

COUNTY OF KAUAI
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:	CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION	Meeting Date:	July 2, 2019
Location	Mo'ikeha Building, Liquor Conference Room 3	Start of Meeting: 3:00 p.m.	End of Meeting: 4:43 p.m.
Present	<p>Chair Richard Jose. Vice Chair Jeffrey Iida. Members: Fely Faulkner, Elizabeth Hahn, Vonnell Ramos, Beth Tokioka, and Ricky Watanabe.</p> <p>Also: First Deputy County Attorney Nicholas Courson. Acting Director of Human Resources Janine Rapozo (<i>left at 3:16 p.m.</i>). Office of Boards and Commissions Staff: Administrator Ellen Ching, Administrative Specialist Anela Segreti (<i>arrived 3:19 p.m. and left at 4:05 p.m.</i>) and Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.</p>		
Excused			
Absent			
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
	Prior to the meeting being called to order, Administrative Assistant to the County Clerk Eddie Topenio administered the Oath of Office to Commissioner Ricky R. Watanabe serving a first term ending 12/31/22.		
Call To Order/Roll Call		Chair Jose called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. with seven members constituting a quorum.	
Approval of Minutes	<u>Open Session Minutes of June 4, 2019</u>	Vice Chair Iida moved to approve the Open Session minutes of June 4, 2019, as circulated. Ms. Tokioka seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.	
Acting Director's Report	<p><u>CSC 2019-12</u> <u>Acting Director's Reports, Announcements and Pertinent Updates for the June 2019 period.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Labor contracts and negotiations b. Administrative Services and Benefits c. Classification and Pay and Labor Relations d. Recruitment and Exam e. Payroll 		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>f. Employee Development and Health Services</p> <p>Acting Director of Human Resources Janine Rapozo reviewed the June report with the Commission (on file). The County Council approved the Hawai'i Fire Fighters two year contract that included a 2% across the board increase as well as a yearly \$1,800 to \$2,000 bonus. United Public Works (UPW) and State of Hawai'i Organization of Police Officers (SHOPO) also received a raise effective July 1, 2019. Ms. Rapozo said the other five Hawai'i Government Employees Association (HGEA) bargaining units do not have a contract and arbitration has been set to start September 2019 until January 2020.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo updated the Commission on several trainings that was recently rolled out. The first was a DiSC workshop presented to Mayor Kawakami, department heads and deputies. DiSC is a behavioral assessment that provided tools on how to work and connect better with others, and understand different personalities. The second training was conducted by Human Resources Manager Jill Niitani and herself for the supervisors of Parks & Recreation and Public Works on investigations and progressive discipline.</p> <p>Ms. Rapozo informed the Commission that as requested the advertisement for the Director of Human Resources went out in mid-June to all the places they requested with a July 19th deadline date.</p> <p>Vice Chair Iida asked for an explanation on the grievance hearing regarding violation of the time limitation noted in the first bullet on page 3 under Classification and Pay and Labor Relations. Ms. Rapozo explained that the SHOPO contract had a three year statutes of limitations on administrative investigations. The Police Department conducted an investigation and SHOPO grieved that the incident happened four to five years prior.</p> <p>Chair Jose announced he was implementing a new procedure going forward and asked for a motion to receive the report for the record.</p>	<p>Ms. Tokioka moved to receive the Acting Director's June 2019 Report, as circulated. Ms.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		Faulkner seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.
Communications	<p><u>CSC-2019-13</u> <u>Communication dated May 30, 2019 from Acting Human Resources Director Janine Rapozo to Boards and Commissions Administrator Ellen Ching regarding Pay Adjustment Requests for Commission-Appointed Officers.</u></p> <p>With no discussion required, Chair Jose called for a motion to receive the communication.</p>	Vice Chair Iida moved to receive the communication dated May 30, 2019 from Acting Human Resources Director Janine Rapozo to Boards and Commissions Administrator Ellen Ching regarding Pay Adjustment Requests for Commission-Appointed Officers. Ms. Hahn seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.
Business	<p><u>CSC-2019-14</u> <u>Discussion and implementation of the hiring process to begin selection of a Director of Human Resources. [12/11/18, 1/22/19, 2/26/19, 3/19/19, 4/2/19, 5/7/19, 6/4/19]</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Report from Human Resources on advertisement update and placement. b. Update from Boards and Commissions on the receipt of applications. c. Review and possible approval of the Criteria Scoring Worksheets. <p>Administrator Ellen Ching said information on the advertisement was stated during the Acting Directors June report. Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin informed the commissioners that as of July 2nd the Office of Boards and Commissions received 19 resumes.</p> <p>Ms. Ching referred the Commission to the draft criteria scoring worksheet included in their packet. Chair Jose announced that they would discuss each portion individually and required a motion for each section of the worksheet.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resume section – There were no changes. 	<p><u>Motion No. 1</u> Vice Chair Iida moved to accept</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>2. Mandatory Qualifications section – There were no changes. Mr. Watanabe inquired who would verify that a candidate had the mandatory qualifications of training or experience to which Ms. Ching replied that the Commission would decide, and shared that it could be the responsibility of the Commission as a whole, the PIG or HR.</p> <p>3. Education section - There were no changes.</p> <p>4. Critical Performance Factors section – Ms. Ching shared that the Police Commission used part of the performance evaluation in their scoring worksheet; however, they did not use the same wording, they only used the wording provided in red. The process for the Police Commission was to first review the resumes using a criteria scoring worksheet, which narrowed the field of applicants. The second step was to send the remaining applicants a couple of questions that required a written essay. The applicants that passed the second step were then moved on to the third step which was the oral interview.</p>	<p>the resume section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Ms. Hahn seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 2</u> Ms. Tokioka moved to accept the mandatory qualifications section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Vice Chair Iida seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 3</u> Ms. Tokioka moved to accept the education section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Vice Chair Iida seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Tokioka stated that they did not ask potential applicants to include these in their resume and felt it would be difficult to extract some of the criteria's noted in this section. It would not work well as a screening tool unless it was reworded and requested to pull out "Achieving Goals." Ms. Tokioka also asked to change the score to a one to five rating. Ms. Faulkner favored including essay questions to broaden their picture of the applicant and to compare their ability to communicate in writing and verbal response. Mr. Ramos felt that the applicant should have the opportunity to present their responses in other formats, like power point. A power point presentation would be capable or highlighting their leadership style and skills in the same manner as an essay.</p> <p>For clarity, Ms. Tokioka outlined the interview process. She said the first step would be to complete the criteria scoring worksheet for each resume. The passing resumes would move forward to the second step which would be to complete an essay on leadership capabilities or how they plan and organize and their answer in an essay or format of their choosing which would be reviewed by the Commission as a whole or PIG. The passing resumes would then move forward to the oral interview.</p> <p>Ms. Hahn preferred keeping only the red section. Ms. Tokioka requested the customer service section be shortened to "has the applicant demonstrated experience in meeting customer needs." Mr. Ramos requested they use the same rating system as outlined on the evaluation form.</p>	<p><u>Motion No. 4</u> Ms. Faulkner moved to retain the entire critical performance factors section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Ms. Tokioka seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 5</u> Ms. Faulkner moved to withdraw her motion to retain the entire critical performance factors section as circulated in</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>The Commission requested a copy of the evaluation form.</p> <p>Chair Jose called for a recess at 3:53 p.m. Chair Jose called the meeting back to order at 3:57 p.m.</p> <p>Ms. Ching read the rating score from the DHR performance evaluation; 1-unsatisfactory, 2-needs improvement, 3-satisfactory, 4-excellent and 5-superior.</p>	<p>the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 6</u> Ms. Tokioka moved to accept the critical performance factors section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet with the following amendments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove yes and no column and replace with a score column of 1-5 with 1-does not meet expectations, 2-somewhat meets expectations, 3-meets expectations, 4-exceeds expectations and 5-superior. 2. Keep the following sections: customer service with criteria shortened, planning and organizing in red, leadership in red, communication in red,

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>5. Public Information section – The Commission unanimously decided to remove this section from the worksheet and agreed to save it for use during the oral interview portion.</p> <p>6. Preferred Qualifications section – The Commission discussed at length how each section should be scored and agreed on the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In PQ #1, the PIG would place a score on one; either for a Bachelor’s degree or experience. There would be no additional points for a Master’s or other credentials. Each year of experience would equal to one year of a degree or 6.25 points, up to 25 points. Bachelor’s degree was 25 points. • In PQ #2, general knowledge would be 8 points and the remaining six items would be 7 points. • In PQ #3, each item would be 5 points. • Remove the yes or no column. 	<p>personnel management in red and financial management in red.</p> <p>3. Delete the following sections: achieving goals and policy development.</p> <p>4. Add a total points score at the bottom.</p> <p>Ms. Hahn seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 7</u> Ms. Tokioka moved to accept the amended preferred qualifications section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet as follows;</p> <p>1. Remove yes or no</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>7. Resume section – There were no changes.</p>	<p>column and leave score column.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Score PQ #1 section with 25 points for either the bachelor’s degree or experience. Experience would be calculated at 6.25 points per year of experience. 3. Score PQ #2 section with the first item, general knowledge at 8 points and the remaining six items at 7 points. 4. Score PQ #3 section with 5 points for each item. 5. Change total score to no more than 100 points. <p>Vice Chair Iida seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 8</u> Ms. Tokioka moved to accept the resume section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Mr. Ramos seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>8. Applicant Criteria Score section –</p> <p>After some discussion the Commission decided they did not need this section and wanted it removed.</p> <p>9. Recommendation and Evaluator section - There were no changes.</p>	<p><u>Motion No. 9</u> Vice Chair Iida moved to accept the applicant criteria score section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Ms. Faulkner seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 10</u> Vice Chair Iida moved to withdraw his motion to accept the applicant criteria score section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 11</u> Ms. Hahn moved to remove the applicant criteria score section from the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Vice Chair Iida seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p><u>Motion No. 12</u> Ms. Hahn moved to accept the recommendation and evaluator section as circulated in the draft criteria scoring worksheet. Mr. Ramos seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statutes §§92-4 and 92-5 (a) (2) (4), 92-9 (a) (1-4) and (b) the purpose of this Executive Session is to receive and approve Executive Session minutes, and to discuss the hiring of a new Director of Human Resources and other related matters where consideration of matters affecting privacy will be involved, and to consult with the Commission's legal counsel on questions and issues pertaining to the Commission's and the County's powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and/or liabilities as they may relate to this agenda item.</p>	<p>Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p>Ms. Ching read the Hawai'i Revised Statutes to move the meeting into Executive Session.</p> <p>Vice Chair Iida moved to enter into Executive Session. Ms. Hahn seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p> <p>At 4:18 p.m. the Commission entered into Executive Session.</p>
<p>Return to Open Session</p>		<p>The meeting resumed in Open Session at 4:42 p.m.</p>
<p>Announcements</p>	<p>Next Meeting: Tuesday, August 6, 2019 – 3:00 p.m., Mo'ikeha Building, Liquor Conference Room 3.</p>	
<p>Adjournment</p>		<p>With no objections, Chair Jose adjourned the meeting at 4:43 p.m.</p>

Submitted by: _____
 Sandra Muragin, Commission Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
 Richard Jose, Chair

(X) Approved as circulated. 08/06/19

() Approved with amendments. See minutes of _____ meeting.