



1 APPEARANCES:

2 COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

3 Grady L. Pettigrew, President  
4 Larry Price

5 PRESENTERS:

6 Charday Litzy-Taylor  
7 Wendy Brinnon  
8 Beth Dyke  
9 Tammy Rollins

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 C. Amy DeLong  
12 Jaasiel Rubeck  
13 Carol Lagemann  
14 Jennifer Shea

15 - - -

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, on the 24th day of  
3 May, 2021, the Municipal Civil Service Commission  
4 came for a regular meeting, Grady L. Pettigrew,  
5 President. And the parties appearing in person  
6 and/or by counsel, as hereinafter set forth, the  
7 following proceedings were had:

8 - - -

9 MS. RUBECK: So we're recording now.

10 This Civil Service Commission regular  
11 meeting is a public meeting and being held virtually.  
12 In order to comply with guidelines regarding virtual  
13 public meetings, any person who is speaking must also  
14 be visible on video.

15 To our commissioners, please leave your  
16 video on during the entire meeting. To those  
17 presenting, you may leave the video off until it's  
18 your turn to present.

19 To all others attending the meeting,  
20 please turn your video off and leave it off during  
21 the duration of the meeting. If a technical issue  
22 should occur where either audio or video is not  
23 available when needed, the meeting will be stopped in  
24 order to resolve. In addition, this meeting is being

4

1 recorded for the record. Thank you.

2 Commissioner Pettigrew, you may begin.

3 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Thank you. I will  
4 call to order and introduce the City of Columbus,  
5 Ohio Municipal Civil Service Commission meeting for  
6 the month of May 2021. We will be following the  
7 published agenda.

8 The first item is review and approval of  
9 the minutes from the April 26, 2021, regular meeting.

10 MR. PRICE: I move the approval of the  
11 minutes from the April 26, 2021, regular meeting.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second. All in  
13 favor say, "Aye."

14 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.  
16 We have no prehearing conference reviews, no trial  
17 board recommendations. Items No. 4 through 6, which  
18 are items with no revisions, will be joined together.  
19 Item No. 4: Request of the Civil Service Commission  
20 staff to approve the specification review for the  
21 classification diversity and inclusion specialist II  
22 with no revisions.

23 Item No. 5 is for the classification  
24 diversity and inclusion specialist I with no

5

1 revisions. And item No. 6 is for the classification  
2 fire protection plans reviewer with no revisions.

3 MS. DYKE: Beth Dyke, personnel analyst  
4 with the Civil Service staff. Review of the  
5 classifications regarding items No. 4 through 6 is  
6 part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to  
7 review all classifications every five years.

8 Based on feedback received, it was  
9 determined that the current specifications do  
10 accurately reflect the work being performed. It is  
11 recommended that the specifications be approved with  
12 no revisions.

13 MR. PRICE: Am I doing all three together  
14 or individually?

15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All three together.

16 MR. PRICE: Okay. So I'll wait to speak  
17 on all three and then do it, correct?

18 MS. DYKE: Yes.

19 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Oh, okay.

20 MR. PRICE: That's why the hesitancy. So  
21 is it on me? I'm --

22 MS. DYKE: Yep. You're up.

23 MS. RUBECK: Yes.

24 MR. PRICE: Okay. I move to approve the

6

1 specification review for the classification diversity  
2 and inclusion specialist II with no revisions. And I  
3 also move to approve the specification review for the  
4 classification diversity and inclusion specialist I  
5 with no revisions. I also move to approve the  
6 specification review for the classification fire  
7 protection plans reviewer with no revisions.

8 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second those  
9 motions.

10 All in favor say, "Aye."

11 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

13 Item No. 7 is a request of the Civil  
14 Service Commission staff to revise a specification  
15 for the classification community dental program  
16 manager.

17 MS. DYKE: Beth Dyke. Again, personnel  
18 analyst with the Civil Service staff. The review of  
19 this classification is part of the Civil Service  
20 Commission staff's effort to review all  
21 classifications every five years. In consideration  
22 of the preferred vernacular regarding the department  
23 name, it is proposed that the definition section be  
24 revised to remove the word department from references

7

1 to Columbus Public Health. There are no other  
2 changes proposed to the specification at this time.

3 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the  
4 specification for the classification community dental  
5 program manager.

6 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second.

7 All in favor, say, "Aye."

8 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

9 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are -- It is  
10 approved.

11 Items No. 8, 9 and 10 will be joined.

12 Item No. 8 is a request of the Civil Service  
13 Commission staff to revise the specification for the  
14 classification technical --

15 MS. RUBECK: Mr. Pettigrew, your video  
16 turned off. Can you restart it, please?

17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Oh.

18 MR. PRICE: It booted back up.

19 MS. RUBECK: It's back on. You can  
20 continue.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All right. This was  
22 a request of the Civil Service Commission staff to  
23 revise the specification for the classification  
24 technical support supervisor.

1                   No. 9 is for the -- to revise the  
2                   specification for the classification desktop support  
3                   technician.

4                   And No. 10 is to revise the specification  
5                   for the classification technical support analyst.

6                   MS. DYKE: This is Beth Dyke, personnel  
7                   analyst with the Civil Service staff. The review of  
8                   these classifications is part of the Civil Service  
9                   Commission staff's effort to review all  
10                  classifications every five years. Minor revisions  
11                  are proposed within all three specifications in order  
12                  to correct general and grammatical errors and to  
13                  update language used throughout the series.

14                  In regards to the desktop support  
15                  technician and technical support analyst  
16                  specifications, it is proposed to delete portions of  
17                  existing examples of work statements and a full  
18                  statement on each specification as such duties are no  
19                  longer performed within each respective  
20                  classification. It is also proposed to add a new  
21                  example of work statement to the desktop support  
22                  technician specification to acknowledge duties  
23                  currently being performed within -- being performed.

24                  Within the minimum qualification sections



9

1 of both the desktop support technician and technical  
2 support analyst specifications, it is proposed to  
3 remove the specific course requirements from the  
4 associate degree qualification as well as simplify  
5 the language used for the experience substitution.  
6 The minimum qualification revisions are being  
7 proposed in order to maintain consistency between  
8 similar classifications within the City's class plan  
9 and to provide greater clarification. It is proposed  
10 to revise the classification title reference in the  
11 guidelines for class use section of the technical  
12 support analyst specification.

13           Lastly, with regard to the technical  
14 support supervisor specification, it is proposed to  
15 revise the definition section by updating language  
16 used within the section to better encompass various  
17 facets of support operations and technologies.  
18 Within the same specification, it is proposed to  
19 revise the list of software applications referenced  
20 within the knowledge, skills and abilities section.  
21 There are no other proposed revisions to these  
22 specifications at this time.

23           MR. PRICE: I move to revise the  
24 specification for the classification technical

10

1 support supervisor, and I move to revise the  
2 specification for the classification desktop support  
3 technician, and I move to revise the specification  
4 for the classification technical support analyst.

5 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second.

6 All in favor say, "Aye."

7 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

8 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

9 Item No. 11 is a request for the Civil  
10 Service -- of the Civil Service Commission staff to  
11 revise the specification for the classification  
12 facilities operations manager.

13 MS. LITZY-TAYLOR: Charday Litzy-Taylor,  
14 personal analyst with the Commission. The review of  
15 this classification is part of the Civil Service  
16 Commission's effort to review all classifications  
17 every five years. This classification is used by the  
18 Department of Finance and Management. After  
19 reviewing feedback from current incumbents, a couple  
20 of minor additions are proposed to the knowledge,  
21 skills and abilities section.

22 Due to the nature of the work performed,  
23 it is recommended that ability to adapt, improvise  
24 and make timely decisions, an ability to operate a

11

1 computer and utilize related software be added. No  
2 other revisions are proposed at this time.

3 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the  
4 specification for the classification facilities  
5 operations manager.

6 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second.

7 All in favor say, "Aye."

8 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

9 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It's approved.

10 Item No. 12 is the request of the Civil  
11 Service Commission staff to revise a specification  
12 for the classification safety technician, retitle it  
13 to read "occupational safety technician" and amend  
14 Rule 11 accordingly.

15 MS. LITZY-TAYLOR: The review of this  
16 classification is also part of the Civil Service  
17 Commission's efforts to review all classifications  
18 every four to five years and maintain a consistency  
19 within the class series and to better communicate the  
20 primary purpose of this classification to potential  
21 applicants. It is recommended that safety technician  
22 be revised to read occupational safety technician.  
23 Within the examples of work section, one minor  
24 grammatical error has been corrected. One statement

12

1 referring to the Industrial Commission of Ohio has  
2 been revised for accuracy and clarification.

3 Due to the duties associated with this  
4 class, it is proposed that "ability to read,  
5 interpret and apply codes and standards" be added  
6 within the knowledge, skills and abilities section  
7 and that the knowledge statement referencing the  
8 Industrial Commission be removed. There are no other  
9 changes proposed at this time. It is therefore  
10 recommended that the specification for safety  
11 technician be revised and retitled to read  
12 "occupational safety technician" and Rule 11 be  
13 amended accordingly.

14 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the  
15 specification for the classification safety  
16 technician, retitle it to read "occupational safety  
17 technician" and amend Rule 11 accordingly.

18 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second.

19 All in favor say, "Aye."

20 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

22 MS. RUBECK: Mr. Pettigrew, your video is  
23 off again.

24 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Okay. I'm not sure

13

1 what's happening because I can see me here.

2 MS. RUBECK: Try turning off your camera  
3 and wait a few seconds, and then turn it back on.

4 (Discussion held off the record.)

5 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: No. 13 is a request  
6 of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the  
7 specification for the classification automotive  
8 mechanic supervisor I. I'm sorry. No. 14 is joined  
9 with that. 14 is a request to revise the  
10 specification for the classification automotive  
11 mechanic supervisor II.

12 MS. LITZY-TAYLOR: The review of these  
13 classifications is also part of the Civil Service  
14 Commission's efforts to review all classifications  
15 every four to five years. One addition is proposed  
16 to the examples of work section for automotive  
17 mechanic supervisor I.

18 To better reflect the work performed, it  
19 is also recommended that ability to communicate  
20 effectively be added to the knowledge, skills and  
21 abilities section. Lastly, it is recommended that  
22 the automotive mechanic supervisor I classification  
23 title be removed from the minimum qualifications  
24 section for automotive mechanic supervisor II. The

14

1 proposed change will help provide clarification for  
2 external candidates. No other revisions are proposed  
3 at this time.

4 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the  
5 specification for the classification automotive  
6 mechanic supervisor I. I also move to revise the  
7 specification for the classification automotive  
8 mechanic supervisor II.

9 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,  
10 "Aye."

11 MR. PRICE: It's a second,  
12 Mr. Commissioner.

13 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: I'm sorry. I  
14 thought you did.

15 MR. PRICE: No. You have to second.  
16 Remember, it's only me and you.

17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: I'm sorry. I second  
18 those motions. Sorry.

19 All in favor say, "Aye."

20 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.  
22 I'm sorry.

23 MR. PRICE: No problem.

24 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Okay. Items 15 and

15

1 16 are joined together. Item 15: Request of the  
2 Civil Service Commission staff to revise the  
3 specification --

4 MR. PRICE: Commissioner, I'm sorry. I  
5 thought I got an email that said 15 and 16, unless  
6 something came out again, was deferred.

7 MS. RUBECK: Yes. They are deferred.

8 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are deferred?

9 MS. RUBECK: Yes, sir.

10 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Okay. Then we will  
11 pass 15 and 16. And then 17 is the remaining item:  
12 Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to  
13 create the specification for the classification  
14 senior budget/management specialist, assign a  
15 probationary period of 365 days, designate the  
16 examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule 11  
17 accordingly.

18 MS. ROLLINS: Tammy Rollins. The proposed  
19 creation for senior budget/management specialist was  
20 requested by the Department of Finance. This  
21 classification would serve as the middle  
22 classification and in the series that consists of a  
23 budget/management specialist at the entry level and  
24 then the budget/management officer on the top end.

16

1           The proposed classification would perform  
2 advanced level analytical work that would involve  
3 citywide financial and operations matters. The  
4 proposed classification would also provide some span  
5 of relief -- some span of control relief for the  
6 budget/management officer who supervises many of  
7 these budget/management specialists that are in the  
8 class plan. The current management specialists  
9 have -- tend to do most of their work focused on  
10 their assigned departments, so this second senior  
11 level would have more of a citywide scope with the  
12 work assignments and projects assigned.

13           There is a proposed guidelines for class  
14 use if this classification would be limited to no  
15 more than three positions, and we are recommending a  
16 probationary period of 365 days and an examination  
17 type as noncompetitive.

18           MR. PRICE: I move to create the  
19 specification for the classification senior  
20 budget/management specialist, assign a probationary  
21 period of 365 days, designate the examination type as  
22 noncompetitive and amend Rule 11 accordingly.

23           PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second.

24           All in favor save, "Aye."



17

1 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

2 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

3 As to the remaining items, we have  
4 background removals; and these are applicants removed  
5 post exam. Commissioner Price, did you have any  
6 issue with the recommendations on those?

7 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Commissioner  
8 Pettigrew. I read them; and, no, I don't have any  
9 issues. Again, as always, I raised a small issue of  
10 beginning to review our standards especially when it  
11 comes to marijuana use and how it's affecting our  
12 candidates. But other than that, overall, the two  
13 that they restored I thought was justified in terms  
14 of that.

15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Okay. All right.  
16 Then as to the -- Okay. As to the action today then,  
17 for Abdulazeez Sanat, do not reinstate; for Douglas  
18 Collins, do not reinstate; for Douglas Barber, II,  
19 reinstatement; for Brian Marsh, do not reinstate; for  
20 Tyler Bowman, do not reinstate; for Joshua Burchnell,  
21 reinstate; and for Richard Patton, do not reinstate.

22 And I believe those are the only agenda  
23 items. So with that, we can adjourn the monthly  
24 meeting.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a true, correct and complete written transcript of  
the proceedings in this matter, taken by me on the  
24th day of May, 2021, and transcribed from my  
stenographic notes.

\_\_\_\_\_

MARILYN K. MARTIN  
Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio  
and Registered Professional Reporter.

My Commission Expires October 15, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Grady L. Pettigrew, President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date