

1 APPEARANCES:

2 COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

6 PRESENTERS:

7 Amy DeLong
8 Beth Dyke
9 Tammy Rollins
10 Carol Lagemann
11 Jennifer Shea
12 Charday Litzy-Taylor
13 Liz Reed

14 ALSO PRESENT:

15 Wendy Brinnon - - -

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

1 MR. PRICE: Yes. I move for the approval
2 of it.

3 MS. DELONG: Second.

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

6 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

7 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved. The
8 Trial Board decision will be signed.

9 Items four and five are the request of the
10 Civil Service Commission staff to create the
11 specification for the classification Cyber Security
12 Technician, assign a probationary period of 365 days,
13 designate the examination type as noncompetitive and
14 amend Rule XI accordingly.

15 For item No. 5, it is for the
16 classification Cyber Security Analyst, assign a
17 probationary period of 365 days, designate the
18 examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule XI
19 accordingly.

20 MS. DYKE: Beth Dyke, personnel analyst
21 with the Civil Service staff. The Civil Service
22 staff received a correspondence from the Department
23 of Technology requesting the creation of a Cyber
24 Security Technician and the Cyber Security Analyst

1 classification. The request is in response to
2 funding included within the mayor's 2021 operating
3 budget for a major citywide cyber security
4 initiative.

5 The City classification plan was reviewed,
6 and it was determined that currently there are no
7 existing classifications which are specifically
8 designated for maintaining ongoing risk management
9 and control of citywide cyber related risks. The
10 Cyber Security Technician classification is proposed
11 as a junior marking level classification working
12 under general supervision and responsible for
13 providing support and resolution of matters related
14 to the security of the City's information systems
15 and/or networks.

16 The Cyber Security Analyst classification
17 is proposed as a full working level classification,
18 working under direction and responsible for
19 identifying, researching, analyzing and responding to
20 matters related to the security of the City's
21 information systems and/or networks.

22 The Examples of Work Section for each
23 classification is proposed to include those
24 responsibilities identified as important for each

1 classification. Additionally, there is a guidelines
2 for class use proposed for each classification
3 stating that the class is designated for use
4 exclusively within the Department of Technology.

5 The Minimum Qualifications Section for
6 each classification was developed to reflect the
7 qualifications necessary for successful performance
8 of the job duties and to ensure a well-qualified and
9 diverse applicant pool. For Cyber Security
10 Technician, it is proposed that one year of cyber
11 security and/or information technology security work
12 qualifies as an appropriate experience requirement.
13 Additionally, completing one year of college
14 coursework in cyber security, information technology
15 security or information technology would be
16 equivalent to the required work experience.

17 It is also proposed that a certificate of
18 completion from a recognized vocational program in a
19 computer-related technology program may substitute
20 for the experience requirement. To ensure that the
21 employees have demonstrated a baseline knowledge and
22 understanding of cyber security principles and
23 procedures, it is proposed that the employee would
24 need to obtain the associate of ISC² or higher

7

1 certification prior to achieving a permanent status.

2 The ISC², formally called the
3 International Information System Security Consortium,
4 is considered an industry leader in the certification
5 of information security professionals. Certification
6 obtained through this consortium requires the
7 candidate to pass an examination for each level of
8 certification. Additionally, where there is an
9 experience requirement, the candidate's experience is
10 verified by professionals within the consortium prior
11 to issuance of any certification.

12 With regards to the minimum qualifications
13 for Cyber Security Analyst, it is proposed that the
14 possession of an associate degree and two years of
15 experience performing cyber security and/or
16 information technology security work would provide an
17 appropriate level of education and experience.
18 Additionally, it is proposed that possession of a
19 valid associate of ISC² certification may substitute
20 for the education requirement and that possession of
21 a valid ISC² certification and certified information
22 systems security professional certification qualifies
23 to substitute for both the education and experience
24 requirement.

8

1 It is further proposed that possession of
2 a bachelor's degree in cyber security or information
3 technology may substitute for both the education and
4 experience requirement and that additional experience
5 performing cyber security and/or information
6 technology security work may substitute for the
7 required education on a year-for-year basis.

8 In consideration of the progression of
9 minimum qualification requirements within a
10 classification series and also to ensure that
11 employees have demonstrated a baseline knowledge in
12 understanding of matters related to cyber security,
13 it is proposed that employees would be required to
14 obtain the system security certified practitioner or
15 higher ISC² certification prior to the completion of
16 probation.

17 The Knowledge, Skills and Abilities
18 Section for each classification was developed to
19 include the knowledge, skills and abilities expected
20 of a candidate's successful performance in the job.
21 It is recommended that the probationary period for
22 each classification be 365 days which is consistent
23 with those classifications within the City's
24 classification plan in which specialized work related

1 to the City's information systems and/or networks is
2 performed.

3 This also allows ample time for the
4 department to provide the appropriate training. It
5 is proposed that the examination type of both
6 classifications be designated as noncompetitive, as
7 the minimum qualifications of each classification is
8 proposed to require the employee to obtain
9 certification by the completion of the probationary
10 period. Furthermore, the recommendation is
11 consistent with Commission policy with regard to the
12 effective practicability of testing when a Commission
13 exam would duplicate a previous testing process and
14 would divert testing dollars for classes in which the
15 commission exam is the only test instrument.

16 It is recommended that both proposed
17 classifications be assigned within the applied
18 sciences job family and they're within the
19 information technology group of the City's
20 classification plan. Lastly, it is proposed that the
21 Cyber Security Technician classification be assigned
22 to the Technician EEO/DOJ job category and the Cyber
23 Security Analyst classification be assigned to the
24 professional EEO/DOJ job category. Therefore, it is

10

1 recommended that the classification Cyber Security
2 Technician and Cyber Security Analyst be created as
3 proposed and amend Rule XI accordingly.

4 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Thank you.

5 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Beth.

6 I move to create the specification for the
7 classification Cyber Security Technician, assign a
8 probationary period of 365 days, designate the
9 examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule XI
10 accordingly.

11 I also move to create the specification
12 for the classification Cyber Security Analyst, assign
13 a probationary period of 365 days, designate the
14 examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule XI
15 accordingly.

16 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

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

19

20 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

22 Items No. 6 and 7 will be joined together.

23 Item No. 6 is a request of the Civil Service

24 Commission staff to create the specification for the

11

1 classification Building Compliance Manager, assign a
2 probationary period of 365 days, designate the
3 examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule XI
4 accordingly. Item No. 7 is to retitle the
5 classification Inspection Manager to read Building
6 Inspection Manager and amend Rule XI accordingly.

7 MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann, Personnel
8 Analyst II with the Civil Service Commission. These
9 two actions arose out of a class action request from
10 the Department of Building and Zoning. The only
11 change proposed for Inspection Manager is to retitle
12 it to Building Inspection Manager. Adding this
13 distinction helps clarify that inspections related to
14 enforcing Ohio Building Code are under this
15 classification.

16 The proposed creation titled Building
17 Compliance Manager is designed to fill a need within
18 the Department of Building and Zoning for managing
19 six Building Compliance Specialists and the support
20 staff for the Building Compliance Section. The
21 section is currently managed by a Management Analyst
22 II, and not every Building Compliance Specialist has
23 a degree. And since there's no substitution for the
24 degree in MA II, it was proposed to create this new

12

1 classification.

2 The new classification has substitutions
3 for the degree which allow for specific job-related
4 State of Ohio certifications. This will allow for
5 Building Compliance Specialists that do not have a
6 degree but do have the relevant certifications to
7 promote into management. There is a proposed
8 guidelines for class use that addresses this will be
9 a single position classification.

10 This classification is expected to perform
11 supervisory work and be assigned the 365 day
12 probationary period. The Examples of Work and
13 Knowledge, Skills and Abilities Sections were
14 designed to be illustrative of the types of work and
15 knowledge, skills and abilities needed for the job.

16 Since this classification is primarily to
17 oversee the Building Compliance Specialist and a few
18 support staff, the minimum qualifications mirror
19 those of the class that will supervise in the series,
20 with the experience requirement building two more
21 years. Since an incumbent of this classification is
22 expected to travel to building locations and to
23 appeal hearings, a driver's license is also required.

24 It's further recommended that the exam

13

1 type be designated as noncompetitive per Commission
2 policy since classifications that supervise and a
3 professional EEO/DOJ job category be assigned.
4 Within the classification plan it is proposed
5 Building Compliance Manager be in series with
6 Building Compliance Specialists and assign to the
7 Protective Services job family and the inspections
8 group. It is therefore recommended that the
9 classification Building Compliance Manager be created
10 as proposed and for both proposed actions amend Rule
11 XI accordingly.

12 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Carol.

13 I move to create the specification for the
14 classification Building Compliance Manager, assign a
15 probationary period of 365 days, designate the
16 examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule XI
17 accordingly. I also move to retitle the
18 classification Inspection Manager to read Building
19 Inspection Manager and amend Rule XI accordingly.

20 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
22 "Aye."

23 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

24 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

14

1 Item No. 8 is the request of the Civil Service
2 Commission staff to revise the specification for the
3 classification Public Health Environmental Health
4 Specialist III.

5 MS. LITZY-TAYLOR: Good afternoon.
6 Charday Litzy-Taylor, Personnel Analyst with the
7 Civil Service Commission. This review was initiated
8 at the request of Columbus Public Health. The
9 current definition requires the Public Health
10 Environmental Health Specialist III class supervise
11 other Public Health Environmental Health Specialists
12 in a specialized phase of Environmental Health
13 program.

14 As the Environmental Health section moves
15 into a direction that includes policy development and
16 management, the department would like to remove the
17 supervisory limitation and use this classification to
18 supervise other classes that could provide direction
19 with environmental health policy management.
20 Therefore, to address the supervisory limitation, it
21 is proposed that the definition be revised to read:
22 Under direction is responsible for supervising staff
23 involved in a specialized phase of environmental
24 health program. There are no other revisions

15

1 proposed to this specification at this time.

2 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Charday.

3 I move to revise the specification for the
4 classification Public Health Environmental Health
5 Specialist III.

6 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

7 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
8 "Aye."

9 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

10 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

11 Item No. 9 is the request of the Civil Service
12 Commission staff to revise the specification for the
13 classification Civil Service Commission Executive
14 Assistant Director.

15 MS. ROLLINS: Thank you. Tammy Rollins.
16 This classification is -- This class review was
17 initiated as part of the Commission's efforts to
18 review every classification at least once every five
19 years. I'm happy to report this is our last
20 classification for our 2021 scheduled reviews. So
21 all were completed.

22 But based on this review that was
23 completed, there are a couple of minor additions to
24 this classification, most notably to the Knowledge,

16

1 Skills and Abilities Section to ensure that it covers
2 the critical knowledge, skills and abilities that are
3 important for successful performance. There are no
4 other proposed revisions at this time.

5 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Tammy.

6 I move to revise the specification for the
7 classification Civil Service Commission Executive
8 Assistant Director.

9 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

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

12 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

13 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
14 Thank you.

15 No residency hearing reviews. As to
16 background removals, applicants removed post
17 examination agreed upon by the commissioners are as
18 follows: Ryan Donahue, do not reinstate; Christopher
19 Billings, reinstate; Terrel Reynolds, do not
20 reinstate; and Devan Kline, do not reinstate.

21 We have no administrative or
22 jurisdictional reviews. The next two items, 13 and
23 14 are joined together. Item No. 13: Request of the
24 Civil Service Commission staff to amend Rule

17

1 VII(A) (4) to add language allowing for the hiring of
2 the state-certified police officers from a United
3 States jurisdiction other than the City -- and that's
4 the City of Columbus -- without further competitive
5 testing.

6 Item No. 14 is request of the Civil
7 Service Commission staff to revise the background
8 removal standards for police officer and 911
9 Emergency Communications candidates.

10 MS. DELONG: I just want to amend. It's
11 XII (A) (4) for No. 13.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: I'm sorry. XII
13 (A) (4).

14 MS. DELONG: Yes. Amy DeLong, Executive
15 Director of Civil Service Commission. The request of
16 the Civil Service Commission staff to amend Rule XII
17 (A) (4) to add language allowing the hiring of
18 state-certified police officers from a United States
19 jurisdiction other than the City without further
20 competitive testing. Throughout the country, most
21 candidate pools for law enforcement positions are
22 deficient in terms of diversity and declining in the
23 total number of interested applicants.

24 While to date the City has not -- has been

18

1 able to consistently fill its recruit classes each
2 year, the need to increase diversity numbers
3 continues to be a need and a priority. And we do not
4 want to wait to address our own potential for
5 declining applicant numbers as seen in other
6 jurisdictions. As such, the staff is recommending
7 expanding Rule XII(A) (4) to allow hiring current or
8 former state-certified police officers from other
9 jurisdictions within the United States.

10 The individuals hired as police officers
11 under these provisions would still be required at a
12 minimum to be or have been certified by a state level
13 authority as qualified and able to perform police
14 officer or peace officer work within the issuing
15 agency's jurisdiction. Prior to hire they must
16 complete any background, interview, medical,
17 psychological and/or other assessments or processes
18 as required by the City. Once hired, they must
19 complete the Ohio Peace Officer Training Academy,
20 OPOTA, and/or CPD training and/or testing as
21 assessment required by OPOTA certification and
22 performance of police officer duties by CPD, and they
23 must complete a 365 day probationary period.

24 Essentially police officers moving

19

1 laterally from one police officer position from
2 another jurisdiction to the City of Columbus would be
3 required to complete any and all selection
4 prerequisites, training and assessments and as those
5 individuals are entering our training academy through
6 the competitive testing process. However, lateral
7 hires would fulfill the competitive testing portion
8 of the City's selection process by virtue of their
9 previously held qualifying police officer
10 appointment. Based upon the foregoing, the
11 Commission staff is recommending adoption of the
12 language change as proposed.

13 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: You're doing 13
14 separate from 14?

15 MS. DELONG: I am doing it.

16 MR. PRICE: Thank you.

17 I move to amend Rule XII(A) (4) to add
18 language in line for the hiring of state-certified
19 police officers from other United States
20 jurisdictions other than the City without further
21 competitive testing.

22 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

23 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: I have a question.
24 Would an officer certified in the District of

20

1 Columbia qualify? That's considered a jurisdiction?

2 MS. DELONG: Yeah. What would happen is
3 anybody who is qualified in their jurisdiction as a
4 police officer and has had a position as a police
5 officer for more than three years would be allowed to
6 come here; however, they're still going to have to
7 meet all of the State's requirements in terms of
8 training under OPOTA and then all of our requirements
9 that the City of Columbus has in our academy for
10 those individuals in order -- before they'll be able
11 to be put out on the street.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: What if they were
13 certified in Puerto Rico?

14 MS. DELONG: That's outside of the United
15 States, and I think our definition is United States
16 at this point.

17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Okay. And then that
18 does not include military police officers, CID?

19 MS. DELONG: It does not include military.

20 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Okay. Any further
21 questions?

22 MS. LYNCH: No.

23 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
24 "Aye."

21

1 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

2 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

3 Item No. 14 is the request of the Civil Service
4 Commission staff to revise the background removal
5 standards for Police Officer and 911 Emergency
6 Communications candidates.

7 MS. DELONG: Thank you. Amy DeLong. The
8 Commission staff is recommending the adoption of the
9 recently reviewed and revised background removal
10 standards for Police Officer and 911 Emergency
11 Communications candidates proposed herein. As a part
12 of the City of Columbus efforts to reimagine public
13 safety, all facets of police officer recruitment,
14 selection, training, retention processes have been or
15 are currently under review for the need of change
16 and/or enhancement. One area of interest by several
17 stakeholder groups was the makeup of the
18 administration of the background review process.

19 For context, the original list of removal
20 standards was developed in 1995, '96 through a
21 collaborative effort between the Civil Service
22 Commission, the Department of Public Safety, the
23 Division of Police, with considerable input from
24 members of the public, as well as employees of the

22

1 Division. These standards were designed -- were
2 designed as and continue to be an objective list of
3 disqualifying background characteristics for which a
4 Police Officer or 911 Emergency Communications
5 applicant would be removed from the selection process
6 by the Civil Service Commission, the intent being to
7 ensure uniformity to the process used by the City of
8 Columbus within the general hiring process for these
9 positions.

10 Although these standards have been
11 reviewed and updated many times throughout the years,
12 it was agreed by many that a top to bottom review of
13 the standards with an expanded group of stakeholders
14 was now warranted as a part of the City's reimagining
15 efforts. To this end, numerous groups were held to
16 provide general -- I'm sorry -- numerous groups -- I
17 can't get the word out -- numerous focus groups were
18 held to provide general public, community leaders,
19 City leaders and the Division of Police personnel
20 opportunity to hear a brief history, identification
21 and explanation of the current standards and then ask
22 questions and provide feedback and input as to how
23 the standards do or do not meet -- I'm sorry -- do
24 not need to change or need to be improved.

1 After gathering the various stakeholders'
2 input, revised standards were drafted, reviewed with
3 the community and City leaders in order to provide
4 final guidance on the needed updates to the
5 standards. The listing of standards included herein
6 are the end result of these efforts.

7 In general, based on the overall input
8 received from the stakeholders, previous standards
9 covering gambling, non-applicant responsiveness were
10 removed or incorporated into other areas of the
11 revised standards for Civil Service rules. Further,
12 the categories of honesty and falsification and
13 family history were renamed to better reflect the
14 intent of the standards contained with each of those
15 respective categories. And finally, the previous
16 standard related to marijuana use has been
17 eliminated, and minor changes were made to the time
18 frames listed within the areas of employment, traffic
19 and illegal substances.

20 Overall, these revisions were made in
21 order to ensure the standards were, one, appropriate
22 and warranted, validated for the position and, two,
23 objective and clear in their descriptions and
24 application. Identifying and selecting great

24

1 candidates for these critical safety positions has
2 been and will continue to be the foundation of
3 providing effective public safety services that meet
4 the needs and desires of our community. As such, the
5 Commission staff is recommending the adoption of the
6 updated standards as proposed.

7 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Director. And if I
8 may, just point of personal privilege. I want to
9 thank you and the staff. I had the pleasure of
10 accompanying you, as you well know, to these
11 community meetings. And a lot of times we go into
12 the community; and they think we're not listening,
13 that this is just a dog and a pony show and that
14 there will be no real change. So I'm happy to report
15 that there will be change, and it will be shared with
16 the community. And we did hear some of those
17 concerns.

18 So, again, thank you not only to the
19 staff, but the Civil Service Commission for doing an
20 enormous job.

21 Mr. President, I move to revise the
22 background removal standards for the Police Officer
23 and 911 Emergency Communications candidates.

24 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

25

1 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,

2 "Aye."

3 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

4 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

5 MS. DELONG: I just had one thing to add,
6 and that is: Now that these standards are approved,
7 we will be sending these out to all community members
8 who were involved in the process so that they see the
9 change has occurred. We'll also be sending it out to
10 the media, so you may get questions on that.

11 And also, I just would be remiss if I
12 didn't say personally thank you, Commissioner Price,
13 for coming out to all those meetings because I know
14 it takes a lot of time and effort and also thank Liz
15 Reed and Jen Shea, who, without them, this would not
16 be accomplished. They put a tremendous amount of
17 effort, and I wanted to make sure it was acknowledged
18 publicly today. Thank you.

19 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Thank you.

20 Item No. 15 is the request of the Civil
21 Service Commission staff to revise the background
22 removal standards for firefighter candidates.

23 MS. REED: Good afternoon, commissioners.
24 I'm Liz Reed, Civil Service Commission Executive

1 Assistant Director. Commission staff recommends
2 adopting the proposed background removal standards
3 for firefighter candidates. The removal standards
4 for firefighter candidates were not a part of the
5 background standards review; however, we are
6 proposing that these removal standards remain
7 consistent with the public -- with the police officer
8 standards that you just approved. Two job-related
9 differences. First, we are proposing to maintain the
10 termination or resignation in lieu of
11 termination -- I'm sorry -- in lieu of discipline for
12 any salaried fire/EMS position or health care
13 professional position, which is not part of the
14 police version of the standards.

15 Second, since anyone who committed
16 Medicare or Medicaid fraud or appear on a Medicare or
17 Medicaid list cannot serve as a firefighter,
18 therefore this standard remains in the background
19 standards and the disapproval for gaining leave
20 access is not needed in this standard and does remain
21 in the police officer removal standards.

22 Currently, failure to pass a polygraph
23 exam does not exist in the police officer standards.
24 The CSC staff is proposing to remove this statement

1 from the firefighter version of the standards.

2 The remaining standards are consistent
3 between the two removal standards documents. So
4 Commission staff recommends adopting the firefighter
5 background removal standards as proposed.

6 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Liz.

7 I move to revise the background removal
8 standards for firefighter candidates.

9 MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.

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

12 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

13 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
14 Thank you.

15 With that, we have finished the agenda,
16 and we will adjourn.

17 - - -

18 And, thereupon, the meeting was adjourned
19 at 1:09 p.m.

20 - - -

21

22

23

24

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

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
13th day of December, 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 16, 2026.

Grady L. Pettigrew, President

Date