

as there is sufficient process. Tavis indicated he would like to see the code amended to avoid any conflicts.

Cal Kolling questioned whether the reason for addressing the issue is due to the recent roster given to the police department which contained applicants rejected in the prior hiring process. Stenberg confirmed stating the department had received more or less the same list of names for two hires. Sund stated the candidates were rejected for cause and without addressing the issue now, the City could be faced with re-advertising again and again.

Tavis questioned if the additional task placed at 15 is too early in the process or if maybe it should be placed after item 24 or 25. Sund stated the rejection would need to take place prior to the roster being approved. Cal Kolling questioned if any interviews were done prior to roster approval. Cianni indicated no interviews have been conducted to date prior to roster approval but they could be if desired. Lisko questioned if backgrounds on candidates should be done prior to roster approval, which would provide another layer of protection for the candidates. Sund stated the language could read “if applicable” instead of “prior 12 months”. Matt Kolling stated the discretionary cause should be made by Civil Service. Lisko stated he would be more comfortable if Civil Service is able to verify cause. Tavis indicated documentation would need to be provided to Civil Service as was done recently with the request to amend the roster. Stenberg stated in the case of the Police Department, the recommendations come from the interview panel as summarized by one person of the interview panel. Matt Kolling stated the determination would be that of hire-ability.

Cal Kolling questioned if the City utilizes Fair Credit practices. Sund indicated no. Tavis stated because background checks are done internally, the reporting requirements of using a third party does not apply. Kolling spoke of the process when Civil Service scored applicants.

Tavis questioned if there was any additional discussion regarding the employee hearing. Stenberg commented this is a unique situation, as he had not seen in before in the in the nine years he’s been with administration at the police department. Sund stated the current process is still fairly new and continues to evolve making the process better. Stenberg also commented there are several openings throughout the State which is making it more difficult to get the best candidates.

Tavis closed the hearing at 9:48 AM.

Tavis acknowledged that at the start of the meeting he preferred amending code over changing the hiring process, but through the discussion he is comfortable amending the process. Tavis stated task 25 still allows Civil service to confirm applicants were treated fairly. Sund stated when code is updated in the future the item could be addressed. Lisko commented as long as the cause is verifiable. Sund again indicated a letter of rejection could be sent to the applicants allowing them the chance to appeal. Matt Kolling agreed it would let the applicant know they are not being placed on the roster for a specified reason(s).

Kolling questioned where the background information is kept. Stenberg stated in their case it’s kept with the applicant’s application and destroyed following a hire. Tavis stated there will need to be documentation either in the form of a narrative report or the

background documents. Sund stated a form could be created to show cause for rejection. Tavis stated this gives Civil Service an additional level of due diligence.

Tavis questioned if the new task should stay where proposed or moved and if the wording was acceptable. Tavis again indicated Civil Service would need to review documentation prior to roster approval. Kolling questioned if the applicant's name would appear on the overall list. Tavis indicated it would appear at the bottom of the list. It was questioned if those being rejected could be given a phone interview for further information. Matt Kolling stated problems could arise if all applicants were not interviewed this way and recommended it be all or none.

Sund suggested moving the proposed task to follow setting of interviews as then all applicants would be scored and would not require an additional meeting if Civil Service did not agree with the cause for rejection. Tavis agreed it may be better to reject candidates after they are scored. Through discussion it was decided to move the task to follow conduct interviews and have it read "remove applicants deemed non-hirable for cause".

MOTION BY: Erv Bren SECONDED BY: Ron Lisko
To approve amending the Civil Service Hiring Process Sheet, moving the proposed task from number 15 to number 22 with the new task reading "Remove Applicants Deemed Non-Hirable for Cause with the responsibility being the City Administrator Designee.
DISPOSITION: Motion carried unanimously.

B. Other
None

6. ADJOURNMENT:
MOTION BY: Ron Lisko SECONDED BY: Cal Kolling
To adjourn the meeting at 10:15 AM.

OFFICIAL MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Kristi Cianni
Assistant to City Administrator