

MINUTES

**Sacramento County Civil Service Commission Meeting
700 H Street, Suite 1450
Sacramento, California 95814**

August 24, 2012

The Commission convened for its regularly scheduled meeting at 1:31 p.m. on Friday, August 24, 2012, at 700 H Street, in Suite 1450, Sacramento, California. Commissioners Bowler, Johnson, Nelson, and Purdy were present. Commissioner Nelson was absent for Item A on the Consent Calendar. Commissioner Suter was absent.

CONSENT CALENDAR

(Matters on The consent calendar are acted upon as one motion.)

- A. **Minutes 8/10/12**
- E. **Receive And File: Department Of Personnel Services Monthly Status Report On Exempt Student Classes For JULY**
- F. **Receive And File: Department Of Personnel Services Monthly Status Report On Promotional Examinations And Late Applications For JULY**

At the request of Commissioner Bowler, Items E and F were removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

ACTION: By unanimous vote of those present, approved the Consent Calendar (Item A).

SEPARATE MATTERS

B. **Departmental Requests To Extend Provisional Appointments**

(1) **Kiernan Andrews, In The Class Of Senior Mental Health Counselor**

ACTION: By unanimous vote, extended the above mentioned provisional appointment for five months and 29 days from date of expiration, or until 20 days after the eligible list is established, whichever occurs sooner.

(2) **Paul Bonnier, In The Class Of Airport Manager, Operations**

ACTION: By unanimous vote, extended the above mentioned provisional appointment for five months and 29 days from date of expiration, or until 20 days after the eligible list is established, whichever occurs sooner.

(3) **Mark Grimshaw, In The Class Of Auditor I (*Expired Appointment*)**

The Commission conferred with its counsel regarding the Civil Service Rules on the matter of expired appointments and whether it has authority over such matters. Commission's Counsel stated it was her opinion that the Rules do not give the

Commission the authority to extend an appointment that has already expired. As it was deemed the matter was outside of their jurisdiction, the Commission took no action.

Department of Personnel Services Director, David Devine, noted he would make certain that this intermittent employee would not be negatively impacted due to the hiring department's administrative error that allowed the employee's provisional appointment to expire. Mr. Devine also stated he would put into place new procedures to ensure that a situation like this does not occur again.

C. Appeals Pursuant To Civil Service Rule 4.2, Application Rejections - *NONE*

D. CLOSED SESSION: Proposed Decision Of The Hearing Officer

ACTION: At the request of the appellant, the Commission convened and acted on this matter in closed session. By the following vote of those present adopted as the decision of the Civil Service Commission, County of Sacramento, State of California, the hearing Officer's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order *granting* the appeal.

AYES: Commissioners Bowler, Johnson, Purdy, and Nelson

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Suter

E. Receive And File: Department Of Personnel Services Monthly Status Report On Exempt Student Classes For *JULY*

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

ACTION: By unanimous vote of those present, Received and Filed.

F. Receive And File: Department Of Personnel Services Monthly Status Report On Promotional Examinations And Late Applications For *JULY*

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

ACTION: By unanimous vote of those present, Received and Filed.

G. Receive And File: Department Of Personnel Services Monthly Status Report On Provisional Appointments For *JULY*

ACTION: By unanimous vote of those present, Received and Filed.

H. **Sacramento County Board of Supervisors: Remanded Planning Chief / Director Classification Study**

The Planning Director classification study was initially heard by the Commission at its June 8, 2012 meeting. On behalf of the County Executive's Office, Department of Personnel Services (DPS) submitted their initial request dated May 22, 2012, which reported that the Department of Planning, and the Department of Environmental Review and Assessment had been restructured and combined into one Division under the newly created Department of Community Development. The proposed new Planning Director class would be used to fill the management position heading the new Planning Division, as there was no current County classification that could perform the function.

During discussion, the Commission noted that the title "Director" as typically used by Sacramento County denotes the head of a *department*, whereas usually County Division heads are not titled "Director." Citing the scope of the proposed new position's duties, the Commission approved the class study with the exception that the title be modified to Planning *Chief*.

Department of Personnel Services submitted to the Commission the *Request To Reconsider The Title Of Planning Director* dated June 14, 2012 which was scheduled for the Commission's June 29, 2012 meeting. DPS reported that there are at least six (6) County Divisions where the division head position is titled "Director". Some of the examples cited were: *Medical Director*, *Director, Mental Health Services*; *Communication and Media Director*, and, *Director, District Attorney's Laboratory of Forensic Services*. Following discussion during the public hearing, the Commission chose to take no action on the matter, resulting in a denial to grant the request to reconsider changing the class title to *Planning Director*.

At its July 24, 2012 meeting, the Board of Supervisors voted to remand the class study back to the Commission for further consideration of approving the classification title of Planning Director. Subsequent to their meeting, the Board submitted a letter to the Commission dated July 25, 2012, *Remanded Class Study – Planning Chief/Director*, sending back the class study, citing several reasons for Commission approval of the Planning Director title. One reason cited was that the title "*Chief*" would not produce the quality or level of candidates that the County would like to hire; and that it is not uncommon for a Planning Director to report to a Community Development Director in the State of California. In addition, the letter noted that other Sacramento County Director title classifications are not department heads and that approving Director in the title would eliminate the need to make changes to existing codes and ordinances.

The matter of the Board of Supervisor's *Request To Reconsider The Title Of Planning Director* was scheduled for the August 10, 2012 Commission meeting. In preparation for the meeting, the Commission requested that its staff provide it with data concerning the number of existing Sacramento County classifications titled Director that have oversight of departments; classifications titled Director that have no department oversight; and the titles used for head positions overseeing divisions. Lists of existing classifications with the Director titles and division head titles were submitted to the Commission as requested.

Additionally, the Commission requested that staff research other California counties' practices for titling their heads of planning. The research disclosed that of the 58 California counties surveyed, 20 have Planning Departments. Of those 20, 19 counties utilize the title *Planning Director*, and 1 county uses *Senior Planner*. The remaining 38 counties that have planning function structures similar to the County of Sacramento utilize titles such as *Deputy Director-Planning*, *Planning Manager*, *Division Manager-Planning*, *Principal Planner*, *Senior Planner*, *Planning Division Manager*, or *Planning Division Chief*. One of these 38 counties uses *Planning Director* for its Division head title.

During discussion at the August 10, 2012 meeting, the Commission noted it was their consensus that an industry standard does not exist across the State of California for using the title *Planning Director* for the head of planning functions that are not department heads, and that most counties, where the planning function is a division, use one form or another of "Deputy Director – Planning."

The Commission conceded that while the Planning Chief title may not accurately reflect the responsibilities of the new position, it was the only logical conclusion they could come back to given the considerable lack of pertinent information provided in the study report. DPS was directed to review the Commissions' research and come back with a new suggestion for the title to one similar to that suggested by Commission Counsel, *Planning Director, Chief of Planning Services*. The Commission continued the matter to its August 24, 2012 meeting,

At the August 24, 2012 Commission meeting, Department of Personnel Services (DPS) Director, David Devine restated their desire to keep the title of "Planning Director" but also suggested a secondary title of "Planning Director, Planning Services Division".

Mr. Devine noted that their August 23, 2012 memo to the Commission cited data DPS staff had collected from ten (10) California cities. Two of the surveyed cities' (consolidated cities in counties) planning departments operate separately from other city functions, and both use the title *Planning Director*. Eight of the cities surveyed operate as a division within another department with four utilizing the title of Assistant Director or Deputy Director, three using the title *Planning Director*, and one employing the title *Planning Manager*. DPS noted that from the local government perspective, research revealed there is inconsistency with regard to naming conventions used across the State. Following further discussion, the Commission agreed to the second title recommended by Department of Personnel Services, *Planning Director, Planning Services Division*.

ACTION: By a vote of three to one, the Commission approved the title of *Planning Director, Planning Services Division*.

The Commission requested that, and Mr. Devine committed to providing copies of the research collected to date, with the Planning Director, Planning Services Division class study when it is submitted to the Board of Supervisors for final approval.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before The Commission and by unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 5:21 p.m. The Commission will reconvene for its next regularly scheduled meeting at 1:30 p.m. on Friday, September 21, 2012, in Suite 1445 at 700 H Street, Sacramento.

Respectfully Submitted:

Approval Recommended:

/S/
Jeanette King,
Civil Service Specialist

/S/
Leslie Leahy,
Executive Officer

APPROVED:

/S/
Michael Johnson,
Chairperson