

**STATE OF NEVADA  
PERSONNEL COMMISSION**

Carson City at the Legislative Counsel Bureau, 401 S. Carson, Room 3138 and in Las Vegas at the  
Grant Sawyer Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue via Video Conference

-----  
**MEETING MINUTES (Subject to Commission Approval)  
Thursday, October 10, 2013**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT  
IN CARSON CITY:**

Ms. Katherine Fox, Chairperson  
Mr. David Read, Commissioner

**STAFF PRESENT IN  
CARSON CITY:**

Ms. Lee-Ann Easton, Division Administrator, DHRM  
Ms. Shelley Blotter, Deputy Administrator, DHRM  
Ms. Carrie Parker, Deputy Attorney General

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT  
IN LAS VEGAS:**

Mr. David Sanchez, Commissioner  
Mr. Gary Mauger, Commissioner  
Mr. Nathaniel Waugh, Commissioner

**I. OPEN MEETING**

**Chairperson Katherine Fox:** Opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. and confirmed they had a quorum. Welcomed new Commissioner Mr. Nathaniel Waugh.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**No Action Taken**

**III. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Action Item**

**MOTION:** Move to approve the Minutes of the 06/20/13 meeting  
**BY:** Commissioner Read  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Mauger  
**VOTE:** The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**IV. 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. (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 Committee Chair may elect to allow additional public comment on a specific agenda item when the item is being considered.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if there was any public comment. She noted there was none in the north or the south.

**V. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED REGULATION CHANGES TO NEVADA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, CHAPTER 284** **Action Item**

**Chairperson Fox:** Noted that she would like the Division of Human Resource Management (DHRM) to present each item and they would have a discussion about each followed by a vote.

A. LCB File No. R137-12

- Sec. 1. New Section – Organizational climate study defined.
- Sec. 2. NAC 284.010 – Definitions
- Sec. 3. NAC 284.718 – Confidential records
- Sec. 4. NAC 284.726 – Access to confidential records

**Michelle Garton**, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, DHRM: Stated that for several years the DHRM had undertaken the process of organizational climate studies as a tool to identify issues within an agency and to assist management in developing strategies with a view to resolving problems. She noted that for the climate studies to be successful and for individuals to feel comfortable participating, two regulations related to confidential records and access to those records were being proposed to be amended and a new section was being proposed to be adopted.

She stated that Section 1 defined the term organizational climate study. She added that the studies are conducted by the DHRM at the request of another department or agency. She noted that the division could use a variety of methods and techniques in the study process. She said that Section 2 incorporated the definition of the organizational climate study into the general provisions of NAC 284 which was the section of the regulations that defined specific terminology. She stated that the DHRM was proposing a permanent amendment to NAC 284.718 to ensure that information gathered during the study that related to an employee's performance or conduct would remain confidential. She added that they were also proposing a permanent amendment to NAC 284.726 which would establish rules of access to the confidential information.

**Commissioner Mauger:** Referred to associations not being able to get the results of the study and asked what process the employee would have to use to include the association's written authorization.

**Michelle Garton:** Responded that the employee would be provided with the information and could then directly distribute it to whomever they desired. **Commissioner Mauger:** Acknowledged that information and then asked if the employee could give a written request to the state to forward that information to the association. **Shelley Blotter:** Responded that they could if they authorized the employee's association to be their representative. She gave the example of a grievance and said if the employee had designated the association as their representative then they could get that directly. She emphasized that it was the employee who would be the conduit to make that happen.

**Chairperson Fox:** Stated that it was her understanding that the organizational climate studies were designed to be a management tool where, for example, there was an issue related to communication within a particular organization or morale issues. She stated that the study would be designed to improve the effectiveness of that particular department. **Shelley Blotter:** Confirmed that was correct.

**Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked if during the study process, violations of policies and procedures would be determined, what type of remedy would there be? **Shelley Blotter:** Responded that it would be the typical remedy. She explained that studies of this type were not meant to be studies that would find issues of that type for particular employees. She said if it was determined that there was inappropriate behavior or violations then progressive discipline would apply, prohibitions and

penalties would apply. **Chairperson Fox:** Stated that if it was determined that that type of information or allegation came to light that the employee would be given first notice of an investigative interview and that process would first occur to ensure that they were being investigated accurately. **Shelley Blotter:** Responded absolutely.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked for any further questions from the Commissioners. There were none. She asked if there was any public comment. There was public comment from the north.

**Kareen Masters,** Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS): Indicated that she wanted to testify in support of the change. She indicated that she also supported the changes being made under Item V. B. She said the DHRM had conducted organizational climate studies in divisions within her department and they had found them to be very helpful. She noted that it was important for the employees to feel that sense of confidentiality when participating in the studies.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if there was any public comment from the south. There was none.

MOTION: Move to approve proposed regulation changes to NAC, Chapter 284 specifically LCB File No. R137-12 that includes the New Section 284 and revises NAC 284.010, NAC 284.718 and NAC 284.726.  
BY: Commissioner Gary Mauger  
SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

B. LCB File No. R045-13

Sec. 1 NAC 284.718 – Confidential records.

Sec. 2 NAC 284.726 – Access to confidential records.

**Michelle Garton,** Supervisory Personnel Analyst, DHRM: Referred to LCB File No. R045-13 and stated that both regulations related to confidential records and access to confidential records. She stated the DHHS and the Department of Transportation (NDOT) were proposing to the amendments. She added that the DHHS and the NDOT requested that information obtained through an internal study that related to an employee's performance or conduct should also remain confidential and access should be limited. She said, similar to the previous regulations that the studies were intended to identify issues within an agency so that management could make improvements and resolve problems. She stated that if both LCB File No. R137-12 and LCB File No. R045-13 were to be adopted then new subsections within NAC 284.718 and NAC 284.726 would be created.

**Commissioner Mauger:** Asked what they would learn from the internal study that they could not learn from the organizational climate study. **Michelle Garton:** Responded they would learn similar information and that it just depended on whether the DHRM or the internal human resources departments conducted the studies. **Commissioner Mauger:** Asked if this would be considered duplication. **Michelle Garton:** Responded that it would not be duplication. She said most departments would conduct their own studies or the DHRM study but would not consider doing both. **Chairperson Fox:** Asked if they had added this particular language because some departments preferred not to engage with the DHRM and conduct their own internal study. **Michelle Garton:** Responded yes. **Commissioner Mauger:** Responded he understood that point but this would become a regulation that would have to be adhered to and he continued that he did not realize that they had the option to participate or not participate. He said it was his understanding that if it was a regulation

they had to participate. **Shelley Blotter**: Stated that the studies were optional so the DHRM would not conduct such a study without the support and at the request of the management of that particular organization. She explained that there had to be both a want and desire to seek that type of information and accept the recommendations of the DHRM. **Commissioner Mauger**: Noted for clarification that both studies were optional for the departments, as to whether they chose to participate. **Shelley Blotter**: Confirmed that was correct. **Commissioner Mauger**: Asked what then was the purpose of the regulation if departments would not adhere to it? **Shelley Blotter**: Responded the regulation was stating that if these types of studies were to be conducted that any information that came from such a study reflecting on an employee's performance would remain confidential.

**Mark Evans**, Employee Development Manager, (NDOT): Stated in response to Commissioner Mauger's queries, that the DOT had conducted an employee satisfaction survey for several years. He said they selected their own questions, noted the trends and noted that one area they concentrated on was communication. They were interested to determine how well they were communicating with their own employees. He stated because they had their own historical data they could use this. He explained that if they brought in the DHRM they might have different questions and measures and then the NDOT would not have that same straight-across comparison.

**Commissioner Mauger**: Asked if the regulation was there as a guideline. **Shelley Blotter**: Responded, no it was not a guideline but did have the effect of law once put into effect. She explained that its purpose was that if there was a study and information was gleaned from that study that reflected on an individual employee's performance then it would make that information confidential. She continued, the second amendment would allow access to that employee to those portions of the study that might reflect badly on their performance so if there was a subsequent disciplinary action they would have access to that information.

**Chairperson Fox**: Asked if there was any public comment relating to Item V. B.

**Kareen Masters**, Deputy Director, (DHHS): Referred to the different types of studies and stated at times it was a matter of scope. She stated for the DHHS they may have had a particular work unit that was experiencing some difficulties so the personnel officer would go in and work with that unit perhaps doing some facilitation to resolve the issues. She stated by comparison, the DHRM studies for the organizational climate studies were typically an entire division or major portions of a division. She gave an example of a study that the DHHS was currently doing to illustrate that point.

**Mark Evans**, Employee Development Manager, NDOT: Stated that they supported LCB File No. R045-13. He noted that their agency conducted an annual satisfaction survey and the results were used to develop strategies to improve the organization. He stated that the purpose of the survey was to obtain an overall view of the agency and its climate. He said there were times when the comments in the surveys which were both good and bad about employees' co-workers, their supervisors and managers and they felt that those types of comments should remain confidential. He said they thought that it supported the integrity of the survey and allowed employees to express themselves freely. He stated that the NDOT was asking for approval of the regulation.

**Ron Cuzze**, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association: Referred to the information collected in the studies which was supposed to remain confidential. He noted that such information could be used for a disciplinary issue but then expressed concern that such information might be used against an employee in other ways such as a letter of instruction or that it might be

placed in an employee's evaluation. He asked if there were any safeguards to prevent that. **Shelley Blotter**: Responded that the intent of the study would be to look into communication or other issues going on within the organization. She stated if it revealed an issue that would cause disciplinary action then there would be further investigation into that issue. She reiterated it might cause disciplinary action but the intent was that it would safeguard that employee's information from other employees.

**Commissioner Mauger**: Asked if there was a violation that would then trigger another type of investigation. He asked if that was correct. **Shelley Blotter**: Responded yes, that is what would happen. **Mark Evans**: Stated that a comment on a survey would be from a confidential source so that might make the agency aware of a situation in a division or section and that might cause an investigation but an employee would not be disciplined based on a comment on a survey. **Ron Cuzze**: Stated he was not concerned with disciplinary issues as they had their own procedures to deal with that. He stated he was talking about non-disciplinary issues such as a letter of instruction or comments of an adverse nature in an employee's evaluation. **Mark Evans**: Stated that comments were not necessarily shared with a division or section for that reason. He said if the exact content of a comment was shared with a supervisor they would make assumptions about who made the comment. He said those types of comments were not put into the employee's file or used for their evaluation. **Commissioner Waugh**: Asked if it was assumed that those types of comments would not be applied or was there something set in policy that would address Ron Cuzze's concerns. **Chairperson Fox**: Stated that it was her understanding according to the proposed changes on the agenda that access to any notes, records, recordings, findings or other information obtained from an internal study or an organizational climate study conducted that directly related to an employee's performance would be limited to the employee, the appointing authority who would typically be the department head, persons authorized to this information and to any state or federal law, or order of the court or the governor. She said, for example, if comments came out related to an office assistant's performance, the supervisor of that office assistant would not be entitled to that information. She stated that was her understanding. **Shelley Blotter**: Stated that it said the appointing authority or a designated representative, so as Mr. Evans stated, it would typically be a high-level type of a study and result. She said if there were issues going on within a particular unit then they would have to step back and look at the whole unit and see how it was functioning. She said that automatically that supervisor would not necessarily get that information. **Mark Evans**: Stated that the proposed regulation was giving confidentiality to the results.

MOTION: Move to approve proposed regulation changes to NAC, Chapter 284 specifically LCB File No. R045-13, related to NAC 284.718 – Confidential Records and NAC 284.726 – Access to confidential records.  
BY: Commissioner Waugh  
SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez  
VOTE: The vote was four Yeas and one Nay in favor of the motion. The motion passes.

C. LCB File No. R021-13

Sec. 1. NAC 284.5811 – Family and Medical Leave: Maximum amount in 12-month period; eligibility; use.

**Carrie Hughes**, Personnel Analyst, DHRM: Stated that the DHRM was proposing a permanent amendment to NAC 284.5811 in LCB File No. R021-13. She stated that the intent of the amendment was to clarify that an employee may not be required to use his or her accrued paid leave when on

approved Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and also receiving payment from the Disability Benefit Plan such as short or long-term disability at the same time. She explained that currently employees are required to exhaust all of their applicable paid leave while on FMLA leave with the exception of workers' compensation. She noted that the amendment would allow an agency and employee to jointly agree to allow the employee to use his or her accrued paid leave while receiving his or her disability benefit. She stated that the amendment was based on the FMLA federal regulations.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if there were questions from the Commissioners or public comment. There was none.

**MOTION:** Move to approve proposed LCB File No. R021-13 related to NAC 284.5811 – Family and Medical Leave.  
**BY:** Commissioner Mauger  
**SECOND:** Commissioner David Read  
**VOTE:** The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

D. LCB File No. R022-13

- Sec. 1. NAC 284.531 – Furlough leave.
- Sec. 2. Repeal of NAC 284.531
- Sec. 3. Repeal of Section 2 of LCB File No. R021-11
- Sec. 4. Repeal of Emergency Regulation LCB File No. E001-13
- Sec. 5. Effective dates of previous sections.

**Michelle Garton**, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, DHRM: Referred to NAC 284.531 and stated that it set the rules surrounding the furlough requirement. She noted that the regulation was the same as the emergency regulation adopted at the June 2013 meeting and was now due to expire. She stated that the Commissioners' action today would allow the regulation to become permanent until its expiration on June 30, 2015. She stated there were several sections to the file for the ease of administration. She explained that Section 1 changed the reference in Section 10 of the regulation to the new bill AB 511 of the 2013 Legislative Session. Section 2 of the file repealed NAC 284.531 as of June 30, 2015. Section 3 of the file repealed the regulation related to the furlough requirement during the previous biennium. Section 4 of the file repealed the emergency regulation that was adopted at the June 20, 2013 meeting as the new permanent regulation would replace it upon filing with the Secretary of State. Section 5 of the file set timeframes for the different actions in the regulations.

**Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked if she could go over the details of how State employees are currently being furloughed and the procedures. **Michelle Garton:** Responded that AB 511 of the 2013 Legislative Session mandated that most State employees would be required to take 48 hours of unpaid furlough during each fiscal year of the biennium. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked how that was implemented. **Michelle Garton:** Explained that different agencies had their own individual ways of handling the furloughs. She explained that some agencies would allow one-hour increments and some agencies would allow four-hour increments. **Chairperson Fox:** Asked for clarification and said that generally speaking it was four hours per month. **Michelle Garton:** Responded, exactly.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if there were questions from the Commissioners or public comment.

**Ron Cuzze**, President, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association: Stated that he had brought the issue up previously and would say it once more, that four hours per month when completing 10 or 12 hours shifts in law enforcement did not work. He stated that they had asked that language be inserted to have law enforcement and correctional managers be able to manage those hours in a more accommodating manner. He referred to the shortage of employees in correctional facilities and the fact that they were losing law enforcement officers as a reason why they needed additional flexibility. **Commissioner Mauger**: Asked how that was currently being utilized and what was the impact on law enforcement officers and at corrections? **Shelley Blotter**: Responded and noted that they had heard the concerns of Ron Cuzze and the law enforcement agencies had also expressed their concerns. She said that during the last biennium and continuing into this biennium, in Subsection 6 of the regulation, it allows an employee to take up to 12 hours at a time so that would cover those situations where an employee might have a 10, 8 or 12-hour shift. She said they were aware of the concerns and they had been addressed in the regulation. **Ron Cuzze**: Read from a section and said that it noted that an appointing authority shall not require or allow an employee to take more than 12 hours of furlough leave in a work week. He thought that it did not fully address the issue. **Commissioner Sanchez**: Asked Ron Cuzze if he had given the Commission or the department such wording that we could look at? **Ron Cuzze**: Responded no but said he would be happy to do that. **Chairperson Fox**: Suggested that he do that and have that conversation at the department level, with the Department of Corrections (NDOC) and the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to ascertain how it was working or not working. **Ron Cuzze**: Indicated he had been speaking with management. **Chairperson Fox**: Requested that he then bring some suggested language before the commission.

MOTION: Move to approve proposed LCB File No. R022-13, Sections 1 through 5.  
BY: Commissioner Read  
SECOND: Commissioner Waugh  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

- E. LCB File No. R023-13
  - Sec. 1. NAC 284.374 – Active Lists; Removal and reactivation of names; refusal to consider certain persons.

**Dana Carvin**, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, Recruitment: Referred to LCB File No. R023-13 and she advised the DHRM was recommending the permanent adoption of the proposed amendment to NAC 284.374. She noted that the amendment would require an appointing authority to consider an eligible person only one time from a recruitment list. The Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association testified that they were neutral on the proposal. She said the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Business Center North submitted written comments in support of the proposed regulation. She said additionally comments were received at the workshop that indicated that when positions are highly technical and it had already been determined that the candidate did not have the appropriate skill set for a particular position the change would reduce unproductive required interviews.

**Chairperson Fox**: Asked if there were questions from the Commissioners or public comment.

**Gennie Hudson**, Personnel Analyst, Agency HR Services: Stated that Agency HR Services represented 15 State agencies. She stated these included the Departments of Administration, Agriculture, Business and Industry, Education, Taxation, Tourism and Cultural Affairs, Public Employees Benefits and the Secretary of State. She confirmed that Agency HR Services supported

the changes proposed to NAC 284.374. She explained how these changes would facilitate the departments in the recruiting process. She said Agency HR Services had asked for feedback from their agencies. She stated that the feedback was supportive.

**Peter Barton**, Administrator of the Division of Museums and History, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs: Stated that he was present to indicate his support for the proposed change. He stated that they had highly skilled, technical positions. He noted as an example that they hired curators but noted within the curatorial series they might still be looking for someone with a specialized skill in collections management for example. He said many positions were historically difficult to fill and sometimes recruitments went on for six to eight months. He explained how some applicants showing up on lists repeatedly hampered them in their ability to fill positions efficiently.

**Paulina Oliver**, Deputy Director, Department of Taxation: Advised that she wanted to testify in support of the change. She considered that it would be a major improvement affecting the interview process for many reasons already discussed.

**Julia Teska**, Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education: Advised she wanted to support the comments of HR Services as well as the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. She indicated that they also experienced similar issues when they wanted to fill positions for very specific curriculum-based backgrounds and specialists for special student populations. She stated that increased flexibility with the lists was critical to their department when filling positions.

**Nancy Corbin**, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Business and Industry, Division of Mortgage Lending: Stated that she wanted to show her support for the change of NAC 284.374. She said she had been serving in the Deputy position since 1997 and handling personnel had often become part of her position. She described some of the issues which arose when interviewing applicants multiple times. She noted that the recruitment process was lengthy and while she supported the process in identifying the best candidate she supported the change of having to consider an eligible candidate only once.

**Chairperson Fox**: Asked if there were any additional questions from the Commissioners or further public comment.

**Commissioner Sanchez**: Stated that he had struggled with the issue throughout his career as an HR director. He noted that he liked the flexibility of the language because it gives the appointing authorities the option to consider the individuals again. He supported the change.

MOTION: Move to approve proposed LCB File No. R023-13 related to Section 1 of NAC 284.374  
BY: Commissioner Waugh  
SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

F. LCB File No. R024-13  
Sec. 1 NAC 284.373 – Inquiry of availability of eligible person.

**Dana Carvin**, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, Recruitment: Stated that the DHRM was recommending the permanent adoption of proposed amendment NAC 284.373. She stated that the amendment would reduce the number of days from three to two for an applicant to respond to an

email, voicemail or other similar electronic inquiry of the availability of an applicant. She noted that a representative from the Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association testified against this amendment at the workshop. She stated that the NSHE, Business Center North submitted written comments stating with the increase in handheld technology they had seen applicant response times decrease after receipt of electronic message. She stated this change was consistent with applicant behavior and would allow agencies to move more quickly when hiring.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners or public comment.

**Kathleen Kirkland**, Personnel Officer, Agency HR Services: Stated that representatives from the agencies they served agreed that most people had the ability to provide an immediate response to an inquiry given the current technology available. She stated the decreased the number of days accelerated the recruitment process and provided a more expedient process overall. She noted that Agency HR Services and the agencies they served supported the change.

**Nancy Corbin**, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Business and Industry, Division of Mortgage Lending: Stated that she was present to support NAC 284.373. She indicated that filling a position with the most qualified person as soon as possible was important to every agency. She noted problems with contact slowed the process. She indicated that in her experience truly interested candidates responded quickly and typically always under 24 hours.

**Ron Cuzze**, President, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association: Stated that his association opposed the change. He stated the reason was that his members did not work Monday through Friday, 8 to 5. He said they worked shifts and on periods of three days off took part in activities and might not be in an area where they could pick up cell service. He said it was just one day and they were asking for consideration for his members. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Responded that it was not necessarily for current employees but for employees coming in on an alternate list or who may have never worked for the State of Nevada. He said in 1988 when he served as the director of personnel and employee relations for the City of Las Vegas they had re-written the civil service rules and they had reduced the number of contact days from three to two. He said they had had no problems with any of the organized units then and that was before there was so much electronic technology. He supported the change. **Commissioner Read:** Asked if they were referring to business days or were weekends included. **Dana Carvin:** Responded that they looked at business days.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if there were any further questions from Commissioners or public comment. There was none.

MOTION: Move to approve proposed LCB File No. R024-13 related to NAC 284.373.  
BY: Commissioner Waugh  
SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

G. LCB File No. R025-13

Sec. 1. NAC 284.361 – Use of lists and consideration of eligible persons.

**Dana Carvin**, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, Recruitment: Stated that the DHRM was recommending the permanent adoption of proposed amendment to NAC 284.361. She said the amendment allowed an appointing authority to interview five persons from the top ten ranks of a list

of eligible candidates. She noted that a representative from the Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association testified against the amendment at the workshop. She said a representative from the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees submitted written comments indicating the association's opposition to the amendment. She added that a personnel officer representing management of 14 departments and agencies testified in support of the proposed changes. She said the NSHE, Business Center North submitted an argument why the score ranking due to bonus points, for example, for Nevada residency, might not place the candidate with the best knowledge, skills and abilities in the top five ranks.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked how many points were awarded for a Nevada residency. **Dana Carvin:** Responded that was five points. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked if there were points awarded for veterans. **Dana Carvin:** Responded yes, there were five points for being a veteran and five extra points for being a disabled veteran. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked if there were defined periods of services for veterans. **Dana Carvin:** Responded yes but she did not have the details available at the meeting.

**Alys Dobel,** Personnel Officer, Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles: Stated that they supported the regulation. She commented that they liked the idea of a broader candidate pool.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked for clarification. She asked whether the eligible lists were open competitive eligible lists or did it also include promotional lists. **Dana Carvin:** Responded both. **Chairperson Fox:** Asked if the promotional lists awarded Nevada residency points. **Dana Carvin:** Responded they did. She clarified that if they applied for a promotional recruitment they could only use their veteran's points once for a promotional. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked how the lists were assembled. He said was it a written test or a composite score of written and interview or other performance tests. **Dana Carvin:** Responded they had different types of testing tools, written, training and experience which gave the candidate a score based on their training and experience. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked how promotional lists were established. **Dana Carvin:** Responded they were established the same way. She explained the different categories using division, state and national lists.

**Chairperson Fox:** Indicated there was public comment in the north.

**Kathleen Kirkland,** Personnel Officer with Agency HR Services: Stated that expanding the base of eligible applicants allowed the agencies more flexibility in selecting qualified individuals. She said currently employees who were qualified and had the experience were being excluded from the process due to limited ranking. She said the change would allow more opportunity for applicants who could be considered based on their overall experience rather than test scores. She confirmed that Agency HR Services had received overwhelming support from Agency representatives.

**Nancy Corbin,** Deputy Commissioner, Department of Business and Industry, Division of Mortgage Lending: Stated that she was there to support the change and noted that she agreed with some of the previous comments. She thought it would allow agencies to consider a larger pool of qualified persons.

**Ron Cuzze,** President, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association: Noted that they were primarily concerned with the advancement and promotional not the initial testing. He stated that they did not believe that it should be expanded from the top five to the top ten. He said they thought that if there was a problem with the process of determining the top five then that issue

should be addressed. He thought they should look at the testing procedure. He thought expanding the list suggested that there might be politics involved versus getting the best candidate.

**Commissioner Waugh:** Stated if there was a top ten, what would prevent numbers five through ten being interviewed instead of one through five. He said he understood it was agency discretion. He asked about issues such as additional eligibility with veterans' points and high testing scores. **Dana Carvin:** Responded that the regulation would expand the top five to top ten. She said it was optional to agencies. She said the only thing the regulation stated was that they must attempt to communicate with the top ten. **Chairperson Fox:** Asked for clarification and said they were not circumventing the top ones, just expanding those to be invited for an interview. **Dana Carvin:** Responded yes. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked if the State of Nevada had the ability to do a statistical analysis on the written tests that were given. **Dana Carvin:** Responded that they could do that. She said just recently they had changed their testing process and had reduced the number of written exams. She described the change. She said they had reduced the number of written exams so that if an individual came in and for example, took an exam for Accountant I that exam would encompass numerous positions. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Asked if they had a way to determine the reliability of the written tests. **Dana Carvin:** Responded yes, they could bring their administrator and test validator together and do that. **Commissioner Sanchez:** Stated that he supported the point system for veterans as that was how he was hired and began his career. He noted however that there was a certain amount of error in testing and establishing eligibility lists. He said at times the best candidate could fall by the wayside due to a compounding of error in testing, interviewing issues and points. He thought it was a good idea to open up lists at times as there was very little difference between the first and last candidate. **Commissioner Mauger:** Referred to the minutes of the July 17th workshop and noted he had a question for Ron Cuzze. He noted that there were comments he made and he was asking for clarification.

**Dennis Perea,** Deputy Director, Department Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR): Stated that he was there to support the change.

**Julia Teska,** Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education: Stated that her department supported the change. She said the flexibility was good and they were still talking about the top ten candidates.

**Shannon Chambers,** Department of Business and Industry: Stated that she echoed the comments made by other representatives as well as Agency HR Services. She thought by expanding the applicant pool to ten it would allow them to get the best person for the position.

**David Badger,** Personnel Officer, Nevada Department of Wildlife: Stated that he supported the regulation change. He commented that he had hoped that exams would cover every aspect of the job but they did not. He noted that people that did well on exams were not necessarily the best person for the position. He gave an example of this from within his own department.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if there was any additional public comment.

MOTION: Move to approve proposed LCB File No. R025-13 revising Sec. 1 of the NAC 284.361.  
BY: Commissioner Waugh  
SECOND: Commissioner Sanchez  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**VI. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF REMOVAL OR ADDITION OF CLASSES OR POSITIONS APPROVED FOR PRE-EMPLOYMENT SCREENING FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES**

A. Position to be removed from list of positions approved for pre-employment screening for controlled substances:

6.229 – Staff I, Associate Engineer – NDOT, PCN 027036

**Carrie Hughes**, Personnel Analyst, DHRM: Stated that NRS 284.4066 provided for the pre-employment testing for controlled substances of applicants for positions affecting public safety prior to hire. She stated that the law required the appointing authority to identify the specific positions that affected public safety requiring pre-employment testing subject to the approval of the Personnel Commission. She said the NDOT had requested the removal of the requirement of pre-employment screening for controlled substances for position number 027036, Class Code 6.229, Staff I, Associate Engineer and outlined in Agenda Item VI. A. She stated that they recommended the position be removed as it was their understanding that the position no longer required a commercial driver's licence and did not have safety-sensitive tasks.

**Chairperson Fox**: Asked if there were questions from the Commissioners or public comment. There was none.

**MOTION:** Move to approve proposed the removal of Staff I, Associate Engineer for NDOT, PCN 027036.

**BY:** Commissioner Mauger

**SECOND:** Commissioner Waugh

**VOTE:** The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

B. Positions and classes to be added to the list approved for pre-employment screening for controlled substances:

6.313 – Engineering Technician III – NDOT, PCN 101342

7.713 – Transportation Technician III – NDOT, All PCNs beginning with 805 & 813

7.714 – Transportation Technician IV – NDOT, All PCNs beginning with 805 and 813

7.715 – Transportation Technician II – NDOT, All PCNs beginning with 805 and 813

7.722 – Traffic Center Technician Supervisor – All PCNs

9.609 – Facility Supervisor II – NDOT, PCN 302001

**Carrie Hughes**, Personnel Analyst, DHRM: Stated that the NDOT had requested the approval of positions for pre-employment screening for controlled substances in class codes 6.313 Engineering Technician III, 7.713, Transportation Technician III, 7.714, Transportation Technician IV, 7.715, Transportation Technician II, 7.722, Traffic Center Technician Supervisor and 9.609, Facility Supervisor II as outlined in Agenda Item VI. B. They were recommending that the positions be added as it was their understanding that the positions had safety-sensitive tasks.

**Chairperson Fox**: Asked if there were questions from the Commissioners or public comment. There was none.

**MOTION:** Move to approve the classes approved for pre-employment screening specifically 6.313, Engineering Technician III; 7.713, Transportation Technician III; 7.714, Transportation Technician IV; 7.715, Transportation

Technician II; 7.722, Traffic Center Technician Supervisor; and 9.609, Facility Supervisor II and all positions within the Nevada Department of Transportation.

BY: Commissioner Waugh  
SECOND: Commissioner Read  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

## **VII. REPORT OF UNCONTESTED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES**

Posting #11-13, #12-13, #13-13, #14-13, #15-13, #01-14, #02-14, #03-14, #04-14 and #05-14.

**Chairperson Fox:** Stated that it did not require Commission approval.

## **VIII. SPECIAL REPORTS**

### **A. Bills Affecting Employees**

**Lee-Ann Easton,** Division Administrator, DHRM: Stated that they wanted to bring to the attention of the Commission bills that were passed during the 2013 Legislative Session that affected employees. She stated that there was a list of bills for various agencies that had been included in everyone's packets. She noted she would be happy to answer any questions.

**Chairperson Fox:** Stated that she saw under AB 511 that effective July 1, 2013 the 2.5% was restored to employees' salaries. **Lee-Ann Easton:** Confirmed yes. **Chairperson Fox:** Asked if longevity pay was still not being awarded. **Lee-Ann Easton:** Confirmed no.

### **B. Update regarding Parole functions from the Department of Public Safety, Division of Parole and Probation to the Department of Corrections**

**Rachel Baker,** Personnel Analyst, Classification Unit: Stated that on May 10, 2013 the classes, Parole Command Staff Series consisting of the Parole Major, Parole Captain and Parole Lieutenant, Parole Sergeant Agent Series and the Parole Specialist Series were presented to the Commission and approved contingent upon the transfer of parole functions from the Department of Public Safety, the Division of Parole and Probation to the Department of Corrections. She noted that the proposal to move these functions was not approved by the 2013 Legislative Session and therefore the classes would not go into effect. She added subsequently the pre-employment screening for controlled substances was null and void. She noted the existing Parole and Probation Specialist Series did not require pre-employment screening for controlled substances as the Department of Public Safety, Division of Parole and Probations had not identified the positions as affecting public safety under NRS 284.4066.

### **C. Award for NVAPPS**

**Lee-Ann Easton,** Division Administrator, DHRM: Stated that she wanted to bring to the attention of the Commission the fact that the Nevada Application System was given an international award. She asked one of the project coordinators, Micheal Shannon, to stand up. She noted that Micheal Shannon and Alan Rogers were the project managers for the project and they also submitted the application to obtain the award. She thanked them and noted they had received the G2 Award – the Government to Citizens Award.

**Chairperson Fox:** Asked if they had used their own in-house developed application or something off the shelf that was then customized.

**Micheal Shannon,** Business Process Analyst, DHRM: Responded that the application was developed through a contracted vendor who had done other work with the State of Nevada. He stated that it was a customized solution. He said it is currently maintained by internal staff but initially was developed by a contractor.

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

## **IX. PUBLIC COMMENT**

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. (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 Committee Chair may elect to allow additional public comment on a specific agenda item when the item is being considered.

**Commissioner Waugh:** Expressed his appreciation to the staff in the DHRM and his fellow Commissioners for helping him with his responsibilities at the Personnel Commission.

**Commissioner Read:** Asked Lee-Ann Easton to share the information they had just received regarding the Highway Patrol and aircraft situation raised at a previous meeting. **Lee-Ann Easton:** Indicated that she had spoken with Director Wright with DPS and he informed her that they had disbanded the flight program with DPS and were in the process of excessing all the planes.

## **X. ANNOUNCEMENT OF DATES FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**Chairperson Fox:** Stated that they had tentatively scheduled December 13, 2013 but there had been some suggestions to move it. It was decided that the next meeting would be January 10, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. She then noted a date of April 11, 2014 for the following meeting.

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Move to adjourn the meeting at  
BY: Chairperson Fox  
SECOND: Commissioner Read  
VOTED: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion