



**Minutes  
Diversity Steering Committee  
Tuesday, February 1, 2011  
3 p.m.**

Every month the Diversity Steering Committee meets to discuss current diversity issues as well as the ongoing implementation of the Diversity Action Plan. In the interest of city wide inclusiveness and creating openness, the Diversity Steering Committee will publish a monthly summary of items discussed. Please review the following items and contact your respective 6-Sided Partnership representative or a Diversity Steering Committee member should you have any questions or suggestions.

**Mission: To work with each other and the community to make Tempe the best place to live, work, and play.**

**Values: People...Integrity...Respect...Openness...Creativity...Quality...Diversity**

**In Attendance**

- Jackie Awosika, SEIU
- Ginny Belousek, Diversity Office
- Dave Boivin, SEIU
- Renie Broderick, Human Resources
- Molly Enright, Confidential Employees
- Michelle Fedor, SEIU
- Lynn Fletcher, SEIU
- Jerry Hart, Financial Services
- Rosa Inchausti, Diversity Office
- Jeff Kulaga, Assistant City Manager
- Lawrence LaVictoire, Human Resources
- Todd Lunn, IAFF
- Jeff McHenry, TOA
- Jon O'Connor, Human Resources
- Tim Peeks, SEIU
- Wendy Springborn, TSA
- Louis Telles, Human Resources
- Bonnie Wallace, Human Resources

The meeting began with introductions.

Renie continued with two correction requests to the December 7, 2010 minutes. Renie requested that “with the help of Karl Stephens” be added to the end of the second paragraph on page 4 and that “HR will respond to the original Recruitment Recommendations memo at the March 1, 2011 meeting” be added to the fourth paragraph on page 4. Renie said that HR needs to receive all the recruitment recommendations before responding to the Diversity Steering Committee’s recommendations.

**I. Review Recruitment Practices Recommendations**

Rosa began by explaining the Recruitment Recommendations came from the Diversity Steering Committee discussions over the past few months and feedback from the Six Sided Partnership. Members were going to discuss this draft with their employee representative groups and get that information back to the Diversity Steering Committee.

Molly Enright then passed out the consensus points relating to the recruitment recommendations from the “Confidential Employee Meeting – January 11, 2011”. Molly reported that they have approximately 85 Confidential Employees and they received feedback from approximately 25 of those employees.

Wendy Springborn stated that TSA has not yet formulated their response.

After the group reviewed the Confidential Employees Consensus Points, Rosa asked for comments. Molly added that she would e-mail the Consensus Points with two late additions, for group dissemination. Rosa suggested discussing the Recruitment Procedure Recommendations from Confidential Employees first. Molly said that the Confidential Employees did not respond to the Recruitment Recommendations line by line because there were some points that did not have a clear consensus in any one direction. Molly added that the Confidential Employees Consensus Report also included comments to HR’s response to the November 2, 2010 memo entitled “Recommendations to Improve City Marketing and Employee Recruitment”. Rosa asked that Molly discuss the points pertaining to the Recruitment Recommendations before addressing the concerns about the Diversity Steering Committee.

Molly began with the Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point #1: “Use the scoring process for either ALL recruitments or NONE of the recruitments”. Molly reported that the Confidential Employees general consensus was that an all or nothing approach was not necessarily going to achieve the desired goals. Molly said that there was less disagreement although the Confidential Employees felt this point was not sufficient to allow for adaptability depending on the position. Molly said that fairness and equity is important to the Confidential Employees and felt that Point #1 could possibly be expanded to address the all or nothing approach.

Molly continued with Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point #3: “Have a standard practice for who should sit on the interview panels”. Molly said the consensus was that there was currently a standard practice in place for who sat on interview panels and that maybe that practice needed to be better explained and advertised.

Molly said the Confidential Employees discussed open recruitment although they did not specifically discuss Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point #5: "Create a policy regarding when a position is administratively placed versus open recruitment".

Regarding Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point #6: "Create a policy determining when appropriate for classification changes from unclassified to classified", Molly reported that Confidential Employees supported HR communicating this better if situations of equity was the issue.

On Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point #8: "Create a policy for when selection feedback requires public record request", Molly said some of the Confidential Employees wondered if public records requests were not being fulfilled.

Molly added that Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point #9: "Bi-annual review of minimum qualifications for all City positions" did not come up as a specific issue for the Confidential Employees.

Rosa asked Molly to remind the Diversity Steering Committee about who primarily makes up the Confidential Employees Group. Molly responded that the Confidential Employee Group is made up of employees throughout the City both vertically and horizontally and although she does not have specific numbers, Molly believes the bulk is from Police, HR, the City Attorney's office and some from 3<sup>rd</sup> floor City Hall. Bonnie Wallace added that all Executive Assistants are also included.

Wendy asked if SEIU's comments could be reviewed and asked for clarification on the different colors included in their handout. Jackie Awosika explained that the different colors were different people's responses and that each person's comments stayed the same color. Lynn Fletcher explained that the proposed recommendations went out to all members.

Jackie reported that SEIU mostly agreed with Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point #1, that the scoring should be up front but that "mandatory" scoring should be added.

Jackie continued with Recruitment Procedure Recommendation Point # 2: "Interview process – panelists would be able to review but not discuss scoring for all candidates and turn in score sheets at the end of the interview day". Jackie said that interview panels she has been a part of in the past have done the scoring and turned in their numbers at the end. At that point, they could have discussions but not during the scoring process. Jackie reported that SEIU's consensus was they agreed with that process. Jeff Kulaga agreed that discussions shouldn't take place until the end so that scoring numbers are not changed but inquired about when the scoring numbers were turned in. Jackie and Bonnie replied that scoring numbers were turned in after each person. Ginny Belousek added that the committee had discussed holding on to the scoring until everyone had been interviewed and having the chance to change your original scores before turning in the scoring numbers. Jeff explained that he wouldn't know how to score the first person he interviewed because you are scoring on a curve. Ginny confirmed that had been part of previous discussions. Wendy asked what the concern is about waiting to score until all the interviews are completed. Renie said she

thought the purpose of today's meeting was to *hear* the recommendations but we could discuss as well. Renie continued that she did not think there was a right or wrong way and HR is open to hearing the recommendations. Renie said that if someone was trying to "fix" or manipulate the system it would be easier to do if scoring sheets were kept until the end. Jackie said that SEIU was recommending keeping the scoring separate with the discussion afterwards, and that there be no changing of the numbers. Jackie said the hiring manager could then take that discussion into consideration but that the scoring is over and done with. Jerry Hart was concerned if there were multiple candidates, how it would be possible to remember everyone. Jerry said it was better to score the candidate while everything was fresh in your mind. Ginny said they used to score after each interview but hold on to the scoring sheets to possibly make changes based on your own perceptions before any discussions. Todd Lunn offered an analogy of buying the first car you see even though you might see a different car that would better suit your needs. Renie suggested that a ranking system could be added to the end of the interview process which would be separate from the scoring process. Renie said it would give an additional way to analyze the interview results. Renie stated that there were a number of ways to proceed as long as it was fair. Jeff McHenry asked Renie how things worked in Pennsylvania. Renie replied that there was no one way. Jeff said that he has been on interview panels that have worked every way possible. Renie asked for his recommendation. Jeff McHenry agreed with the comment that you are grading on a curve and you wouldn't want to let things set overnight. Lawrence LaVictoire said that he and Todd have been on interview panels that have lasted three weeks, interviewing 130 people and that at the end of the process they can usually tell the top five candidates. Todd added that they take notes and pictures of each candidate.

Jeff Kulaga asked if some of the SEIU comments were inconsistent. Jackie replied that there was not a consensus and the process was all about having a voice. Molly said that the discussion concept allows for faith in the interview panel. Molly continued by saying that the folks that did not have faith in the panel would opt for no discussion and to trust the numbers only. Molly continued saying that discussion opens it up to delineate between the top candidates. Rosa added that Point #2 was a compromise about how much discussion should be allowed and that originally it was open discussion.

Jackie continued with Point #3. Jackie said that one of the suggestions was for a SEIU Representative to be included in the interview panels. Jackie stated that SEIU wanted to ensure there was expertise on the panel relevant to the position and would like to see more energy put into determining what the interviewers bring to the panel.

Jackie said that disclosing the panelist's identities before the interview would be helpful especially when the panel includes people from other cities.

Jackie reported that within Point #5, that if people are transferred, it was recommended that there be a policy to identify when positions are appointed or go to competitive competition.

Jackie said SEIU agrees with Point # 6.

Regarding Point # 7, Jackie said at one time candidates were encouraged to set up an appointment to get feedback from HR but they should have options as to how that feedback is received (i.e. face to face, e-mail or phone call). Employees should not have to use a public record request but if they did, they should not have to pay for the service.

Jackie said that SEIU thought a bi-annual review of minimum qualifications would be enough for Point # 9, but that it needed to be done.

Jackie concluded that SEIU added a Point #10: "Create a pathway to move employees from temporary status to part-time benefit and/or full-time benefit". Jackie said that SEIU is the only work group that has temporary workers on the payroll for five-ten years at 40 hours per week. Wendy asked if Point #10 would reinstate the policy that temporary workers could apply for internal job openings after working 1,040 hours. Jackie said that currently temporary workers may only apply for external positions and Point #10 would possibly change that.

Renie asked when TSA would be responding with their comments on the Recruitment Recommendations. Wendy said she would get TSA comments to HR in the next two weeks.

Jeff McHenry said he thought the most important recommendation was the scoring procedure. Jeff said the scoring is worthy of additional discussion and requires the most thought. Jeff concluded that he does not have a problem with the other recommendations. Todd agreed with Jeff that problems are possible if one strict scoring policy is decided on. Jackie asked if we currently score for external applicants. Renie replied yes and that essentially the same process is used. Jerry said he wants to get some feedback from the management team. Jerry asked if SEIU is implying a scoring system be used for a second interview. Jerry said that currently the second interview is more informal and does not utilize scoring. Jackie replied that the SEIU comment is recommending another format be used if a second interview is conducted. Wendy asked if that could be a ranking system and Jackie agreed that ranking would be one possibility. Jerry said that the second interview did not include prepared questions and wondered how it would be documented. Jackie suggested that employee forums or Survey Monkey results could be incorporated. Jerry confirmed he could have management feedback ready for the next Diversity Steering Committee meeting. Rosa said Recruitment Recommendations will be included on the next meeting's agenda. Ginny asked if HR will be responding at the March or April meeting. Renie said if she could have two weeks to respond after receiving TSA's comments, HR could be ready with their response at the March Diversity Steering meeting.

## **II. Review December 7, 2010 Human Resources "Recruitment Procedure Recommendations" Memo**

Renie was prepared to respond to the November 2, 2010 "HR's Response (in blue) to Recommendations to Improve City Marketing and Employee Recruitment" memo. Renie explained that this memo was in response to the March 5, 2008 memo to Charlie Meyer from the Diversity Department and the City Marketing and Recruitment Outreach Committee (ROC). The consensus was to table this item for the next meeting since the

memo was not included in the committee's packets and to discuss HR's December 7, 2010 "Recruitment Procedure Recommendations" memo instead.

Renie suggested we discuss the last paragraph of the December 7<sup>th</sup> memo in which HR recommends "an open recruitment process where all job openings are posted internally and externally at the same time". Rosa asked for clarification on the open enrollment recommendation. Renie explained that currently the City does an internal recruitment first and then the "four or fewer" rule determines if it is opened up externally. Wendy began by sharing that TSA is all over the map on this one. Some TSA members are very passionate about maintaining internal recruitment first while others are adamant that the only way to keep things fresh and diverse is to allow for open recruitment. Wendy said it's not always about the most experience but about finding the best fit. Todd asked how a Captain from the outside would be scored. Wendy responded that it would depend on how the scoring was allocated. Wendy added that maybe external experience would be weighted lower. Todd said that internal applicants are already competing against themselves through a testing process to become Captain. Todd wondered if applicants would be competing twice, first against each other and then again with external applicants. Renie said that currently the mandate is an internal recruitment first. Renie added that HR tries to have fair and consistent policies but the process needs some flexibility because there isn't always a one size fits all. Renie said that possibly there would not be the need for open recruitment in sworn positions as with the current policy where scoring is not used for unclassified positions but scoring is used for classified positions. Renie explained that no decisions have been made and that is all open to discussion.

Jeff McHenry asked what positions this change would apply to. Renie explained that this open recruitment would theoretically apply to all positions but that it doesn't necessarily have to involve all positions. Jackie recommended we exclude all groups except management level and above and keep all other positions internal. Todd asked if this change was due to problems the City had been experiencing. Renie replied that Charlie Meyer has mentioned several times that there have been strong recommendations made by outside entities that our recruitment procedures and policies are not encouraging diversity. Rosa would like to see data on the pool of diversity in the last open recruitments to determine if that is a valid argument. Rosa explained that we bring in diversity at all levels of the organization and that we offer mentoring opportunities to our employees so they have opportunities to move up in the organization. Rosa added that Covey supports promotion from within. Jackie said that there is some data found in the answers HR provided in the November 2, 2010 memo. Jackie continued that although there is always room for improvement, when you compare City employees with the Tempe population you see a lot of diversity. Renie said the memo shows a snapshot of the whole organization compared to the census population but further analysis shows what levels minorities are employed at. Renie added that in addition to comparing the overall data, it is about breaking the glass ceiling. Jackie said that was all the more reason to give our employees a chance to promote from within. Renie said that argument is assuming the internal candidates are the most diverse and that is not always the case. Rosa said we actually had more diversity in our vertical diversity of the organization when we had promotion from within and the recent changes in the organization have decreased the vertical diversity. Renie said she was not sure that was the case and that the November 2, 2010 memo includes diversity information on the recent management recruitments. Renie said that research

shows that promoting and encouraging diversity in an organization was accomplished by casting the widest net.

Renie wanted to clarify that HR is not against promotion from within. Renie said she didn't think it was a case of open recruitment or promotion from within but that it is possible to have both. Renie stated that these were difficult issues and felt that there is no right or wrong answers but it is more about figuring out what makes the most sense for your organization at any given time.

Lawrence said another factor is the current high unemployment. Lawrence added that we are a public entity and open enrollment gives the public that support us additional employment opportunities rather than just entry level positions. Lawrence said that it's not always about diversity but about fairness. He explained when the City first moved to internal recruitment he researched the previous data. The research showed that 50% of the time the City moved forward with an internal candidate, and that percentage increased to 70% when internal recruitment was adapted.

Jerry said that due to the continued City budgetary challenges, everyone is being asked to provide the same level of services by working more efficiently. Jerry added that not considering outside candidates might be in opposition to that goal because you want to make sure you get the person with the best skills available. Jerry offered this observation for consideration only and is not either endorsing or opposing open recruitment at this time.

Wendy said that sometimes you need to bring in new people to get a fresh perspective instead of continuing to do things the same way. Wendy used Don Bessler in Public Works as an example of someone who is bringing in new ideas and she feels it has had a positive impact in the department.

Ginny said that the organization has experienced some morale issues because of the budget crisis and as we move into the healing phase employees need to be rewarded and recognized for working harder by being given the first opportunity at promotion. Ginny added that going outside could be perceived as insulting when we have qualified candidates in house.

Jeff McHenry said that open recruitment would be quite a departure from what he understands to be Tempe's values. Jeff said he thought it would be more than a policy change and would instead be a cultural change.

Rosa is concerned about the inconsistency of the message. Rosa read from Jim Collins *Good to Great*, "Research findings show the majority of good to great leaders come from the inside". Rosa said that we need to be consistent with the leadership management tools we support. Research shows that when you treat your employees well they will be loyal and will rise through the ranks.

Renie said that internal employees will still have the advantage. Renie is not concerned that open recruitment will keep hard workers from being promoted. Renie said we do not have to give our internal employees favoritism to rise to the top because they will do that on their own merit. Renie does not agree that having open recruitment means we will not still be encouraging promotion from within. Renie brought up a practical

consideration in that having an internal and external recruitment at the same time would speed up the recruitment process.

Ginny asked what the delay is for having an internal recruitment first, a week?

Lawrence replied that it is closer to a month or more. Ginny suggested we just open it internally for a week so it doesn't delay it that long. Renie said a week is not usually a long enough time. Lawrence pointed out that if internal and external recruitments were done concurrently for a longer time, it would give internal employees a longer time to apply. Todd suggested running the recruitments concurrently with the stipulation that if there were more than four internal candidates the external recruitment would be stopped.

Jeff McHenry said that it really comes down to what is the philosophy. Jeff McHenry asked if the purpose is to increase diversity or because of the extra time needed to open recruitments internally first. Renie replied that the purpose is increased diversity; the extra time required is just an additional factor. Jeff McHenry asked if we would then increase recruitment times to cast the widest net if diversity was the goal.

Jackie asked about cases where an employee has been displaced through the reduction of force. Using an Executive Assistant position as an example, Jackie asked about if they are bumped down to an Administrative Assistant position and then the Executive Assistant position becomes available again. Instead of having the displaced worker go back to their previous Executive Assistant position that position is opened for a competitive recruitment. Jackie said the displaced employee should have the opportunity to go back to their previous position with their original ranking and salary *before* it is open to anyone else. Renie explained that any one on the layoff list has the right of recall to the position they originally held. Renie said anyone on the layoff list is being treated as an internal employee if they apply for a City position. Renie further explained that once someone has exercised their bumping rights and has gone into another position, they do not have any rights to their previous position. Jackie said that employees should have that right and that the displacement should be reversed. Ginny said that reversing the bumping order seems to make sense and then someone from the layoff list could apply for the vacant Administrative Assistant position. Renie said one of the things HR hopes to do this year is to resurrect looking at the Rules and Regulations and this situation could be one of the considerations that had not been thought about earlier. Renie explained there is not currently a rule or *right* for bumping back up. Todd added that there is a right thing to do. Jackie said there is language out there and a right thing to do, we just don't happen to have the language in our Rules and Regulations or in the MOU as of yet. Jackie said that SEIU knew that this is happening. Rosa asked if she was describing an actual employee. Jackie said yes, this is actually happening. Lynn Fletcher said she knew of a couple who were experiencing this situation. Lynn explained that one person was a Facility Technician who became a Meter Reader rather than lose their job. Now that a Facility Technician position has opened up he was told he would have to apply for that position. Jackie explained the other situation involved an Executive Assistant bumping down to an Administrative Assistant position and they have been told they need to compete for their former position. Wendy said there was also a Senior Engineering Associate who got bumped down to an Engineering Technician. Wendy said that when the Senior Engineering Associate position becomes available due to retirement, the current Engineering Technician will have to compete to get his former job back.



Jon O'Connor said that this is a good example of when sometimes policies get put into place and not utilized for a long time, we do not always understand their full implications. Jon reminded everyone that the layoff policy was vetted through the employee groups at the time and was put into place around 2001 or 2002. Jon added that fortunately layoffs were not needed for many years and that originally the policies were thought to be employee protections. Now that the implications can be seen, not all of them are now viewed as protections. Jon said the policies were put into place by employees and the situations that we are seeing now are the result of simply following the policies. Jackie said that the policy does not go to the next step to address getting employees back to former positions without interviewing if they become available. Jon said that was the policy that is currently in place.

Jeff Kulaga said it seemed we were discussing fairly specific issues. He said that the balance of promoting diversity and finding the best person for positions do not have to be mutually exclusive. Jeff asked what the value judgment is regarding what philosophy is most important. Rosa said the bigger issue is the lack of trust in the organization. Jeff asked how we fix the lack of trust. Rosa replied that the Diversity Steering Committee needs to discuss it. Rosa said we were discussing a policy that is not going to fix the relationships people have right now. Jackie suggested beginning with open recruitment at the management or director level and see how that goes over. Rosa discouraged changing a policy until we discuss what recommendations and compromises the Diversity Steering Committee is interested in. Todd would like to see the facts on the diversity for our current recruitments. Todd asked, if we don't have specific facts that we are doing poorly, then why are we changing?. Ginny wondered why now. Renie reiterated that the recommendation came from the community group but that Charlie Meyer has also been straight forward about wanting an open recruitment process. Todd said that Charlie has also written memos about promoting from within. Jeff Kulaga said that was his point, the two are not mutually exclusive. Jeff Kulaga said it would be difficult to have one set of rules for one group and another set of rules for another group. Rosa said that is where the four or fewer compromise came from. Jackie said if we could do sworn and civilian positions differently we could also do management and non-management. Ginny added we should have the same rules for everyone. As devil's advocate, Jeff Kulaga wondered if we are going to have standard scoring for everyone and then play two different games, was that not gaming the system.

Rosa recommended she work with Renie to get some additional data to bring to the committee next month for additional discussion. Wendy asked if we had enough feedback from the work groups. Todd and Jackie agreed they had enough information from their groups. Rosa welcomed more information from any work groups who would like to do so.

Jackie asked when we could try to do what's right with the people who have been bumped out of their positions. Renie said we could set up a meeting to discuss it but that she wasn't exactly sure how easy it would be to do. Renie said they could certainly look at the issues. Jeff asked about the current bumping policies. Renie replied there were no bumping back policies in place. Jackie added that maybe we never considered the positions would reopen. Renie added that if someone held the position previously,

they would be in a good position to compete for that position. Jackie said that was like a slap in the face and it was insulting to have to compete for their previous position. Todd said employees have sacrificed by bumping down and then are asked to compete for their previous position. Michelle Fedor said that there could be another internal Administrative Assistant who had seniority over the previous Executive Assistant. Todd said that those two people should compete and Jackie agreed. Michelle said that is the problem with exceptions. You can address one and then there will always be more. Wendy asked if it was correct that a current job opening would not have any external recruitment, but would only include those who met the minimum qualifications like an EPP as long as there were no APP candidates. Renie explained that there is no process for the APP simply including those who meet the minimum qualifications. Renie said the EPP is basically an internal recruitment. Jackie asked what if the exact position in the exact department became available. Wendy and Renie replied that there could be two displaced employees qualified for the same position. Renie said it would then go to seniority. Michelle pointed out that a Management Assistant could also be involved if they had been bumped to Administrative Assistant. Jackie said she would rather look at limiting open positions to the displaced employees rather than open competition. It could be called DPP, Displaced Placement Program.

Molly agreed with Jeff Kulaga that the open recruitment and promotion from within are not mutually exclusive. Molly said she is committed to being respectful while discussing these most difficult issues.

Rosa asked for Molly's help with communicating to the Confidential Employee group what the Diversity Steering Committee purpose is and why the committee discusses certain operational issues that lead to bigger discussions regarding the values of the organization. Molly will e-mail the Confidential Employees Consensus Point for dissemination. Rosa would like to put the other issues brought up in the Confidential Employees document on the agenda at a later date.

### **III. Member Updates**

Wendy wanted to remind the committee of the Unity Walk on Saturday, February 5<sup>th</sup>. Ginny said people should assemble at ASU Lot 59 to join the walk.

Jeff Kulaga congratulated the Diversity Office on the MLK Brunch. The consensus was that MLK was a very successful and enjoyable event.