

**STATE OF NEVADA
PERSONNEL COMMISSION**

Carson City at the Gaming Control Board, 1919 College Parkway; and via video conference in
Las Vegas at the Grant Sawyer State Building, Room 2450, 555 East Washington Avenue

**MEETING MINUTES
Friday, June 19, 2015**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

IN CARSON CITY: Ms. Katherine Fox, Chairperson
Mr. David Read, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Peter Long, DHRM
Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General
Shelley Blotter, DHRM
Tawny Polito, DHRM
Carrie Lee, DHRM
Carrie Hughes, DHRM
Rob Easton, NDOT
Lisa Friend, DHRM
Rachel Baker, DHRM
Kendra Martin, DHRM
David Wright, NDOC HR
Ann Scott, PUC
Allison Wall, DMV
Teri Hack, NDF
Katie Holmberg, DHRM
Ana Maria Ornellas, DHRM
Kareen Masters, DHHS
Patricia Kreymborg, DHCFFP
Alys Dobel, DMV
Christine Ripley, DHRM
Kimberley King, NDOT

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

IN LAS VEGAS: Mr. David Sanchez, Commissioner
Mr. Gary Mauger, Commissioner

COMMISSIONER NOT PRESENT

AT THE MEETING: Mr. Andreas Spurlock, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT IN

LAS VEGAS: Lee-Ann Easton, Administrator, DHRM
Heather Dapice, DHRM

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

Chairperson Katherine Fox: Opened the meeting at 9:00a.m. She welcomed everyone and took roll.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT NOTICE: Read into record by Chairperson Fox:

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 under NRS 241.020. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person, and persons making comment will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their last name. The Commission chair may elect to allow additional public comment on a specific agenda item when the item is being considered.

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING DATED MARCH 20, 2015 - Action Item

MOTION: Motion to approve the minutes of the meeting dated March 20, 2015.
BY: Commissioner Read
SECOND: Commissioner Mauger
VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

IV. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF ADDITION OF CLASSES OR POSITIONS APPROVED FOR PRE-EMPLOYMENT SCREENING FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES AND REVISIONS TO CLASS SPECIFICATIONS - Action Item

- A. The Department of Transportation requests the addition of positions to the list approved for pre-employment screening for controlled substances and requests approval of class specification amendments to include pre-employment screening for controlled substances:
1. Classes and positions requested for approval of pre-employment screening for controlled substances:
 - 6.228 Staff II, Associate Engineer, PCN: 018024, 018025, 018036, 018037, 018046, 018047
 - 10.536 Environmental Scientist II, PCN: 018012, 018013
 - 10.545 Environmental Scientist IV, PCN: 018011

Carrie Hughes, Personnel Analyst, Division of Human Resource Management: Stated that NRS 284.4066 provides for the pre-employment testing for controlled substances of candidates for positions affecting public safety prior to hire. She explained that the state statute requires the appointing authority to identify the specific positions that affect public safety, subject to the approval of the Personnel Commission. She stated that federal courts have indicated that pre-employment testing by public entities may constitute a search within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment, and if so, must be justified by a special need that outweighs a reasonable expectation of privacy. She listed the positions for which the Department of Transportation has requested approval of pre-employment screenings (see A.1. above). She recommended approval of the positions as their duties will involve activities on or in close proximity to roadways with traffic present. She further noted that positions in the Staff Associate Engineer class series have previously been approved by the Commission. She stated that Rob Easton, Personnel Officer for the Department of Transportation, was available to answer any questions of the Commissioners.

Chairperson Fox: Stated it was her understanding that Department of Transportation has received legislative approval to create a new Stormwater Division which will consist of 59 positions, of which 42 positions are newly created and additionally, nine positions will require pre-employment drug testing since they have the potential to impact public safety as the job duties are performed on roadways with high volume traffic traveling at high rates of speed.

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sanchez: Inquired about the funding for the drug screening. He asked if the agencies fund the concept before it comes before the Commission for approval or do they have to deal with it after the fact in their budgets.

Carrie Hughes: Answered that NDOT explained to her that the funds are available to support screening these positions and if the budget is inadequate they will raise the funds.

Chairperson Fox: Asked for any public comments on the agenda item. There was none.

MOTION: Motion to approve addition of classes or positions for pre-employment screening for controlled substances for the Department of Transportation including the position control numbers list for the Staff II Associate Engineer, Environmental Scientist II, Environmental Scientist IV.

BY: Commissioner Read

SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez

VOTE: Motion passed.

2. Request for approval of class specification changes to include pre-employment screening for controlled substances for some positions:
6.228 Staff II, Associate Engineer
10.536 Environmental Scientist II
10.545 Environmental Scientist IV

Chairperson Fox: Stated that as a result of the approval of the positions in the previous agenda item there will need to be changes made to the class specifications for the Staff II Associate Engineer, Environmental Scientist II, and the Environmental Scientist IV. She asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners. There were none.

MOTION: Motion to approve changes to the class specification for the Staff II Associate Engineer, Environmental Scientist II, and Environmental Scientist IV specifically to add the language for pre-employment screening for controlled substances.

BY: Commissioner Read

SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

V. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF INDIVIDUAL CLASSIFICATION APPEAL - Action Item

- A. Catherine Reinsch, Social Worker II, Department of Health and Human Resources

Chairperson Fox: Gave the appellant directions for the appeal process for the reclassification.

Catherine Reinsch: [audio quality poor] Stated that since the class was first created in 1992 much has changed, including the population of Clark County which has doubled. She explained that technology has advanced such as personal computers, SmartPhones, online banking, etc., which has caused a flourish of different types of financial problems that did not exist before. She stated that the skills, knowledge, and abilities required of the intervention process has changed. She stated that the complexity of tasks performed were considerably different from other Social Workers in the state and compared them to those of Social Worker III. She stated that in the past few years she has needed to contact individuals with a higher level of expertise and providers such as psychiatrists, and outside forensic medical and financial specialists to complete a complex technical investigation. She explained that law enforcement often relies on the Social Worker II's research, details, and support documentation to further their investigations. She stated that the quantity of cases has increased in the past few years and that technical changes and complexities have also increased. She stated that a greater knowledge base was required, as well as education and training, more than other Social Workers in the state. She explained that a higher level of professional expertise is required to adequately communicate and advocate for the elderly population with law enforcement, public and private guardians, attorneys, attorney generals, etc. She stated that the investigation requirements cause a higher risk to the Social Worker II's than that of other Social Workers in the state. She explained she was frequently required to make on the spot life preserving decisions. She stated that she feared that the elderly have a diminished worth to the Commission due to prior denials of classification change by the Commission. She reiterated the differences of the duties and requirements of an EPS Social Worker II from other state Social Workers. She had several exhibits for the Board supporting her claims, including a letter from Lee-Ann Easton of the Division of Human Resource Management. She presented a response to Lee-Ann Easton which stated that prior to 2002 the class concepts of Social Worker II included different specialty areas that are not associated with the different specialty areas of CPS, foster care, or adoption. She presented another exhibit, class specification for Social Worker III, which read: Social Worker IIIs are distinguished from the lower levels by the nature and complexity of specific programs that have a high proportion of complex and sensitive case work requiring the application of advanced principles of the professional and decision making, the assessment of abstract problems and development of unique solutions based on personal observation and analyst of critical thinking with dysfunctional families and children whose welfare are at risk. She stated that a Social Worker III conducted unannounced home visits, encountering volatile domestic crises which placed workers at risk, which she stated should also apply to the CPS Social Worker II. She presented a further exhibit, which she quoted: "The overall purpose of my position is to investigate abusive neglect, self-neglect, isolation, and exploitation of adults over 60. Since Clark County transitioned the workload has increased, making it appear that my focus was on the increase of volume, but though the volume has increased, this was accompanied by positions that we approved over time." She stated that Lee-Ann Easton acknowledged in her letter that this change had resulted in higher levels of financial crimes along with higher levels of complexity and responsibility. She asked that the classification be re-evaluated relevant to today's times. She stated that based on the increased responsibility and complexity of EPS's role today, the previous decisions were no longer fair or accurate.

Chairperson Fox: Asked to hear from the Division of Human Resources Management next and then entertain questions from the Commission.

Peter Long: Pointed out that this was an individual appeal of an individual study and the Division of Human Resource Management, per regulation, is bound by significant change in determining whether or not a position can be reclassified. He stated that the definition of "significant change" is "a change in duties and responsibilities assigned to a position and class that is outside the scope of the class as described by the class specification, is not part of the scope or responsibility of the position, and results in a preponderance of duties and responsibilities being allocated to a different class." He stated that the majority of Ms. Catherine Reinsch's presentation would be viewed in an occupational study. He explained

that the division does not look at all the positions as a whole to determine if the duties are performed at a higher level when an appeal is made by one individual position.

Chairperson Fox: Thanked Mr. Long and introduced Heather Dapice.

Heather Dapice: Introduced herself as a Personnel Analyst, Human Resource Management, Division of Compensation, Classification, and Recruitment. She stated that on February 9, 2015 she conducted an individual classification study on the appellant's request for reclassification from a Social Worker II to a Social Worker III. She shared that the study included a review of position description questionnaires from an occupational group study of Social Worker II, and several more position comparisons. She stated that this review determined there has been no significant change at this time to NAC284.126 and therefore, the request for reclassification was denied. She explained that NAC284.126, subsection 1B, "significant change" means "a change in the duties and responsibilities assigned to a position in a class that: Is outside of the scope of the class as described by the class specification; Is not part of the scope of responsibility of the position; and results in the preponderance of duties and responsibilities being allocated to a different class." She reiterated that "significant change" means that duties assigned to a position have changed to such a degree that the current classification no longer fairly describes preponderance of responsibilities. She stated that in applying the definition of change, natural growth or an increase in workload common to most positions in state service is not considered to fall within the description of significant change, nor is the addition of duties that are similar in nature or complexity to previous responsibilities. She stated the class concept of Social Worker II says they must perform the full range of duties described in the series concept at the journey level and the minimum qualifications are stated, in part, as "the incumbent must have working knowledge of principles, practices, and techniques of social work, management practices related to program assignment and investigative techniques," whereas the class concept for the Social Worker III states, in part, that the incumbent "perform advanced journey level case management services in child protective services, foster care and/or adoptions." She further stated that the minimum qualification state, in part, that the incumbents "have working knowledge of federal regulations and state law in child welfare, and families who apply abuse, or neglected children, in the cases of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse in children, affect of foster care on the child, caregiver, biological family, and other families and community; court procedures related to child abuse and neglect." If the incumbent does not provide advanced journey level case management services and child protective services, nor does it meet the minimum qualifications, her position does not meet the class concept of the Social Worker III. She stated that Ms. Reinsch communicated in her written appeal to Division Administrator Lee-Ann Easton and the Commission that investigation into elder abuse, neglect, exploitation, or self-neglect are not explicitly stated in the class specifications, and have never been stated in the class concepts, that Ms. Reinsch feels the position has always been functioning outside of the class specifications of Social Worker II. She explained that the incumbent further indicated that the duties and responsibilities of a Social Worker II in Elder Protective Services are similar to a Social Worker III's and Child Protective Services, and feels that the Social Worker III should be her class. Ms. Dapice also noted that Ms. Reinsch indicated that significant change has occurred because Elder Protective Services reacquired duties and responsibilities from 2010 but had not relinquished the Clark County Adult Protective Services duties. She explained that prior to the occupational group study presented July 1, 2003, the class concept for Social Worker III stated, in part, that Social Worker III "performs advanced journey level case management services in child protective services, foster care and/or adoption program." She noted that the class concept of Social Worker II, Adult Protection, stated in part "the incumbents conduct an investigation to determine whether abuse, neglect, or exploitation of an elderly adult has occurred; perform social and financial assessment to determine appropriate medical, social, and legal intervention." She stated that these duties and responsibilities are the same of the current Social Worker II class, including the incumbent. She noted that these class specifications are in Exhibit 10. She stated that the NDP-19 references, prior to the occupational group study, that the other Social Workers investigate cases of abuse, neglect, exploitation, or isolations. She reiterated that these are the same duties and

responsibilities of a current Social Worker II class. She explained that the occupational group study of 2001 provided an in depth analysis of the Social Worker positions within the state service, including those assigned to Elder Protective Services. She stated that this study resulted in a verbiage change so that case worker services became similar. She stated that the job duties listed are not exhaustive but are general in nature, so as to include Social Worker duties that span different agencies. She noted that the verbiage change was presented to the Personnel Commission in 2002, who determined that the duties and responsibilities assigned to Social Worker who provides case management services and child protective services warrant pay at separate levels. She further explained that the then-Personnel Commission approved the Social Worker II and Social Worker III class specifications for the current series. She pointed out that the appeals for the approved class specifications have expired. She reiterated the duties of a Social Worker II currently and stated that the purpose of the position has not changed since 1993. She noted that Ms. Reinsch is the sole incumbent regarding the NDP-19, but the decision to grant the appeal will directly affect a minimum of 30 Social Worker II positions in Elder Protective Services for approximately \$150,000. She further noted that it could produce changes for an additional 60 Social Worker II positions in Aging and Disability as a whole, as these workers could provide an argument that they also provide protective services to seniors, for a total of unfunded liability of \$150,000. She requested that the Commission deny the appeal. She asked for any questions.

Commissioner Sanchez: Asked what the differences were in the minimum qualifications of Social Worker II and Social Worker III.

Heather Dapice: Answered that the level III class included one year experience in the child protective field. She explained that the entry level requirements were also different in that level III are geared towards children and the adoption process as well as services rendered for them whereas level II is related to general social worker services including investigative techniques, conducting interviews to elicit sensitive information, making physical and behavioral assessments, making home visits, interacting diplomatically, making rapid decisions in confrontations, responding to sensitive and/or emergency situations, dealing appropriately with apathy, hostility and resistance.

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were any more questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Mauger: Stated that both speakers spoke very quickly and he could not understand it all. He asked the appellate how long she has been employed. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered that she has been with the agency for 10 years and was then a community-based worker for four years. **Commissioner Mauger:** Asked her if she'd filed an appeal before. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered no. **Commissioner Mauger:** Asked if there was any one thing that made her bring the appeal. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered no. She stated that the workers in the agency have discussed this for around six years when the changes actually started. She said that the agency wanted to do the appeal as a group but she could not get responses when gathering exhibits and information so she decided to appeal on her own. She stated that she felt the class should have been changed years ago. She pointed out that the minimum requirements Ms. Dapice pointed out were for all levels, including level III.

Commissioner Mauger: Asked Peter Long if the reclassification affects more than just Ms. Reinsch and how many workers it would affect. **Ms. Dapice:** Answered 39 in Elder Protective Services, then 92 in a different department, then 42 in the final department. **Catherine Reinsch:** Pointed out that only investigations are done for abuse and neglect and only done by Child Protective Services and Elder Protective Services and referenced the occupational study group done in 2003. **Commissioner Mauger:** Stated that this is ongoing. He asked if it were increasing over and above.

Commissioner Fox: Asked respondents to state their name for the record.

Catherine Reinsch: Stated in 2002 the Nevada State Elder Protective Services had just started and most of the other protective services work was being done through welfare and the county. She stated that the job did not change drastically until 2010 but that there were changes prior to then. She stated that the more critical investigations on financial abuse were a result of county transition. She stated that the division requested participation in an occupational study group but were told that those studies were no longer being conducted. **Commissioner Mauger:** Asked if she were doing the same job then as she is now and what increased the number of home visits. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered that home visits are being done by any social worker within the state. She stated that welfare does home visits as well as community based care, but pointed out that they do not go into the dangerous and critical volatile environments as the Elder Protective Services workers do. She explained that in her home visit duties she is possibly impeding on personal rights, and deal with family abuse and financial abuse, and she feels those skills are considerably different. She stated that the Elder Protective Services department get more training than any of the social services counterparts. She pointed out that the details and complexities are greater, not the duties, but how the job is done today is considerably different than in 2002.

Commissioner Sanchez: Asked a question of Ms. Reinsch. He stated that the appellant provided a detailed letter to Ms. Easton made on April 14th. He noted that the end of the letter stated that "the Personnel Commission has already predetermined that there will never be any change to this class specification, regardless" and that it further states "in conclusion, I feel that the original classification determination is discriminatory and intentionally signalling out all other department social workers as inferior to the CPS department." He asked for clarification. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered that in prior appeal decisions, submitted in her exhibits, the Personnel Commission stated there will never be a change and can't be a change. She further stated that the investigator that performs almost mirror duties to the Child Protective Services Social Worker and that in the class specifications one could remove the words "childcare" or "daycare" and replace them with "elderly" and "adult daycare." She noted that the EPS worker does have a voice in the adult being removed from an unsafe home and placed into a group home or assisted living. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Again asked where the issue of discrimination came up. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered that she feels that the elderly population is being discriminated against the child population because the people doing the same duties in CPS have a level III whereas the workers in EPS have a level II. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked who was being discriminatory. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered whoever wrote the class specifications was discriminating between the two and referenced again the letters stating that the Personnel Commission has made the direct order to disallow changes. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Clarified and asked if Ms. Reinsch believed that the Personnel Commission was discriminating against her. **Ms. Reinsch:** Answered that the discrimination was in not being allowed to change the description of the job and that the way the specifications were written is discriminatory. She noted that she was denied an opportunity to view the specifications of level III, which she also felt was unfair. She referenced her exhibits 10 and 11, which are written as discriminating against any other population and are only inclusive to Child Protective Services, foster care, or adoptions. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Thanked Ms. Reinsch and told Chairperson Fox it was unfortunate that Commissioner Spurlock was absent as his area of expertise is classification, and that Commissioner Spurlock did submit a document to the Commission. **Chairperson Fox:** Affirmed. She stated she will read the Commissioner's statement into the record during the discussion portion of the agenda item.

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were any public comments related to this item.

Kareen Masters: Introduced herself as the Deputy Director of the Department of Health and Human Services. She noted that this is a difficult situation for the Commission as it is difficult to take one position out of hundreds and make a classification decision based on that case. She stated that she has been involved in the occupational studies of Social Workers and pointed out that the Department of Personnel did make the recommendations of levels between the specialty areas and that at both times there subject matter groups that included social work, supervisors, managers, all who had extensive

knowledge about the duties of those positions. She encouraged another occupational study to review all of the positions in concert.

Chairperson Fox: Entertained a motion which was made and seconded. She then read Commissioner Spurlock's statement into the record: "While I am unable to participate in today's meeting as a voting member, I would still like to offer the following regarding Agenda Item V. I believe it is a management right, subject to all appropriate laws and approvals, to design work classifications. It is their right to weigh the various considerations such as internal equity, external equity, and the needs of department management in order for that department to achieve all of their goals and objectives. I believe that the state was more than within its right to design the Social Worker II classification the way it did and I believe that the preponderance of the same classification covers the duties of the position of Ms. Catherine Reinsch more appropriately than any other classification. Submitted, Andy Spurlock."

Chairperson Fox: Asked for any further discussion from the Commissioners. There was none.

MOTION: Motion to deny Ms. Catherine Reinsch's reclassification of Social Worker II to Social Worker III.

BY: Commissioner Read

SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

VI. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CLASS SPECIFICATION MAINTENANCE REVIEW OF CLASSES RECOMMENDED FOR REVISIONS AND ABOLISHMENT - Action Item

- A. Clerical & Related Services
 - 1. Subgroup: Mail & Supply Services
 - a. 2.124 Mail Service Series
 - 2. Subgroup: Legal Support Services
 - a. 2.159 Legal Assistant

Kendra Martin: Introduced herself as a Staff Professional Trainee with the Division of Human Resource Management, Classification Section. She presented for approval Item VI. A. 1. a. and Item VI. A. 2. a. on the agenda. She stated with regard to Item VI. A. 1.a., working with subject experts in the Mail Service series classification, it was reviewed as part of the biennial class specification maintenance review. She recommended that minor changes be made to the series concept, class concept, and special requirements to update verbiage to reflect new processes and better outline the duties of the positions in the Mail Service Series. She stated that revisions were made to clarify conflicting statements in the Mail Service Clerk I class concepts. She further that stated that due to the types of mail and packages handled and processed by some positions it was requested by DMV and DPS that a special requirement for successful completion of an FBI background check be added. She explained that Human Resource Management worked with agencies involved who supported the changes. She requested approval of the class specification. She stated that in regard to Item VI. A. 2. a. in conjunction with the class specification maintenance review process conducted by Human Resource Management it is recommended that the Legal Assistant class be abolished. She explained that during this review it was determined that there were no classified positions in this class within either state classified service or within the Nevada system of higher education. She explained that agencies which had previously utilized this class indicated that they did not have plans to use the class in the future. She requested approval of the abolishment of the class specification immediately.

Chairperson Fox: Thanked Ms. Martin and asked for questions from the Commission. There were none.

MOTION: Motion to approve class specification changes for the Clerical Related Services series; specifically, the Mail and Supply Services series; and the abolition of the Legal Assistant class within the Legal Support Services subgroup.
BY: Chairperson Fox
SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez
VOTE: Motion Passed.

- B. Medical, Health & Related Services
 - 1. Subgroup: Environmental & Health Protection
 - a. 10.505 Health Resource Analyst Series
 - 2. Subgroup: Allied Therapies
 - a. 10.614 Therapeutic Recreation Specialist Series
 - b. 10.673 Activities Therapy Technician Series

Heather Dapice: Introduced herself as Personnel Analyst with the Compensation, Classification and Recruitment section, Division of Human Resource Management. She presented for approval recommendations for changes to the class specification for the Health Resource Analyst, Therapeutic Recreation Specialist, and Activities Therapy Technician Series in the Medical, Health, and Related Services occupational group, a subgroup of the Environmental and Health Protection and allied therapies. She stated with regard to Item VI. B. 1. a., Health Resource Analyst, in consultation with subject matter experts from the Department of Health and Human Services, it was determined that only minor modifications were needed to the series concept to include the analysis of the national healthcare anatomy. She stated at the Resource Analyst III level a statement was added to include the provision that positions at this level may supervise other professional and/or clerical staff as assigned. She explained that these changes would not require modification of qualifications. She stated that in regard to Item VI. B. 2. a., Therapeutic Recreation Specialist, in consultation with subject matter experts in the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Corrections, and the Office of Veteran Affairs, it was determined that minor modifications to the series concepts were needed to account for changes in duties performed. She stated that minor changes were made in minimum qualifications to account for the changes. She stated in regards to Item VI. B. 2. b., Activities Therapy Technician, in consultation with subject matter experts from the Department of Health and Human Services, it was determined that minor changes were needed to the series concept to account for changes in verbiage used in duties performed. She stated these changes did not require modification to the minimum qualifications. She explained that throughout the process both management and staff participated and they support these recommendations.

Chairperson Fox: Asked if the Commissioners had any questions. They had none. She asked if there was any public comment related to this item. There was none.

MOTION: Motion to approve class specification changes as identified under Item VI. B.
BY: Commissioner Mauger
SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez
VOTE: Motion Passed.

VII. REPORT OF UNCONTESTED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Postings #9-15, #10-15, #11-15, #12-15, and #13-15

Chairperson Fox: Stated that the Report of Uncontested Classification Changes is included in the Commissioners' packets.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF DATES FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS

Chairperson Fox: Stated they are scheduled to meet September 13, 2015. She stated the next meeting after that would be in November 2015 instead of December, at the request of Division of Human Resource Management.

Shelley Blotter: Noted that the September meeting is scheduled on the 25th and not the 13th, and the meeting that follows it is scheduled for November 13th. **Chairperson Fox:** Stated November 13th may present a problem for her.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Fox: Asked for any public comment. There was none.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Fox: Adjourned the meeting.