



City of New Orleans
Great Place to Work Initiative

April 3, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Great Place to Work Initiative Overview..... 2
- II. Great Place to Work Initiative Report..... 3
- III. Great Place to Work Initiative Principles 6
- IV. Appendix A: Rule Improvement Package 7
 - 1. Better Hiring Techniques..... 7
 - 2. Better Careers 12
 - 3. Better Pay 13
 - 4. Better Processes..... 17
 - 5. Better Training 22

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Great Place to Work Initiative Overview

Making the City of New Orleans a model public service organization for employees will require dramatic improvements in the following five key areas: (1) Better Hiring Techniques; (2) Better Careers; (3) Better Pay; (4) Better Processes; and (5) Better Training. Each proposed reform is explained below. More information is available in Appendix A: Rule Improvement Package, as well as online at www.nola.gov/greatplacetowork.

1. BETTER HIRING TECHNIQUES

- Leave in place the same Civil Service protections against hiring candidates who do not possess the knowledge, skill and ability to perform the work the job requires.
- Give more decision making to the managers who know the work requirements best.
- Eliminate the falsely objective rankings based on exams. Allow managers to interview all the Civil Service Department certified eligible candidates and hire the best qualified one.
- Eliminate the “Rule of Three” that requires managers to hire from one of the top three test takers.

2. BETTER CAREERS

- Allow managers to promote employees within their department based on objective measures of performance and qualifications.
- Let managers promote employees within their job series without advanced Civil Service approval, as long as the employee is qualified.

3. BETTER PAY

- Increase the minimum wage for all city employees to \$10.10 per hour.
- Allow department directors to give pay increases within the pay range for special assignments without advanced Civil Service approval.
- Give all departments an equal percentage (budgeted annually by City Council at a rate between 0.5 and 5%) for performance based pay increases to employees every year.
- Let managers use the full approved salary range for jobs with recruitment challenges or candidates with exceptional qualifications. This requires objective justification and increases in salaries for all existing employees in the same job and same unit in the same situation.

4. BETTER PROCESSES

- Streamline processes and set meaningful performance goals for the Personnel function of City government.
- Evaluate the performance of new employees at five months so that the employee can improve, if necessary, and so that managers can coach new employees - before their job becomes permanent.
- Revamp the outdated scantron service rating system to one based on meaningful supervisor/employee feedback and objective, clear performance goals.

5. BETTER TRAINING

- Give all employees the right to take at least one training per month, regardless of intent to take a promotional exam.
- Improve and modernize training the City’s training program.
- Recommend training budgets for every department.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Great Place to Work Initiative Report

New Orleans' personnel system needs updating. While we prevent politically motivated patronage hiring, rewarding, and firing of employees, our system has long failed employees at ensuring a merit-based employment structure where decisions about hiring, promotion, pay and continued employment are made based on the individual employee's performance.

As part of this effort to reimagine human capital in City government, we conducted an employee and manager survey about the state of Human Resources in the City. The results were concerning. Only 18% of employees agreed "that the current city civil service system is effective;" 58% disagreed. When asked if the system was "efficient," 17% agreed while 59.5% disagreed. The hiring process received even lower marks. Only 29% of our employees agreed that "poor performance is dealt with effectively on my team."

Managers and supervisors were equally harsh in their judgments. Only 16% agreed that hiring "occurs quickly enough to meet the needs of my department/office;" 15% said they were "able to hire the best candidates at the appropriate salary to support the needs" of their department or office; and 15% said they were "able to promote qualified employees" when needed. With just 13% agreeing that the system "gives [them] the flexibility to create positions of the type and number [they] need," and a mere 22.5% feeling that the City's Human Resources practices "allows [them] to hire the best candidates for the position," we know that the time for change has come.

In addition to the survey, the City interviewed more than 75 city employees, managers, and dozens of stakeholders, and held representative focus groups and half a dozen meetings with top Department of Civil Service staff. Along the way, we have predominantly heard troubling stories and a call for immediate improvements.

Under the "Rule of Three," hiring managers must choose one of three candidates rated most qualified by the Civil Service Department, based on test scores (if a test is done for that position) and work experience/education, but not on interviews or reference checks. Not surprisingly, after interviews and reference checks, managers often find those top three unsuitable. As one manager told us, "I have been forced to choose between bad, worse, and worst." Our outdated system has tried to make the "Rule of Three" less onerous by using "Bands" of candidates whose scores were statistically tied and can be treated equal. But even "Bands" tie the hands of managers to evaluate candidates using more realistic and valid selection criteria.

Qualifications are often so rigid that managers cannot hire those candidates they consider best qualified because, though they may have exactly the experience the manager wants, they don't have the required degree or certification. When hiring web developers, for instance, the qualifications favor those with the most certifications, but the best web developers tend to not have time to take courses and accumulate certifications; they are too busy responding to the demand for their services.

Managers must pay new employees at the bottom of their pay range, unless they spend a great deal of time making the case they cannot find the talent they need at that salary. One department has lost about a quarter of the candidates it wanted to hire in the past two years because of this problem. On the survey, only 8% of managers agreed that the current system "allows me to set the pay for new hires equal to their knowledge, skills and ability to perform the job well." This practice must change.

Managers speak of losing good employees constantly because they cannot raise their pay or promote them. People get promoted largely based on longevity, test scores, and taking training courses many employees judge to be irrelevant, and not because managers think they perform well. Less than a quarter of employees agree that "supervisors, managers, and department heads have the ability to promote employees who exhibit outstanding performance." One department had a management analyst with a track record of high

performance (as well as a law degree) but could not promote him to the next classification in the job series because people who had taken seven irrelevant training classes trumped him on the list.

Hiring can take six months or longer. Managers find the written tests for many positions outdated and irrelevant. Paper and pencil tests may have made sense for most positions when many government employees were clerks, but that day is long gone.

Finally, the employee evaluation system is a waste of time according to virtually everyone we asked. Few managers rate employees honestly, because doing so has no upside and multiple downsides, including employee anger, low morale, and time-consuming grievances or appeals. A 2010 study by the George Bush School of Government & Public Service at Texas A&M reported that only 1 of every 250 employees in New Orleans had been rated unfavorably in the previous 7 years.

Both the Bush School report and a more in-depth report by the Bureau of Government Research (BGR) in 2004 recommended fundamental changes in the civil service system. The BGR report summed it up this way:

Predictably, New Orleans' human resources system suffers from the flaws inherent in a rule-bound and bureaucracy laden system. It is simply too complex and cumbersome, and often too slow, to meet the challenges of hiring and retaining an effective government work force. The system is beset with problems and inefficiencies at every level. In many cases, bureaucratic steps created in the name of merit ultimately work against the production of the most qualified work force. In addition, efforts to hire and reward high performers are handicapped by a number of failings and systemic problems, including a lack of flexibility in hiring and compensating employees and a meaningless evaluation system.

Problems like this are typical of traditional civil service systems, which were created for industrial era bureaucracies filled with clerical and often rote jobs. Hence many governments have reformed their systems over the past 25 years. Half of federal employees have been removed from the civil service system, for instance, and several states have phased out their systems as well. Many cities have long functioned without civil service systems. Other cities and states have modernized their rules, eliminating the rule of three, using fewer written tests, giving managers more flexibility to set pay and promote high performers, and creating pay-for-performance systems.

The City intends to use the best thoughts on these matters today, and working with our employees, managers, Civil Service staff and Commissioners, to tailor an improvement package that will make the City of New Orleans a great place to work.

New Orleans' residents are crying out for a more functional, effective government, and the city's traditional personnel system stands in the way. It is time to step boldly into the 21st century, as so many other cities have done. As we do so, however, we must be careful not to throw the baby out with the bathwater. We must remember the city's history, both positive and negative, and preserve the safeguards that have value. *We are asking to modernize—not eliminate—our civil service system.*

At a retreat in December 2010, Mayor Landrieu and his department heads identified civil service and human resources reform as one of their top priorities. In 2012 the City partnered with a group of universities, foundations, and business and community organizations to hire the Public Strategies Group, a national leader in helping public organizations transform their antiquated bureaucracies, to help develop a reform plan. What follows are the recommendations city leaders have chosen to put forth before the public for consideration.

Once we receive public and employee feedback, we will present the entire package of improvements to the Civil Service Commission. The Administration will work with the Commission on a comprehensive transition plan for all of the improvements in hiring, promotions, pay increases, processes, and training, and changes to Civil Service Rules will have an effective date that allows us to transition smoothly.

Who Benefits from Making the City a Great Place to Work?

For employees, the recommendations that follow will allow for more pay increases, hiring at higher pay levels, more opportunities for relevant training and for promotion for those who perform well, opportunities for sustainable pay increases based on performance, and a fairer and more objective approach to evaluation. They will not weaken any rights to appeal disciplinary actions or termination, but they will speed up the process, so fewer appeals drag out for years.

For managers, these improvements will give them far more ability to hire, retain, promote and reward high performers, to motivate their employees, and to remove low performers.

For the public and for communities, businesses, and other stakeholders, these reforms should result—over the coming years—in better service, a higher quality of life, and the achievement of outcomes residents' desire, such as lower crime rates, better streets, and less blight.

And for the city's elected officials, they should produce a city workforce with higher morale, higher performance, and greater adaptability to change—which should in turn yield a public that is more satisfied with their city government.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS Great Place to Work Initiative Principles

Becoming a great place to work will require revisions to certain personnel rules and new administrative policies. The full text of the proposed Rule revisions is available in Appendix B and online at www.nola.gov/greatplacetowork.

BETTER HIRING TECHNIQUES	BETTER CAREER	BETTER PAY	BETTER PROCESSES	BETTER TRAINING
Give more decision making to the managers who know the work requirements best	Allow managers promote employees within their department based on objective measures of performance and qualifications	Allow department directors to give pay increases within the pay range for special assignments without prior approval from Civil Service	Set meaningful performance goals for personnel	Give all employees the right to take at least one training per month, regardless of intent to take a promotional exam
Eliminate the falsely objective rankings based on exams; Allow managers to hire the candidate who took the competitive examination, was certified qualified by Civil Service, and they judge to be the absolute best	Let managers to promote employees within their job series without Civil Service approval, as long as the employee is qualified	Give all departments an equal percentage (between 0.5 and 5%) for performance based pay increases to employees every year.	Evaluate the performance of new employees before their job becomes permanent	Improve and modernize training offerings
Eliminate the "Rule of Three" that requires managers to hire from one of the top three test takers		Let managers use the full approved salary range for jobs with recruitment challenges or candidates with exceptional qualifications. This requires objective justification and increases in salaries for all existing employees in the same job and same unit in the same situation.	Revamp the outdated scantron service rating system to one based on meaningful supervisor/employee feedback and objective, clear performance goals	Encourage training budgets for every department

Appendix A: Rule Improvement Package

1. BETTER HIRING TECHNIQUES

Current Rule I. Number 9

"Band": a series of test scores, defined by a high score and a low score, which, based upon the psychometric properties of the total distribution of test scores, may be interpreted as indicative of a given level of knowledge, skill or ability for a job class.

ISSUE

Banding candidate scores masks the true examination scores from the hiring manager and creates an artificial distinction between candidates, when in fact, all candidates who pass the examination have been determined to meet the minimum requirements to be eligible for appointment. As employees are hired off the list, eventually a manager will hire the last remaining qualified candidate. It is unreasonable to prevent the first hiring managers who receive the list of candidates from interviewing and competitively selecting from all the certified qualified candidates. Deletion of this definition and the use of Bands throughout the examination and selection process is intended to provide hiring managers the opportunity to interview, give work sample performance tests, and other legally permissible selection techniques to select the best suited candidate for the position.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Delete Rule.

Current Rule V. Section 2.4

The Director shall fix requirements of training, residence, age, health, skill, education, or other qualifications for admission to examination. Such qualifications must be possessed by any applicant by the final filing date for each examination unless otherwise specified on the official announcement.

ISSUE

Existing Rule does not specifically authorize appointing authority involvement in the establishment of minimum qualifications, although in practice their approval is always obtained. Recommended Rule maintains the Personnel Director's authority in setting minimum requirements for each class, but allows the appointing authority involvement in the process.

RECOMMENDED RULE

The Director shall fix minimum qualifications for training, residence, age, health, skill, education, or other qualifications for admission to examination for each class, subject to the approval of the appointing authority. Such qualifications must be possessed by any applicant by the final filing date for each examination unless otherwise specified on the official announcement.

Current Rule V. Section 5.3

Any period during which any list may remain in force may be extended by the Director for a period no longer than three years from the date of the original establishment thereof. The Civil Service Commission may extend such lists for up to an additional two (2) years.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule provides affected appointing authorities the right to request new recruitment efforts in order to obtain additional eligible candidates who are still interested in the position.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Any period during which any list may remain in force may be extended by the Director for a period no longer than three years from the date of the original establishment thereof. The Civil Service Commission may extend such lists for up to an additional two (2) years. If affected appointing authorities provide evidence to the Department that most candidates on the list are no longer interested or the examination scores of the remaining candidates are below the original fiftieth (50th) percentile, an appointing authority may request and receive approval to reopen the position.

Current Rule V. Section 5.4 a, b, & c.

Combining lists: When establishing a list for a class for which a list already exists the following conditions shall apply: (amended July 25, 2001, amended December 14, 2009, effective January 1, 2010)

- a) If the same test was used to create both lists, the names on the current and new lists shall be placed on one list arranged according to examination score. If the name of any individual appears on both the current and new lists, his standing on the combined list shall be determined by the highest score obtained on either of the examinations.
- b) If the tests used to create the lists being combined are not the same, names on the new list shall precede those on the current list.
- c) In any case that lists are combined, names from the current list shall be removed from the combined list at the time the current list is allowed to expire. In any case that banded lists are combined, the number of the band is considered the examination score.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule modifies references to bands, a practice which would cease under the other recommended change to Rule I Number 9. and provides a way to combine lists of eligibles. It also provides for the veterans and reemployment candidate preference.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Combining lists: When establishing a list for a class for which a list already exists the following conditions shall apply: (amended July 25, 2001, amended December 14, 2009, effective January 1, 2010)

- a) If the same test was used to create both lists, the names on the current and new lists shall be placed on one list arranged according to examination score. If the name of any individual appears on both the current and new lists, his standing on the combined list shall be determined by the highest score obtained on either of the examinations.

b) If the tests used to create the lists being combined are not the same, names on the new list shall precede those on the current list.

c) In any case that lists are combined, names from the current list shall be removed from the combined list at the time the current list is allowed to expire. In any case that former lists that include "bands" are combined, the number of the band is considered the examination score. d) The veterans and reemployment status shall be noted.

Current Rule VI. Section 1.1

Vacancies in positions in the classified service may be filled by demotion, transfer, reinstatement, reemployment, promotion, original appointment, or temporary appointment. Preference shall be given to the methods named in the order in which they are listed above, under the conditions and subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in the Rules. A vacancy shall be considered filled under any of the methods specified, and employment hereunder effective, as of the date on which the employee enters into the duties of the position, in accordance with the Law and the Rules.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule allows the appointing authority to determine if the position is for promotion or original appointment.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Vacancies in positions in the classified service may be filled by demotion, transfer, reemployment, promotion, original appointment, or temporary appointment. A vacancy shall be considered filled under any of the methods specified, and employment hereunder effective, as of the date on which the employee enters into the duties of the position, in accordance with the Law and the Rules.

Current Rule VI. Section 2.3

Request for selective certification: When an appointing authority in his request for certification of eligibles for a position has specified necessary or desirable qualifications of candidates for appointment to the position, the Director shall certify from a list of eligibles having such qualifications, if the Director deems that the request has offered satisfactory evidence that the nature of the position to be filled warrants such certification. If it is necessary to hold a new examination to establish a list of a sufficient number of persons eligible for such selective certification, the Director may authorize provisional appointment, pending establishment of the eligible list, of one of the top three eligibles on an existing list for the class, or any person who demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Director that he possesses, in sufficient degree to have a good chance of passing the examination, the special qualifications on the basis of which the selective certification procedure is to be used. The Director shall consider each request for selective certification on the basis of the facts in that particular instance. The burden of proof shall be on the appointing authority to prove to the satisfaction of the Director that selective certification is warranted. The Director may consider the cost of giving a special examination as a factor in determining whether selective certification is warranted.

ISSUE

Proposed Rule eliminates reference to the falsely objective ranking of eligibles as being of the "top three".

RECOMMENDED RULE

Request for selective certification: When an appointing authority in his request for certification of eligibles for a position has specified necessary or desirable qualifications of candidates for appointment to the position, the Director shall certify from a list of eligibles having such qualifications, if the Director deems that the request has offered satisfactory evidence that the nature of the position to be filled warrants such certification. If it is necessary to hold a new examination to establish a list of a sufficient number of persons eligible for such selective certification, the Director may authorize provisional appointment, pending establishment of the eligible list, of one of the eligibles on an existing list for the class, or any person who demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Director that he possesses, in sufficient degree to have a good chance of passing the examination, the special qualifications on the basis of which the selective certification procedure is to be used. The Director shall consider each request for selective certification on the basis of the facts in that particular instance. The burden of proof shall be on the appointing authority to prove to the satisfaction of the Director that selective certification is warranted. The Director may consider the cost of giving a special examination as a factor in determining whether selective certification is warranted.

Current Rule VI. Section 3.1

Upon a request from an appointing authority to fill a position other than by demotion, transfer, or reinstatement, the Director shall certify to the appointing authority the names of three eligibles for such position of the class of the vacant position, and if more than one vacancy is to be filled, the name of one additional eligible for each additional vacancy. In cases of demotion, transfer or reinstatement, the Director shall approve or disapprove the name of the person submitted by the appointing authority.

ISSUE

Existing Rule provides for the Civil Service department to submit only three names to the appointing authority. Recommended Rule provides for the Department to submit as many qualified candidates who passed the examination as the appointing authority requests to interview in order to find the best qualified candidate.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Upon a request from the appointing authority to fill a position other than by demotion and transfer, or reinstatement, the Department shall provide to the appointing authority the names of all candidates certified by the Department to meet the minimum qualifications. In cases of demotion, transfer or reinstatement, the Director shall approve or disapprove the name of the person submitted by the appointing authority.

Current Rule VI. Section 3.2 (b)

The certification of eligibles from promotional and/or employment lists may be presented in the form of a single band. Names on the appropriate re-employment list, if any, shall be certified first. If fewer than three of these are willing to accept the position, then the top-ranking eligibles from the promotion list, grouped into a single band according to the established psychometric formula for that examination, shall be certified. If no promotional list exists, the same procedure shall be applied to the employment list. As those eligibles with the highest scores are eliminated through appointment or removal from the list, additional names will be added to the band as necessary to maintain the same range of scores within the band.

ISSUE

Existing Rule requires that candidates on the promotional list are given a preference over the entrance list, candidates, regardless of the results of a manager's examination of their merit. Recommended Rule provides for the appointing authority to evaluate the merit of the candidates.

RECOMMENDED RULE

The certification of eligibles from promotional, reemployment and/or employment lists shall be presented in order of the examination score, when competitive, on the same register and noted by the appropriate category.

Current Rule VI. Section 4.1

Reemployment lists shall consist of the names of persons who were separated from their positions for reasons other than fault or delinquency on their part, except as provided in Rule IX, and who, at the time of their separations, had attained permanent status in that class of positions in accordance with the Law and Rules. The order in which these names shall be ranked on the reemployment list shall be in accordance with their number of years of continuous city employment in that class of positions. In case two or more employees have equal service in that position, the person who has the greatest number of years of continuous service in city employment shall be ranked highest. Except as allowed in Rule XII, Section 6.1, no person may be certified from a reemployment list or be reinstated who has voluntarily retired; provided, however, a person who has voluntarily retired may be reinstated, with the approval of the Personnel Director, only to the position he last held, and in the event of his reinstatement, said employee waives all pension rights while so employed.

ISSUE

Existing Rule provides additional ranking preference to candidates on the reemployment list for length of service. Recommended Rule allows for the appointing authority instead evaluating candidates in the reemployment list for merit.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Persons who were separated from their positions for reasons other than fault or delinquency on their part, except as provided in Rule IX, and who, at the time of their separations, had attained permanent status in that class of positions in accordance with the Law and Rules should be noted on lists of eligibles with their number of years of continuous city employment in that class of position. Except as allowed in Rule XII, Section 6.1, no person may be certified from a reemployment list or be reinstated who has voluntarily retired; provided, however, a person who has voluntarily retired may be reinstated, with the approval of the Personnel Director, only to the position he last held, and in the event of his reinstatement, said employee waives all pension rights while so employed.

Current Rule VI. Section 4.3

Preferred reemployment lists shall precede general reemployment lists in certification, provided that persons on such lists meet the requirements and qualifications, to be determined by the Director, to perform the duties of the position involved.

ISSUE

Proposed Rule eliminates reference to ranking reemployment candidates above other preferred candidates, such as veterans.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Civil Service shall identify the preferred status of all candidates on a certified list of eligible candidates. Appointing authorities must select the best suited candidate for the position, whether an original entrance, promotional, veteran, or reemployment candidate.

2. BETTER CAREERS

Current Rule V. Section 5.1

On every competitive promotion list and employment list, the eligibles shall be ranked in the order of their ratings earned in the examination given for the purpose of establishing the list. The Director may determine that ratings earned in the examination shall be divided into bands. Bands shall be established based on psychometric properties of the test score distribution or on job analysis information. All scores falling within a given band shall be considered tied.

ISSUE

Existing Rule results in ordered ranking often based solely on tests which do not necessarily result in the hiring of the best suited candidate. Recommended Rule deletes references to falsely objective rankings based on test scores in favor of a competitive, merit-based selection that gives preference to veterans and former employees, and allows the appointing authority to select the best suited candidate who meets the qualifications for the position.

RECOMMENDED RULE

On every competitive promotion list and employment list, the eligibles shall be ranked in the order of their ratings earned in the examination given for the purpose of establishing the list. Veterans, existing employees, and former employees eligible for reemployment will be noted. All candidates certified on the list shall be considered equally suitable for appointment.

Current Rule V. Section 5.2

The Director shall determine at the time any promotion list or employment list is established, the period during which the list shall remain in force, which shall not be less than one year nor more than three years at the discretion of the Personnel Director.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule provides affected appointing authorities the right to request new recruitment efforts in order to obtain additional eligible candidates who are still interested in the position.

RECOMMENDED RULE

The Director shall determine at the time any promotion list or employment list is established, the period during which the list shall remain in force, which shall not be less than one year nor more than three years at the discretion of the Personnel Director, subject to the approval of affected appointing authorities.

Current Rule V. Section 5.6

Promotion lists: Such lists may be established on a service-wide, or a departmental-wide basis as determined by the Director in cooperation with the appointing authorities.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule allows the appointing authority, in addition to the Personnel Director, to determine in advance whether or not to recruit from within the department or service-wide and to establish the necessary qualifications for the position.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Promotion lists: Such lists may be established by the Department on a service-wide or a departmental-wide basis, as determined by the affected appointing authorities. An appointing authority may set any training and/or testing requirements for promotions for employees based on the class and qualifications for the relevant position. Before any appointment or promotion, the individuals on the list must be certified or rejected for cause by the Department.

Rule V. Section 5.7

New Rule

ISSUE

Recommended rule defines a process for promotion that already occurs in practices within a job series.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Upon certification by the Department, an appointing authority may promote employees to a new job class within their job series, without competition, provided the employee has been determined to meet the qualifications for the higher class. In such cases, the employee shall start at the minimum of the new salary range or receive a five (5) percent salary increase, whichever is greater.

3. BETTER PAY

Current Rule IV. Section 2.2

Subject to the prior approval of the Director, an appointing authority may grant an increase within the pay range to any employee given a special assignment for a limited term within his class of positions, provided that there shall be a corresponding pay reduction at the completion of the special assignment. A written notice of the intention to effect a reduction in pay on the completion of the special assignment shall be given to the employee when the increase is granted. Increases and reductions in pay shall be reported to the Director in such manner as he may prescribe.

ISSUE

Existing Rule requires prior approval for increases and corresponding decreases in pay for special assignments. Recommended Rule requires these pay changes to be approved by the Chief Administrative Officer and reported to the Personnel Director, so that the Personnel Director may investigate the use of all special assignment pay and rescind it if invalid. Special assignment pay is for a limited term and may require

faster action (such as in the case of emergencies). Eliminating the prior approval of the Personnel Director expedites the process, but the Personnel Director would maintain the ability to rescind special assignment pay if unwarranted.

RECOMMENDED RULE

An appointing authority may grant an increase within the pay range to any employee given a special assignment for a limited term within his class of positions, provided that there shall be a corresponding pay reduction at the completion of the special assignment. A written notice of the intention to effect a reduction in pay on the completion of the special assignment shall be given to the employee when the increase is granted. Increases and reductions in pay must be reported to the Department in such manner as prescribed.

Current Rule IV. Section 2.5(a)

The rate of pay for any employee in a classified position may be advanced by action of the appointing authority, subject to the following limitations: (a) The total of these increases given in a calendar year shall be budgeted for each organization unit at an amount equal to 1.25% of the combined base rates (as defined in Rule I, Number 10) of pay of all permanent positions filled in the organization unit as of January 1 of that year.

ISSUE

Existing Rule limits pay increases to 1.25% of the combined base rates. Recommended Rule allows for performance based base pay increases up to 5% in years when the budget allows and employees have not received substantial pay increases due to budgetary constraints in prior years. The Recommended Rule also allows for performance increases less than 5% in years with budget constraints, but no longer permits the City to continue to deny raises to all employees.

RECOMMENDED RULE

The rate of pay for any employee in a classified position may be advanced by action of the appointing authority, subject to the following limitations: (a) The total of these increases given in a calendar year shall be budgeted for each organization unit at an amount not less than 0.5% and up to 5% of the combined base rates (as defined in Rule I, Number 10) of pay of all permanent positions filled in the organization unit as of January 1 of that year.

Current Rule IV. Section 2.5(b)

Such advances shall be effective thirty (30) days after the receipt by the Commission of suitable documentation evidencing personal evaluation of the individual employee and detailing specific justification for the individual employee's entitlement to such an increase. Documentation shall include information on job performance, attendance, compliance with city regulations and disciplinary record.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule replaces the Commission with the Civil Service Department in order to reduce ambiguity regarding the length of time between receipt of suitable documentation and the effective date of the pay advance.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Such advances shall be effective thirty (30) days after the receipt by the Department of suitable documentation evidencing personal evaluation of the individual employee and detailing specific justification for the individual

employee's entitlement to such an increase. Documentation shall include information on job performance, attendance, compliance with city regulations and disciplinary record.

Current Rule IV. Section 2.6

Special Entrance Rate (Hiring Rate) (a) Special rates of compensation for classifications of work may be authorized to address employment problems resulting from recruitment and/or retention difficulties. Such advances may be authorized by the Personnel Director up to the first quartile in the salary range subject to the following criteria: The appointing authority has submitted a written request to the Director detailing the scope of the problem and its impact on the agency's ability to perform. 2. The Director has received verification from the appointing authority and the Chief Administrative Officer that funds are available for such increases. No such rates will become permanent until approved by the Commission at its next scheduled meeting. (b) Advances above the first quartile and up to the midpoint in a salary range may be authorized by the Civil Service Commission, provided the appointing authority has met the criteria listed above and the Personnel Director has recommended the establishment of appropriate special rates of compensation after reviewing all aspects and ramifications of the matter. (c) Advances above the midpoint rate in a salary range will not be allowed unless an appointing authority can demonstrate that the competitive market justifies such compensation. These advances may not take effect until they are approved by the Civil Service Commission and the City Council.

ISSUE

Existing Rule limits the use of the full pay range in the pay plan and requires the Civil Service Director, Commission or City Council to approve in advance hiring above the minimum for recruitment/retention difficulties. By the time such approval is granted, candidates in competitive fields often accept a job offer from another employer. Recommended Rule provides a high degree of oversight, but allows for faster hiring under recruitment/retention difficulties.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Hiring above the minimum for recruitment/retention difficulties

(a) Hiring above the minimum salary in order to address employment problems resulting from recruitment and/or retention difficulties may be authorized for a new employee by the appointing authority not to exceed the midpoint of the pay range, or up to the maximum of the pay range in extraordinary circumstances, provided that:

1. Appointing authority documents employment problems resulting from recruitment and/or retention difficulties and maintains detailed objective analysis of rationale for hiring above the minimum.
2. Appointing authority receives appropriate approvals established by the Chief Administrative Officer, or other budget authority for participating agencies, in advance and reports the action to the Department in such manner as prescribed.

(b) The salaries of all current probationary and permanent employees who occupy positions in the same job classification in the same unit with recruitment/retention difficulties and who possess the same qualifications/credentials should be adjusted up to, but not to exceed, the rate granted to the newly hired employee, provided that the qualifications/credentials are also verified and documented as job related. These adjustments shall only be made on the same date that the higher pay rate is given to the newly hired employee. Such increases above the minimum salary shall be subject to revocation if appointing authority is found to have not complied with these Rules.

Current Rule IV. Section 2.7

Extraordinary Qualifications / Credentials (a) If an applicant who is eligible for appointment under the provisions of Rule V of these Rules possesses extraordinary or superior qualifications / credentials above and beyond the minimum qualifications / credentials, an appointing authority may request that the Director of Personnel authorize pay to the employee at a rate above the minimum provided that: Such superior qualifications / credentials are verified and documented as job related. 2. The rate is requested on or before the hire date. 3. The rate requested does not exceed the midpoint of the range for the affected job. 4. The rate is implemented in accordance with written policies and procedures established by the Civil Service department. 5. The appointing authority has received the budget approval of the Chief Administrative Officer. (b) The salaries of all current probationary and permanent employees who occupy positions in the same job classification and who possess the same or equivalent qualifications/credentials may be adjusted up to but not to exceed the rate granted to the newly hired employee provided that the qualifications/credentials are also verified and documented as job related. Such adjustments shall only be made on the same date that the higher pay rate is given to the newly hired employee. (c) All such increases must be approved by the Commission at its next scheduled meeting after action was taken by the Director.

ISSUE

Existing Rule requires Civil Service staff and Commission to approve in advance hiring above the minimum for exceptional qualifications. This limits the use of the full pay range in the pay plan. Recommended Rule provides a high degree of oversight, but allows for faster hiring for applicants with superior qualifications and credentials, as well as mechanisms to ensure equitable pay for existing employees.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Hiring above the minimum for superior qualifications / credentials (a) If an applicant who is eligible for appointment under the provisions of Rule V of these Rules possesses extraordinary or superior qualifications / credentials above and beyond the minimum qualifications / credentials, an appointing authority may pay the new employee at a rate not to exceed the midpoint of the pay range, or up the maximum of the pay range under extraordinary circumstances, provided that:

1. Appointing authority verifies and documents such superior qualifications / credentials as job related and an objective analysis of the public benefit rationale for hiring above the minimum.
2. Appointing authority submits to the Chief Administrative Officer, or other budget authority for participating agencies, for consideration whether the increase would obligate the city to higher costs in that fiscal year or the following year, including potential effects on the salaries of other personnel to ensure equitable pay policies.
3. Appointing authority receives appropriate approvals established by the Chief Administrative Officer, or other budget authority for participating agencies, in advance and reports the action to the Department in such manner as prescribed.

(b) The salaries of all current probationary and permanent employees who occupy positions in the same job classification in the same unit and who possess the same qualifications/credentials should be adjusted up to, but not to exceed, the rate granted to the newly hired employee, provided that the qualifications/credentials are also verified and documented as job related. These adjustments shall only be made on the same date that the higher pay rate is given to the newly hired employee. Such increases above the minimum salary shall be subject to revocation if appointing authority is found to have not complied with these Rules.

4. BETTER PROCESSES

Current Rule VI. Section 1.2

Transfer. An employee may transfer to another position in the same class. This may occur within the same organization unit or across organization units. Each transfer requires the approval of both the employee's prospective appointing authority and of the Personnel Director. It is important to note that a transfer differs from other personnel actions such as Lateral Classification Change, Promotion and Demotion. These actions are defined in Rule I.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule eliminates the need for Civil Service to approve transfers for efficiency purposes.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Transfer. An employee may transfer to another position in the same class for which the employee is deemed qualified. This may occur within the same organization unit or across organization units. Each transfer requires the approval of the employee's prospective appointing authority. It is important to note that a transfer differs from other personnel actions such as Lateral Classification Change, Promotion and Demotion. These actions are defined in Rule I.

Current Rule VI. Section 2.1

Whenever an appointing authority proposes to fill a vacancy in the classified service, he shall submit to the Director a statement showing the position to be filled and the class and duties thereof, and he may also specify the necessary and desirable qualifications of the person to be appointed thereto.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule revises the process for requesting to fill a vacancy for efficiency purposes.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Whenever an appointing authority proposes to fill a vacancy in the classified service, the appointing authority shall submit to the Department a statement showing the position to be filled, the duties thereof, the necessary and desirable qualifications of the person to be appointed thereto, and the proposed class, if known. The Department shall grant approval of the position allocation within fourteen (14) days for existing classifications and forty-five (45) days for new classifications. The Department shall announce the vacancy within thirty (30) days of an approved allocation. The department shall not withhold reasonable approval of the request unless it can demonstrate the request violates the principals of the merit system. For the purposes of allocating positions to a class, the Department shall interpret the existing classes broadly. If the appointing authority and the Director disagree on the position's minimum qualifications or the class allocation and are unable to resolve their disagreement, the issue must be brought before the Commission for resolution.

Current Rule VI. Section 3.2

(a) The eligibles certified shall be the highest ranking eligibles willing to accept employment, ranked in the following order: (1) all the eligibles on the appropriate reemployment list, if any; (2) those on a promotion list, if any; (3) those on an entrance employment list. All the names on any one of such lists shall be exhausted before any names are certified from another list, but the names certified may be taken from two or more lists if

necessary to make a certification of three eligibles. Names shall be certified from each list in the order of their rank on that list.

ISSUE

Existing Rule requires a preference for promotional candidates. Recommended Rule allows the appointing authority to determine the best recruitment strategy for the position, whether as a promotional opportunity or as an original entrance opportunity.

RECOMMENDED RULE

(a) The appointing authority shall determine whether to recruit from existing eligible employees or from both existing eligible employees and external candidates. The appointing authority shall decide in advance whether to give existing eligible employees any preference in the selection process or have them compete on an equal basis with external candidates. If the appointing authority has chosen to include external candidates but give existing employees preference, both categories should be on the same list with existing employees noted. However, the appointing authority may appoint a candidate from anywhere on the list.

Current Rule VII. Section 1.2

If the duration of the working test period is not stated at the time of the announcement of the test for a class of positions, the working test period shall be six (6) months in duration.

ISSUE

Existing Rule creates a default probationary period of six months. Recommended Rule extends that period to one year and mandates that the Chief Administrative Officer create a system of performance measurement so that employees receive useful feedback within their first year of employment.

RECOMMENDED RULE

If the duration of the working test period is not stated at the time of the announcement of the test for a position, the working test period shall be six (6) months in duration. No extension shall be allowed which would make the total working test period longer than one year in the same position under the same appointing authority. The Chief Administrative Officer, or other budget authority for participating agencies, shall establish a system of performance measurement, which shall provide reliable data about the performance of each new employee within their first six months. Supervisors of probationary employees who are still employed after five (5) months shall be required to perform an employee performance assessment before six (6) months, so the employees understand how they are performing and whether and how they need to improve.

Current Rule XI.

SERVICE RATINGS

ISSUE

Title of Rule

RECOMMENDED RULE

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Current Rule XI. Section 1.1

A uniform service rating system for all organization units is established, which system shall include provisions for periodic rating of employees on the basis of performance. The Director shall prescribe the form on which service ratings are to be made, and each organization unit shall use the form prescribed by the Director in accordance with these Rules and the instructions given on the official form and its accompanying manual.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule replaces the Service Ratings sections in its entirety and replaces it with new Sections entitled Performance Management and Pay for Performance System. This Rule sets forth the basic elements of the system and how it is to be implemented.

RECOMMENDED RULE

A performance management system for all organization units is established, which system shall provide periodic reports to employees regarding their performance and the development of performance improvement plans, if applicable. The system shall provide for goal-setting for each employee and/or team of employees, appropriate performance measures, and work strategies or assignments for which results can be measured through objective performance data, including customer satisfaction data if applicable. The system shall also provide for employee self-evaluation, supervisor feedback, performance improvement mechanisms, and, if desired by the appointing authority, peer or subordinate feedback.

Current Rule XI. Section 1.2

The service rating period July 1, 1982 - June 30, 1983 is extended by six months to December 31, 1983. As of January 1, 1984, and annually thereafter, the appointing authority of each organization unit shall have a service rating made of each regular (permanent) employee in that organization unit who has worked in the classified service during that rating period. However, if the employee has not worked for the current appointing authority for at least ninety (90) days during the rating period, the employee shall be rated by the appointing authority under whom the employee has most recently worked for at least ninety (90) days during the rating period. If the employee has not worked under any appointing authority for at least ninety (90) days, he shall be rated by the current appointing authority. Service ratings shall be made by the supervisor designated by the appointing authority as the individual most familiar with the employees work during the rating period. Such service ratings shall be prepared for all regular employees, including those currently serving in Emergency, Transient, Provisional or Probationary appointments. The service rating shall be discussed with the employee, and after such discussion the employee shall sign the rating, but this act of signing shall be evidence only of the fact that the rating has been submitted to the employee and discussed with the employee. Any refusal to sign shall be so noted on the official rating form. A rating made by the supervisor and signed by the employee shall then be reviewed by the appointing authority or the designated agent. The appointing authority or designate shall sign the rating as presented or as corrected and, when thus signed by the appointing authority or designate, the rating shall become effective as the official service rating of the employee for the period indicated thereon. Any modification by the appointing authority of the supervisor's rating of the employee shall be communicated to the employee and the supervisor.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule provides the Chief Administrative Office with direction to administer a citywide performance system and departmental plans. It also sets requirements for supervisors to communicate with employees.

RECOMMENDED RULE

The Chief Administrative Office shall provide policies, instructions, and appropriate forms in specific formats that may be tailored to departmental needs. The Chief Administrative Office shall oversee and ensure compliance with the system, and appointing authorities shall have responsibility for administering the performance management system in their departments. The Chief Administrative Office review and approval of the performance goals is required. The Chief Administrative Office shall provide training, advice and assistance to departments and serve as a source of expertise. Goals, performance measures, performance data collected and utilized within the system, and performance assessments shall be provided to individual employees at least annually and that employee's input shall be sought as part of the process.

Current Rule XI. Section 1.3

The appointing authority shall submit the original copy of the completed service rating and a certified list of the employees who were rated to the Civil Service Department not later than March 1st of each year. If an appointing authority cannot submit an employee's evaluation by March 1, that appointing authority shall submit, by March 1, a written request for an extension to the Personnel Director stating the reason the rating was not submitted and the date the rating will be submitted, which will be prior to April 1. The majority of the department's ratings must be submitted by March 1, to be granted this grace period. If an appointing authority fails to submit an employee's evaluation by March 1 and has not requested or received an extension to April 1 or fails to submit the rating by April 1 after an extension has been granted, the appointing authority will be in violation of this Rule and subject to sanctions by the Commission.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule details appointing authority responsibilities for providing documentation and for meeting deadlines established by the Chief Administrative Office.

RECOMMENDED RULE

The appointing authority must provide a copy of the completed performance management forms and any other documentation required, as set forth in the procedures and within the timeframes provided by The Chief Administrative Office.

Current Rule XI. Section 1.4

There shall be five possible service ratings, one of which shall be used in rating each employee. The service ratings are: "Outstanding", "Exceeds Requirements", "Competent", Needs Improvement, and "Unsatisfactory".

ISSUE

Recommended Rule eliminates a description of service ratings because it is unnecessary under the proposed new performance system.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Delete Rule.

Current Rule XI. Section 1.4

There shall be five possible service ratings, one of which shall be used in rating each employee. The service ratings are: "Outstanding", "Exceeds Requirements", "Competent", "Needs Improvement", and "Unsatisfactory".

ISSUE

Recommended Rule eliminates a description of service ratings because it is unnecessary under the proposed new performance system.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Delete Rule.

Current Rule XI. Section 1.5

Only those employees who receive an overall rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" shall have a right of appeal to a service rating appellate board consisting of three members which the appointing authority shall designate to hear such appeal. The appointing authority shall notify an employee, in writing, of an overall "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" rating and shall inform the employee, in writing, of the employee's right to appeal the rating. Within thirty (30) days after receiving official notice of the "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" rating, an appeal, if desired, must be made in writing by the employee, specifying what the rating should be and the reasons therefore. Within thirty (30) days after the filing of such appeal, the appellate board shall hear the appeal, have prepared an official transcribed or taped record of the proceedings, render a written decision either sustaining or modifying the rating which has been appealed and forward a copy to the employee and to the Personnel Director.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule eliminates a description of appeal rights based on service ratings because it is unnecessary under the proposed new performance system. An employee who is disciplined because of poor performance will be able to appeal that action, as described in the appeals section. Written performance feedback under the performance management system is not an adverse action taken to punish an employee to correct, improve, prevent or stop unacceptable job performance or behavior.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Delete Rule.

Current Rule XI. Section 1.6

After a final written decision of the appointing authority has been rendered, an employee whose overall rating remains "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" may appeal to the Personnel Director for a further review of the service rating. The appeal to the Personnel Director shall be based solely on the official record established at the hearing of the appeal before the appellate board. A written appeal to the Personnel Director must be filed by the employee within thirty (30) days of the effective date of the decision of the appellate board. After review, a written notice of the final decision of the Personnel Director shall be provided to the employee and to the appointing authority.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule eliminates a description of appeal rights based on service ratings because it is unnecessary under the proposed new performance system. An employee who is disciplined because of poor performance will be able to appeal that action, as described in the appeals section.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Delete Rule.

Current Rule XI. Section 1.7

Once the "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" rating has been determined to be final, the work performance of an employee who received the "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" rating shall be reviewed by the appointing authority for a period of ninety (90) days. At the conclusion of this review period, the appointing authority must state in writing to the employee and to the Personnel Director whether or not the employee's work performance has improved. If, upon review, the work performance has not improved, the appointing authority shall take appropriate disciplinary action under the provisions of Rule IX.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule describes the timelines for monitor performance improvement and maintaining the standards of service under the merit system. An employee who is disciplined because of poor performance will be able to appeal that action, as described in the appeals section. Renumber to Rule XI. Section 1.4.

RECOMMENDED RULE

Once poor work performance of an employee has been established, the appointing authority shall monitor the employee's performance for a period of at least thirty (30) days and not more than ninety (90) days. At the conclusion of the review period, the appointing authority must state in writing to the employee and to the Personnel Director whether or not the employee's work performance has improved. If, upon review, the work performance has not improved, the appointing authority shall take appropriate disciplinary action under the provisions of Rule IX.

5. BETTER TRAINING

Current Rule VIII. Section 4.2

When an employee is authorized or assigned to attend a conference, convention, training program directly related to the employee's work or the work of the employee's department, or training program that is part of a Civil Service Department authorized employee growth and development program, no leave shall be reported and the employee shall be considered as working. All regular employees shall be allowed to take at least one course per month of available authorized Civil Service Department training, if such training is being taken as a requirement for a Civil Service Department promotional examination. Employees elected or appointed as trustees as defined by LA R.S. 9:1781 et seq, on any public employee retirement system's governing board, shall be given time off, subject to the approval of the appointing authority, without loss of pay when engaged in administrative or educational activities required to fulfill their statutory responsibilities as fiduciaries.

ISSUE

Recommended Rule encourages training and professional development by allowing employees to take at least one training per month regardless of intent to take a promotional exam.

RECOMMENDED RULE

When an employee is authorized or assigned to attend a conference, convention, training program directly related to the employee's work or the work of the employee's department, or training program that is part of an authorized employee growth or development program, no leave shall be reported and the employee shall be considered as working. All regular employees shall be allowed to take at least one course per month of available authorized training, subject to supervisor approval, which shall not be reasonably withheld. In any case, appointing authorities shall approve at least four (4) training opportunities for employees each year. Employees elected or appointed as trustees as defined by LA R.S. 9:1781 et seq, on any public employee retirement system's governing board, shall be given time off, subject to the approval of the appointing authority, without loss of pay when engaged in administrative or educational activities required to fulfill their statutory responsibilities as fiduciaries.