner Craig apologized to those people who the Commission was unable to get to.

Commissioner Moore motioned for adjournment at 2:21 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Richardson and approved unanimously.

The items the Commission did not address are listed below:

Item #8 was a report on the City's time to hire statistics.

Item #9 was a request to amend the Commission's Procedures for the conduct of business meetings.

Item #10 (a) under Classification and Compensation Matters was the introduction of an amendment to the Pay Plan for an innovation stipend special rate of pay.

Item #10(b) was a request from EMS for a special rate of pay and new classification of EMS Major.

Item #10(c) was a request from the Aviation Board to reinstitute a hiring rate for Airport Electrical Services Manager for retention/recruitment challenges.

Item #10(d) was a request from the Youth Study Center for the creation of a new classification, title changes and to appeal allocation recommendations made by the Civil Service staff relative to Building Maintenance Manager.

Item #10(e) was a request from Personnel Division Chief Erdwin Fuentes to appeal a Rule IV, Section 2.7(d) Hiring Above the Minimum Determination.

Item #10(f) was a request from Information Technology Specialist Christopher Ard to apply an exception to Rule IV, Section 2.7(d) relative to Hiring Above the Minimum.

Item #10(g) was a request to establish a one-time pay policy relative to the overpayment of clerical employees during the implementation of the 2018 pay plan amendments.

Item #10(h) was a request to implement an equity adjustment for a Civil Service Management Services Specialist in the Recruitment Division.

Item #11(a) under Recruitment and Selection Matters was the approval of examination announcements.

Item #12 under Rule Amendments was the introduction of an amendment to Rule VIII, Section 9 relative to Parental Leave.


Item #13 was the ratification of Public Integrity Bureau (PIB) 60 Day Extension Requests.

Item #14 (a) under Communications was the Personnel Director's Report

Item #14 (b) was a report on ADP ongoing issues.



Michelle Craig, Chairperson



Brittney Richardson, Commissioner



John Korn, Commissioner

