

**STATE OF NEVADA
HUMAN RESOURCES
COMMISSION**

Held at the Nevada State Library and Archives Building, 100 N. Stewart Street, Room 110, Carson City; and via video conference in Las Vegas at the Eureka Building, 7251 Amigo Street, Room 120.

**MEETING MINUTES
March 28, 2025
(Subject to Commission Approval)**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Mr. Mark Olson, Chairperson
Ms. Patricia Hurley, Commissioner
Mr. Andreas Spurlock, Commissioner
Ms. Angela Scurry, Commissioner
Mr. Rick McCann, Commissioner
Mr. Armen Asherian, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

Ms. Bachera Washington, Administrator, DHRM
Ms. Michelle Garton, Deputy Administrator, DHRM
Ms. Heather Dapice, Supervisory Human Resource Analyst, DHRM
Mx. Nadia Tung, Human Resource Analyst, DHRM
Mr. Casey Quinn, Deputy Attorney General

I. CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME, ROLL CALL, ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairperson Olson: I'd like to call the Human Resources Commission meeting for Friday, March 28, 2025, to order. We'll do the roll call.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Olson: No vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Is there any public comment?

Daniel Marlow: I serve as the Administrator for the Department of Administration, Administrative Services Division. I object to action item six on the agenda, specifically removing accounting education requirements. Accountant positions require an extensive level of education and knowledge, especially when dealing with balance sheet items. Removing that education causes great risk for the state including compliance with federal standards, generally accepted accounting principles, and the single audit. Accountant jobs are not just a state position but are nationally and globally a standard position that require that accounting knowledge.

James Smack: I'm the Chief Deputy State Controller. I would voice my objection to this same agenda item based on being the one that does the financial reporting for the state and knowing that our ACFR accountants do the hard work. Although we've had turnover that has caused delays, we've been able to keep our financial accuracy. If our bond rating was to drop, we could go from 3-4% on money we're borrowing to, using Illinois as an example, 12%, which can then lead to the state losing services. The course requirements prepare us to build these resources to ensure that we are getting those qualified individuals. Issues we run into in the State are when we are trying to get information from other agencies, many of their accounting positions have been moved over to management analyst positions which don't have these course requirements, and they don't understand basic accounting principles so getting the information is a challenge which delays our reporting.

Bridget Smith: I am an Accountant III with the Housing Division and have been with the state for 26 years and hold a CPA license in Nevada and California. I believe the proposal to eliminate education as a prerequisite to accounting and auditing positions suggests a lack of understanding as to the definition of accountant versus bookkeeper. We require doctors, lawyers, and tradesmen to have education and experience, so we must also require that of those handling the state's money. With this proposal, how can a person audit financial statements without knowing what these statements are saying. The auditors that come in to audit us will have all those credentials and if there are changes, the uneducated person won't know how to do that.

Christine Hess: I am the CFO of the Nevada Housing Division. I want to thank Ms. Smith for being an integral part of our team and staying on top of this initiative. As CFO of the Housing Division and dealing with millions of dollars of taxable and tax-exempt bonds, it would be very hard to get investors interested without the proper background of our accounting team. This could also risk our bond ratings going down.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

A. December 13, 2024

Chairperson Olson: Any questions, comments, or corrections on the minutes of the meeting dated December 13, 2024? Hearing and seeing none, may I have a motion?

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION:	Moved to approve the minutes from December 13, 2024.
BY:	Commissioner Spurlock
SECOND:	Commissioner Scurry
VOTE:	The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

IV. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF REQUEST TO APPROVE CLASSES OR

POSITIONS FOR PRE-EMPLOYMENT SCREENING FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES AND REVISIONS TO CLASS SPECIFICATIONS

Nadia Tung: The Department of Public Safety is requesting the addition of these classes and positions to the list for pre-employment testing because the incumbents in the positions are responsible for handling reports of potentially dangerous activity related to schools and school age children.

Chairperson Olson: Any questions or discussions on this matter? Not having seen or heard anything from the south or the north, I will ask for a motion to approve this agenda item.

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION:	Moved to approve item four of the agenda as read.
BY:	Commissioner Spurlock
SECOND:	Commissioner Scurry
VOTE:	The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

V. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF PROPOSED TEMPORARY REGULATION CHANGES TO NEVADA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, CHAPTER 284

Heather Dapice: Proposed amendment to NAC 284.126 changes verbiage used from preponderance of duties to majority of duties. This will help with classified positions in a consistent manner statewide. In addition, the proposed amendment removes language specific to a form title to allow for flexibility for form name changes in the future.

Commissioner Spurlock: My understanding is that the form NPD-19 has been revised. Are we no longer asking for a percentage of time or emphasis or ordering of those duties in any fashion?

Heather Dapice: Preponderance deals with percentages and majority deals with the number. We're moving away from the percentage of time because it can be subjective to the majority of duties being performed.

Commissioner Spurlock: I'm curious if the form doesn't have the percentages and it just lists them then it doesn't really help us determine whether majority of preponderance.

Bachera Washington: One of the significant purposes of changing and revising the form is to allow more flexibility when it comes to reviewing and making an assessment because the old form was very subjective based on who was reviewing the request. We reviewed best practices across the nation to determine that percentages of duties were not necessary to make an assessment if a person is performing at a particular classification.

Commissioner Spurlock: When that NPD-19 form is completed doesn't the department head also have to sign off on it? This way they ensure that they review the document is accurate.

Heather Dapice: Current practice is for the supervisor to take the form to the administrator or division administrator and then we do the full audit. We sit with the agency or incumbent to ensure they are performing at the level requested.

Chairperson Olson: I have not seen the form but is there a place for percentage? Or does it just list functions?

Heather Dapice: The NPD-19 form was revised last year. They still have to detail their duties explicitly and then we verify those duties and those responsibilities. The agency review before the form is sent and we verify before I sign off on it as the supervisor. They still have the same opportunities and can appeal the determination.

Chairperson Olson: Okay, to me it sounds like preponderance and majority is the issue or question

Heather Dapice: There's always been a bit of confusion with preponderance people will take it as a legal definition. Majority people see it as more of a number. If there's ten duties and eight are being performed at the higher level, then it should be classified at that higher level.

Chairperson Olson: If there's no number on the form, how do you differentiate this one is 20% and then that one is 10%?

Heather Dapice: We are not utilizing percentages; we are using the number of duties being performed. When we speak to the incumbent or the supervisor, we get those duties described to us in detail.

Commissioner Scurry: Basically, you look at what it takes to complete specific tasks when you sit and have those conversations with that employee and the supervisor to decide on that determination.

Heather Dapice: That is correct. We'll sit down and get that full estimation because some of these class specifications have a fine line.

Chairperson Olson: Any questions or comments from Commissioner Hurley or McCann?

Commissioner McCann: Preponderance and majority are synonymous to me. However, people don't know what preponderance means but people do know what majority means.

Chairperson Olson: Thank you. Final comments? Can I have a motion on item 5?

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION:	Moved to approve agenda item 5A.
BY:	Commissioner McCann
SECOND:	Commissioner Spurlock
VOTE:	The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

VI. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF CONTESTED CLASS SPECIFICATION REVIEWS

Bachera Washington: This request would remove the number of college credits required for each specification listed.

Chairperson Olson: Any more questions or discussions on this matter?

Commissioner Spurlock: I have a question that pertains to all of these. Can we get a quick overview of the recruitment process at the State works? I assume it's the same as what I'm familiar with as far as minimum qualifications, but above that, are there any supplemental? Is it only an interview or are there potential tests or can you screen for things like education or even specific coursework?

Bachera Washington: We do review minimum qualifications as well as supplemental questions that can be attached to the recruitment by department request. These aren't used to screen minimum qualifications but whether or not the department may select an individual for an interview. Then in that interview the department should interview candidates that are asking questions in relation to the candidates' experience and knowledge to determine if the candidate can perform the duties of the position.

Commissioner Spurlock: Would you allow for one of those supplemental questions that is scorable to pertain not to experience but to education? Even if it's not a minimum qualification can the question have them list their degrees or specific courses?

Bachera Washington: Yes, if there is a position that does not require a degree but the department prefers that could be a supplemental question, but it is not rated or given points. Let me clarify that this will not be taking away the required degree, and all positions will still require the same experience and education as before. The only thing being removed is the specific number of college credits due to fluctuations between accrediting establishments. We've had to deny a number of candidates with bachelor's in accounting or may have master's degree, but they do not have the 18 college credits in accounting which could be through university changes. It might not be 18 credits anymore it might just be 10 credits but does not discount that candidate from having that accounting degree.

Commissioner McCann: Ms. Bachera, I'm taking it from your recent comments that 18 is the sticking point. This

doesn't mean that they won't have any credits, they might just have 12 or 15. Is that correct?

Bachera Washington: Yes. For this item it currently requires a bachelor's degree in accounting, business, finance or related field including 18 credits in accounting. The only thing we are doing is eliminating the number of credits; they still need to come with the required education and experience.

Commissioner McCann: Can you envision hiring someone who has no credits in accounting?

Bachera Washington: Based on the minimum qualifications for the job I don't see how anyone could get a bachelor's degree without taking accounting classes.

Commissioner McCann: I see the point from the people that had objections in the beginning. We need people that know what they're doing. We're dealing with hundreds of millions of dollars in some areas. I'm trying to envision a time when someone has an accounting or related field degree and would not have any credits in accounting. We're hung up on the 18 credits, but it could be less correct.

Bachera Washington: Absolutely. One university might have required 18 in the past but now currently requires 10 so why should we disqualify a candidate who has that degree and experience because they only have 12 of the required credits and not 18.

Commissioner McCann: Thank you.

Chairperson Olson: Any other questions or comments?

Commissioner Spurlock: I've seen this in some of my agencies where they changed a requirement like this, it was accounting specifically. It allowed for more flexibility for the type of classes. I just want to back you up that the 18 might not be the magic number so I just wanted to reemphasize that to you.

Commissioner Asherian: Are we qualified to tell colleges how to organize their degrees or are the national accrediting agencies who give colleges the right to issue the degree, do they know better than us. How they organize those classes we don't know. The hiring process should be used to thoroughly vet people rather than using 18 credits to somehow shed the responsibility of doing our due diligence when interviewing.

Commissioner Spurlock: I agree with you.

Bachera Washington: We additionally provided a comparison from entities State of Arizona, Wyoming and Clark County. All of them do not have the number of college credits in their minimum qualifications for these same positions.

Commissioner Spurlock: I just want to go on the record that Clark County for the same readings that we're here for today.

Chairperson Olson: Thank you, commissioners, for that exchange. At this time, I will call for a motion.

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION:	Moved to approve agenda item 6A (1) as written.
BY:	Chairperson Olson
SECOND:	Commissioner Spurlock
VOTE:	The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

1. **Chief Accountant Series**
 - a. **7.103 Chief Accountant**

Chairperson Olson: I broke these separately in case discussion on each one individually. Commissioners up north any questions or discussion?

Commissioner McCann: I ask that the record incorporate my previous questions in the discussion from the previous

matter into this section.

Bachera Washington: Item 6A (2) requests to remove the number of college credits in accounting but the education and experience will remain.

Chairperson Olson: Any comments or questions? Hearing none may I have a motion 6(A) 2?

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION: Moved to approve agenda item 6A (2).
BY: Commissioner Spurlock
SECOND: Commissioner Scurry
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

- 2. Accountant Series**
 - a. 7.135 Accountant III**
 - b. 7.136 Accountant II**
 - c. 7.137 Accountant I**

Bachera Washington: The request is to remove the 18 college credits from the class specifications.

Commissioner McCann: I ask that the record incorporate my previous questions in the discussion from the previous matter into this section.

Chairperson Olson: Any more questions or discussions on this matter? I will ask for a motion to approve this agenda item.

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION: Moved to approve agenda item 6A (3).
BY: Commissioner Spurlock
SECOND: Commissioner Scurry
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

- 3. Accountant Technician Series**
 - a. 7.140 Accountant Technician III**
 - b. 7.141 Accountant Technician II**
 - c. 7.143 Accountant Technician I**

Bachera Washington: The request is to remove the required college credits but not remove the education or experience.

Commissioner McCann: I ask that the record incorporate my previous questions in the discussion from the previous matter into this section.

Chairperson Olson: I will ask for a motion to approve this agenda item.

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION: Moved to approve agenda item 6A (4).
BY: Commissioner McCann
SECOND: Commissioner Hurley
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

- 4. Auditor Series**
 - a. 7.139 Audit Manager**
 - b. 7.145 Audit Supervisor**
 - c. 7.148 Auditor III**
 - d. 7.154 Auditor II**

e. 7.161 Auditor I

Bachera Washington: The request is to remove the required number of college credits from the class specification.

Commissioner McCann: I ask that the record incorporate my previous questions in the discussion from the previous matter into this section.

Chairperson Olson: Thank you. I will ask for a motion to approve this agenda item.

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION: Moved to approve agenda item 6A (5).
BY: Chairperson Olson
SECOND: Commissioner Spurlock
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

VII. REPORT OF UNCONTESTED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES NOT REQUIRING HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION APPROVAL PER NRS 284.160

The following items were posted for at least 20 working days. No written objections were received by the Administrator before the end of the posting period; therefore, the changes automatically went into effect.

Posting: #42-24

NEW Senior Communications Call Taker
NEW Communications Call Taker

Chairperson Olson: Any more questions or discussions on this matter? Not having seen or heard anything from the south or the north, I will move to the next agenda item.

VIII. DISCUSSION OF DATES FOR UPCOMING MEETING

Chairperson Olson: Moving on, discussion of dates for an upcoming meeting.

Michelle Garton: The Division would like to propose Friday, June 27th for the purpose of any possible emergency regulations that may be needed as of July 1st based on the current legislative session. This will give time for preparation. If there are emergency regulations that need to be brought to the Commission for adoption, the regularly scheduled meeting will be held for all the items that can be posted as required. Upon adjournment, a second meeting could start to address any regulations that may be needed.

Chairperson Olson: So, the next meeting of the Human Resources Commission will be tentatively posted for Friday, June 27th.

IX. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Chairperson Olson: No commission comments from the north or the south.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Olson: No vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Is there any public comment at this time? None heard or seen.

XI. Adjournment

Chairperson Olson: This meeting is adjourned.