

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BEFORE THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
MUNICIPAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

- - -

In the matter of:

Regular Meeting

- - -

Grady L. Pettigrew,
President, Presiding

- - -

TRANSCRIPT DEPOSITION OF PROCEEDINGS

- - -

Monday, August 30, 2021
12:40 p.m.
77 North Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

- - -

MARILYN K. MARTIN, RPR

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTER

- - -

ANDERSON REPORTING SERVICES, INC.
3040 Riverside Drive, Suite 125
Columbus, Ohio 43221
(614) 326-0177

1 APPEARANCES:

2 COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

3 Grady L. Pettigrew, President
4 Larry Price
5 Jennifer Lynch

6 PRESENTERS:

7 Jennifer Shea
8 Charday Litzy-Taylor
9 Beth Dyke
10 Sheri Goodwin
11 Carol Lagemann

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 Wendy Brinnon

14 - - -

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

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

2 BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, on the 30th day of
3 August, 2021, the Municipal Civil Service Commission
4 came for a regular meeting, Grady L. Pettigrew,
5 President; and the parties appearing in person and/or
6 by counsel, as hereinafter set forth, the following
7 proceedings were had:

8 - - -

9 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: I'll call to order
10 the Municipal Civil Service Commission regular
11 meeting for August -- today -- 30, 2021. We will be
12 following the printed agenda. The first item is
13 review and approval of the minutes of the July 26,
14 2021, regular meeting.

15 MR. PRICE: I move to approve the minutes
16 of the July 26, 2021, regular meeting.

17 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

18 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
19 "aye."

20 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

22 Item two is prehearing conference reviews
23 for Jennifer McCray versus Columbus City Schools and
24 David Creighton versus Columbus City Schools.

4

1 MS. SHEA: Good afternoon. Jennifer Shea,
2 personnel administrative management for the Civil
3 Service Commission.

4 I have two prehearing conference reviews.
5 I can, before going into them separately, tell the
6 Commission that collectively all parties involved
7 with both of these cases have been informed of the
8 Commission's expectations as it relates to bringing
9 in their exhibits and evidence and things of that
10 nature. All parties have been informed that if they
11 have electronic audio or visual -- or video evidence
12 that they should let us know more than a day or so in
13 advance so that way we can get the hearing room set
14 up appropriately.

15 They've also been notified about the mask
16 order and that we are having hearings in person. And
17 we indicated that if anything were to change with
18 that, we would let them know.

19 I'll start with the Jennifer McCray versus
20 Columbus City Schools. Ms. McCray is a secretary
21 to -- or was a secretary to the Columbus City
22 Schools. She was discharged for allegedly violating
23 attendance procedures. This -- or this -- yeah.
24 Trial board hearing is going to be held September 20,

1 2021, at 10:00 a.m.; and the commissioner assigned is
2 Commissioner Pettigrew.

3 The parties have indicated that they
4 anticipate this to be an approximate three to four
5 hour hearing. They have indicated they believe it to
6 be document intensive, which is why they have elected
7 to estimate a more lengthy time period for this
8 hearing.

9 The second prehearing conference that I
10 had was with David Creighton. He was a bus driver
11 with Columbus City Schools, and he was discharged for
12 allegedly exhibiting unprofessional, disruptive and
13 insubordinate behavior at a bus compound, in
14 violation of the Columbus City Schools Code of
15 Conduct and board policies and procedures. This is
16 scheduled for October 21, 2021, to begin at
17 10:00 a.m.

18 Commissioner Pettigrew will also be
19 presiding on this trial board. The parties have
20 elected to estimate approximately two and a half to
21 three hours for this hearing. And, again -- yes, a
22 10:00 a.m. start time.

23 And that's all that I have to report
24 related to these two conferences.

1 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Do you have the
2 number of witnesses on either of those?

3 MS. SHEA: I do. For Jennifer McCray, it
4 states that the Columbus City Schools would be
5 calling three witnesses; and the appellant,
6 Ms. McCray, would call two witnesses. For
7 Mr. Creighton, I don't have that information. I
8 don't know if Brittany has it with her. Okay. I
9 can -- Commissioner Pettigrew, after this meeting, I
10 can look at that and send you an email with the
11 number of witnesses listed on their witness list.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Please do.

13 MS. SHEA: Will do.

14 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: I'll just comment
15 that I really appreciate the summary on the
16 background removals, the way in which that's set up
17 now. I like that. It's very helpful to me to have
18 it articulated that way. It's easier for us because
19 we either agree or disagree. We haven't disagreed
20 yet. But it could happen I guess. But it's very
21 helpful to have that direct response coming from you.
22 So thank you very much.

23 MS. SHEA: You're welcome. I will not
24 make any changes to that then.

1 MR. PRICE: Just a quick question. Just
2 to project it -- I know it's a guess of how long the
3 second one will last. I know you talked about
4 projecting the first hearing to be several hours. I
5 just -- for me timewise.

6 MS. SHEA: Sure. David Creighton, the
7 second one, they projected two and a half to three
8 hours. So they didn't notify us that it was document
9 intensive. They indicated there is possibly a video
10 or audio but that it's just -- they measured it in
11 seconds versus minutes. So I don't anticipate that
12 even if that is shown it's going to take a
13 significant period of time.

14 MR. PRICE: Okay. Thank you.

15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Are both of these,
16 the appellants, the union representing them?

17 MS. SHEA: I will say, actually, for
18 Jennifer McCray, Mr. Banal is representing the
19 appellant. However -- Actually, you're right. It is
20 for both, for the appellant. We just have a
21 difference in counsel for Columbus City Schools --

22 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Yes.

23 MS. SHEA: -- on David Creighton. We
24 usually see Ms. Lillis. She's on Mr. McCray, but we

1 have a different attorney and representative from
2 Columbus City Schools for David Creighton's hearing.

3 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All right. Thank
4 you very much.

5 MS. SHEA: Thank you.

6 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: No Trial Board
7 recommendations. Items four and five will be joined
8 together. Item four is: Request of the Civil
9 Service Commission staff to approve the specification
10 review for the classification Personnel Psychologist
11 with no revisions; and item five is for the
12 classification Wastewater Technician Residuals
13 Manager with no revisions.

14 MS. DYKE: This is Beth Dyke, Personnel
15 Analyst with the Civil Service Commission staff. The
16 review of the classifications for items four and five
17 is part of the Civil Service Commission staff's
18 effort to review all classifications every four to
19 five years.

20 Based on feedback received, it was
21 determined that the current specification still
22 accurately reflects the work being performed, and it
23 is recommended that the specifications be approved
24 with no revisions.

1 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Together, jointly,
2 the four and five.

3 MR. PRICE: I move to approve the
4 specification review for the classification Personnel
5 Psychologist with no revisions, and I also move to
6 approve the specification review for the
7 classification Wastewater Treatment Residuals Manager
8 with no revisions.

9 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion -- or I
10 second the motion.

11 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Yes. All in favor
12 say, "aye."

13 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

14 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.
15 Items six and seven will be joined together. Item
16 six: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff
17 to revise the specification for the classification
18 Programmer Analyst and designate the examination type
19 as qualifying noncompetitive, and item seven is for
20 the classification Senior Programmer Analyst.

21 MS. DYKE: Beth Dyke again, Personnel
22 Analyst, Civil Service staff. The review of each
23 classification is part of the Civil Service
24 Commission's effort to review all classifications

1 every five years. Minor revisions are proposed
2 within the "Examples of Work" section for both
3 specifications so that the existing statements read
4 more effectively.

5 With regards to the "Minimum
6 Qualifications" section for both specifications, it
7 is proposed to remove the specific coursework
8 requirement and to simplify the existing language for
9 the experience substitution. This recommendation is
10 intended to place more emphasis on the experience
11 requirement and, in turn, generate larger applicant
12 pools.

13 Additionally, to assist the department
14 with difficulties in recruitment for the Programmer
15 Analyst classification, it is proposed to change the
16 examination type to noncompetitive with qualifying
17 examination. By changing the examination type, the
18 Department will have a greater opportunity to hire
19 those applicants who possess the needed computer
20 programming language experience.

21 Lastly, there are minor revisions proposed
22 within the "Knowledge, Skills and Abilities" section
23 of each specification to remove outdated language.

24 There are no other changes proposed at

11

1 this time. It is therefore recommended that the
2 specifications be revised as proposed.

3 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
4 specification for the classification "Programmer
5 Analyst" and designate the examination type as
6 qualifying, noncompetitive. I also move to revise
7 the specification for the classification Senior
8 Program Analyst.

9 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

10 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
11 "aye."

12 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

13 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

14 Items eight and nine will be joined
15 together. Item eight: Request of the Civil Service
16 Commission staff to revise the specification for the
17 classification Licensed Officer. And item 9 is to
18 revise the specification for the classification
19 Licensed Supervisor.

20 MS. DYKE: The review of each
21 classification as part of the Civil Service
22 Commission's effort to review all classifications
23 every five years. Within the "Examples of Work"
24 section for Licensed Officer, it is proposed to add

12

1 two statements to better support and exemplify those
2 duties described within the definition. Within the
3 "Examples of Work" section for the Licensed
4 Supervisor specification, it is proposed to remove
5 the reference to "manager" from two statements as
6 incumbents within the classification may also address
7 other staff members within the administration as well
8 as staff members from the City Attorney's office. It
9 is also proposed to make minor revisions and
10 deletions within the section of each specification to
11 ensure the duties within the classification
12 represents the duties being performed.

13 Within the "Minimum Qualifications"
14 section for licensed supervisor, it is proposed to
15 generalize the experience requirement by removing the
16 reference to the requirement of being a Licensed
17 Officer with the City of Columbus and to replace it
18 with the inferred experience. There are no proposed
19 revisions to the "Minimum Qualifications" section of
20 the Licensed Officer specification.

21 Lastly, there are minor revisions proposed
22 to the "Knowledge, Skills and Abilities" section of
23 both specifications to correct errors and add a
24 knowledge statement to each. There are no other

1 revisions proposed at this time, and it is
2 recommended the specifications for the
3 classifications be revised as proposed.

4 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
5 specification for the classification Licensed
6 Officer. I also move to revise the specification for
7 the classification Licensed Supervisor.

8 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

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

11 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

13 Item No. 10 is the request of the Civil
14 Service Commission staff to revise a specification
15 for the classification Vehicle Impounding Specialist,
16 change the probationary period to 365 days and amend
17 Rule 11 accordingly.

18 MS. DYKE: The review of this
19 classification is, again, part of the Civil Service
20 Commission's effort to review all classifications
21 every five years. Within the "Knowledge, Skills and
22 Abilities" section, it is proposed to add an
23 abilities statement regarding the use of a computer
24 and related software, as incumbents within the

1 classification use various computer programs to
2 complete investigative work related to impound
3 processing.

4 Lastly, in response to feedback received
5 from the Department regarding the appropriate length
6 of time incumbents need to fully learn and
7 effectively perform stated job duties, it is proposed
8 to increase the probationary period to 365 days.
9 There are no other proposed revisions at this time.
10 It is therefore recommended that the specification be
11 revised as proposed and Rule 11 amended accordingly.

12 MR. PRICE: Thank you. Mr. President,
13 just a quick question. What was the probationary
14 period before they made the recommendation to change
15 it to 365 days?

16 MS. DYKE: I believe it was 270. Is that
17 the next one down? I'm pretty sure. I did not bring
18 the specification with me. I can clarify that for
19 you.

20 MR. PRICE: Later. I was just wondering.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: There is an effort
22 to make them consistent at 365.

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

15

1 Impounding Specialist, change the probationary period
2 to 365 days and amend Rule 11 accordingly.

3 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

4 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
5 "aye."

6 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

7 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

8 MS. DYKE: Thank you.

9 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Item No. 11 and 12,
10 13 and 14 are joined together. And they start with
11 11: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to
12 revise the specification for the classification 311
13 Service Representative I. No. 12 is to revise the
14 specification for the classification 311 Service
15 Representative II. And item No. 13 is to revise the
16 specification for the classification 311 Service
17 Supervisor. And then item 14 is to revise the
18 specification for the classification 311 Service
19 Manager.

20 MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann, personnel
21 analyst II, Civil Service Commission. The review of
22 these classifications is part of our efforts to
23 review all classifications every five years. The
24 "Examples of Work" are proposed to be added or

1 modified to clarify responsibilities in the 311
2 Service Rep I and the supervisor.

3 Throughout the series, the "Minimum
4 Qualifications" are proposed to be revised to remove
5 the use of formal classification titles and to
6 require experience in customer service or as a call
7 center representative. In addition and throughout
8 the series, it is proposed that the "Knowledge,
9 Skills and Abilities" section has "telephone
10 etiquette" modified to "customer service etiquette,
11 appropriate levels of knowledge for City of Columbus
12 departments and services" added and modifying the
13 communication ability to ensure describing "working
14 with a diverse population" as proposed.

15 Within the 311 Representative I and II
16 levels, the ability to read a map and operate a
17 computer are included. It's recommended the
18 specifications be approved as proposed.

19 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
20 specification for the classification 311 Service
21 Representative I. I also move to revise the
22 specification for the classification 311 Service
23 Representative II. I also move to revise the
24 specification for the classification 311 Service

1 Supervisor, and I also move to revise the
2 specification for the classification 311 Service
3 Manager.

4 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

5 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
6 "aye."

7 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

8 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

9 Item No. 15 is the request of the Civil
10 Service Commission staff to revise the specification
11 for the classification Sewer Maintenance Assistant
12 Manager.

13 MS. LAGEMANN: Again, Carol Lagemann,
14 personnel analyst with Civil Service. The review of
15 this classification is part of our effort to review
16 all classifications every five years. Within the
17 "Examples of Work" section, removing the statement
18 about "acting in the absence of the higher level
19 classification in the series" is proposed, it is at
20 the manager's discretion for how to assign work if an
21 employee is absent. It is therefore recommended the
22 classification be revised as proposed.

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

1 Maintenance Assistant Manager.

2 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

3 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
4 "aye."

5 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

6 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

7 Item No. 16 is the request of the Civil Service
8 Commission staff to revise the specification for the
9 classification Regulatory Compliance Advisor.

10 MS. LITZY-TAYLOR: Good afternoon.
11 Charday Litzy-Taylor, Personnel Analyst with the
12 Civil Service Commission. This review was initiated
13 at the request of the Department of Public Utilities.
14 Use of this classification is currently limited to
15 the Director's office within Public Utilities.

16 Previously the Stormwater and Regulatory
17 Management Section located in the Division of Sewers
18 and Drains was overseen and supervised by an Engineer
19 IV. This position is currently vacant and, as a
20 result, the Department has reviewed the efficacy of
21 the section and determined that the role responsible
22 for managing the stormwater and regulatory compliance
23 management would be better served by hiring an
24 incumbent with a stronger regulatory management and

1 compliance regulatory background. Therefore, the
2 Regulatory Compliance Advisor classification is
3 better suited for this position.

4 It is therefore recommended that the
5 guidelines for "Class Use" section be revised to
6 allow the Department to utilize this classification
7 in other divisions. Lastly, the classification will
8 be expected to perform supervisory duties moving
9 forward. Therefore, it is recommend that the
10 "Examples of Work" section be revised to include
11 supervisory responsibilities. No other revisions are
12 proposed at this time.

13 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
14 specification for the classification Regulatory
15 Compliance Advisor.

16 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
18 "aye."

19 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

20 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

21 Item No. 17 is the request of the Civil
22 Service Commission staff to revise the specification
23 for the classification Fire Assistant Chief.

24 MS. GOODWIN: Good afternoon. Sheri

1 Goodwin with the City of Columbus Civil Service
2 Commission uniform testing. I request of the Civil
3 Service Commission staff to revise the specification
4 for the classification of Fire Assistant Chief. This
5 is part of -- again, part of our efforts to revise
6 each -- or at least review each classification at
7 least every five years. There is one proposed update
8 for the "Examples of Work" to develop and implement
9 specific initiatives in support of the Division's
10 mission and values statements.

11 There are no other changes proposed to the
12 specification at this time.

13 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
14 specification for the classification Fire Assistant
15 Chief.

16 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
18 "aye."

19 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

20 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

21 For the background removals, item No. 19,
22 we have the following: Daniel Williams, do not
23 reinstate; Cameron Evans, do not reinstate; Jorel
24 Roundtree, reinstate; Andre Small, do not reinstate;

21

1 Nobin Rahut, do not reinstate; Christian Bullinger,
2 reinstate; Rebekah Walsh, reinstate; Christopher
3 Donnelly, do not reinstate; Emmanuel Behn, do not
4 reinstate; James Stevens, reinstate; Jordan Thompson,
5 reinstate; Dustin Baker, reinstate; Christopher
6 Britton, reinstate.

7 We have no other items on the agenda. And
8 with that, we -- Is there another letter?

9 MS. BRINNON: The letters for the
10 administrative/jurisdictional reviews.

11 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Is that the only
12 one? That would be approved. The letter submitted
13 will be approved.

14 With that, we are adjourned.

15 - - -

16 And, thereupon, the meeting was adjourned
17 at 1:01 p.m.

18 - - -

19

20

21

22

23

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

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
30th day of August, 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