Annual Report
2002-2003
City and County of San Francisco
Civil Service Commission
Foremost in the Commission’s agenda is to modernize and streamline the Civil Service Commission Rules, to protect the civil service merit system, and to control costs which result from practices which may not be conducive to the efficient operation of a department. The Civil Service Commission recognizes the need to make our workforce more efficient by providing managers with the necessary tools which conform with and anticipate changes in the work environment so as to avoid expending unnecessary personnel time and resources on duplicative or archaic practices.
The Civil Service Commission held a total of 40 meetings during Fiscal Year 2002-2003. Of the 40 meetings, 20 were regular meetings and 20 were special meetings.

Regular Commission meetings are on the first and third Mondays of each month in City Hall Hearing Room 400. When the regular meeting falls on a holiday, the Commission meets on the next succeeding business day unless it designates another day to meet at a prior regular meeting. Special meetings are called by the President or a majority of the Commission. All meetings of the Commission are open to the public except as otherwise legally authorized.

Commission meetings are conducted in accordance with the Commission's Hearing Policies and Procedures attached to each Agenda and Notice of Commission Meeting documents.

Regular Commission meetings are organized as follows:

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Public Comment on Matters Appearing on the Agenda
3. Public comment on Agenda items
4. Approval of Minutes
5. Announcements
6. Changes to the Agenda, change in meeting schedule and other relevant information
7. Ratification Agenda
   - These are non-contested matters to be acted by a single vote of the Commission. No separate discussion on the items unless requested; the item is severed from the Ratification Agenda and considered a separate item. Matters on Ratification Agenda are proposed personal services contracts that have been posted for seven (7) calendar days by the Department of Human Resources and no appeals were received during the posting period.

8. Consent Agenda
   - All matters on the Consent Agenda will be acted upon by a single vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a request is made; in which event, the matter shall be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered as a separate item.

9. Commissioners Old Business
   - Follow up of previously discussed policy, procedure, or items having impact on the jurisdiction of the Commission.
Table of Contents

Letter of Transmittal from Commission President .............................................. 4
Morgan R. Gorrono to Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr.

Letter of Transmittal from Civil Service Commission ......................................... 5
Executive Officer Kate Favetti to the Civil Service Commission

Mission and Vision ................................................................. 7

Highlights of Fiscal Year 2002-2003 ................................................................. 8

The Commission Members ................................................................. 9
    Membership
    Biographies

The Civil Service Commission ............................................................... 14
    103 Years of Civil Service Commissioners ........................................... 14
    103 Years of General Managers and Executive Officers of the Civil Service Commission .... 17
    Important Milestones in the 103 Years of the City’s Merit System ................. 18

CIVIL SERVICE: 2003 ................................................................. 21
    Responsibility ................................................................. 21
    Organization Chart ........................................................... 22
    Staff ..................................................................................... 23
    Budget ................................................................................... 23
    Commission Meetings ............................................................... 24
    Wage Setting Responsibilities of the Civil Service Commission .................... 26
    Rules, Policies & Procedures ....................................................... 28
        Authority and Administration .................................................. 28
        Rules ................................................................................... 29
        Effective Classification Plan ..................................................... 31
        Professional/Personal Services Contracts ...................................... 32
        Hearings & Appeals ............................................................... 34
        Inspection Service .................................................................. 36

Employee Relations Ordinance Administration ............................................. 38

In Appreciation ................................................................. 41
December 1, 2003

The Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Brown:

It is with great pleasure that the Civil Service Commission submits its Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2002-2003. This year’s Annual Report reflects the Commission’s implementation of new Charter mandated responsibilities, its continued commitment and focus to modernize and clarify merit system rules and policies; at the same time, meeting the challenge of being responsive and fiscally responsible in this very difficult budget year. In addition, the Commission fulfilled its oversight of the merit system by hearing appeals and responding to issues presented by applicants, employees, advocates and members of the public through the newly implemented Charter mandated Inspection Service.

Following the mandate of the San Francisco voters in November 2002 to approve a Charter amendment delegating to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility to determine the Salaries of the Board of Supervisors, the Civil Service Commission set the salaries for the Board of Supervisors.

In its Rules and policy-making authority, the Civil Service Commission adopted Rules to clarify appeal filing time frames and the first Rules on Promotions in the Fire Department in more than twenty (20) years.

The Commission continues to define its role as the final arbiter of appeals and Rules on the City’s merit system. To this end, the Commission conducted a record number of hearings and meetings to resolve appeals and other matters under its jurisdiction. This included a number of well-attended public meetings to hear a complex and sensitive appeal on the removal of the Director of Elections.

On behalf of the members of the Civil Service Commission, I commend the staff for their excellent work in this fiscally challenging year and am pleased to forward the Commission’s Fiscal Year 2002-2003 Annual Report.

Respectfully submitted,

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Morgan R. Gorrono
President
December 1, 2003

Civil Service Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 720
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Commissioners:

This year’s Annual Report focuses on the accomplishments of the Civil Service Commission and its department during Fiscal Year 2002-2003 and highlights the important and expanding role the Civil Service Commission plays in creating a fair and equitable employment structure for the City and County of San Francisco.

In this very tight budget year, the Civil Service Commission and its staff were challenged to chart new territory in a number of “firsts!”

The voters in 2001 authorized the Civil Service Commission to be the final arbiter of an appeal of the Elections Commission to remove the Director of Elections. The Civil Service Commission heard a complex, sensitive and very public appeal by the Director of Elections of the decision of the Elections Commission to remove her from her position. This was an unprecedented appeal to the Civil Service Commission of an action of the Elections Commission as authorized under Charter Section 13.104. Every effort was made by the Commission to ensure that all aspects of the appeal including the adoption of procedures, timelines and guidelines for hearing the appeal as well as the appeal hearing itself, were conducted in an open and fair manner. The procedures adopted by the Civil Service Commission will serve as a model for any future appeals of this nature.

This year staff, on behalf of the Civil Service Commission, negotiated changes to the Rules to modernize the promotion rules in the San Francisco Fire Department – the first civil service promotion rules applicable to the Uniformed Ranks of the Fire Department not governed by a consent decree in over twenty (20) years!

The voters delegated the setting of salaries for the Members, Board of Supervisors in 2002 to the Civil Service Commission. Following the Charter requirements and Commission direction, staff surveyed more than 450 California cities and counties and related nationwide jurisdictions to gather data on salaries and additional information requested by the Civil Service Commission to set the salaries of the Board of Supervisors. This is the first time the Civil Service Commission has set the salaries of the Members of the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission Inspection Service was fully implemented this year – another first! This Charter mandated program provides a review of the operation of the merit system and responds to merit system issues presented by applicants, employees, employee organization representatives, advocates and members of the public.

Training workshops on the merit system were again conducted and attended in record numbers this year. Participants included departmental managers and staff, human resources professional and support staff, city attorneys and employee organization representatives. The Civil Service Commission’s publication, the Civil Service Adviser, continued as a regularly published voice for the merit system and this year covered such issues as Reinstatement, Seniority, Layoff, Staff Reports, Appeals, Appeals on Merit System matters and Appeals on Future Employment Restrictions.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Civil Service Commission for its support and to highlight the outstanding performance of the Civil Service Commission staff in achieving the Commission’s goals and objectives. I proudly transmit the Fiscal Year 2002-2003 Annual Report to you.

Respectfully submitted,

KATE FAVETTI
Executive Officer
The Civil Service Commission dedicates this year’s annual report to the Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr.,
Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, January 8, 1996 to January 7, 2004.

During his administration, Mayor Brown appointed eight Civil Service Commissioners providing
conscientious, dedicated and independent leadership to the Civil Service Commission.

A long time and tireless advocate for equal opportunity and diversity; Mayor Brown is a strong supporter of
a fair and equitable merit system.

The Civil Service Commission would like to recognize and express its deep appreciation to Mayor Brown for
his commitment and support of the civil service merit system.
Mission Statement

The Civil Service Commission’s Mission is to establish, ensure, and maintain an equitable and credible merit system for public service for the citizens of San Francisco. The Commission seeks to set the standard for excellence in personnel management through an effective, fair, and modern system that recognizes and builds on the diversity, skills, and dedication of public employees. The Commission’s goal is to consistently provide the best-qualified candidates for public service in a timely and cost-effective manner.
Highlights of Fiscal Year 2002-03

- Adopted Rules on Promotions applicable to the Uniformed Ranks of the San Francisco Fire Department – the first in over twenty (20) years;

- Conducted complex public hearings on the appeal of the decision of the Elections Commission to remove the Director of Elections;

- Set the Salary and salary setting cycle for the members of the Board of Supervisors;

- Adopted Rules to clarify filing appeals on Examination matters;

- Implemented the Charter mandated Inspection Service to review the operation of the merit system and to respond to merit system issues presented by applicants, employees, employee organization representatives, advocates and members of the public;

- Conducted a record number of training workshops on the merit system at both central locations and on-site workshops;

- Published Civil Service Advisers on Reinstatement, Appeals and Hearings Overview, Protests and Appeals, and Appeals on Future Employment;

- Met and discussed municipal, provincial and national civil service merit system administration and operations issues with international delegations visiting the United States;

- Provided internship at the Civil Service Commission office to a visiting scholar from Guangdong province, China participating in the Senior Executive Training Program at San Francisco State University. The study project focused on human resource management and development in city and state public administration;

- Conducted a Special Meeting with the Council of Human Resources Managers to address merit system issues facing departments.
Rules, Policies and Procedures Administration

Civil Service Commission Rules

Foremost in the Commission’s agenda is to modernize and streamline the Civil Service Commission Rules, to protect the civil service merit system, and to control costs which result from practices which may not be conducive to the efficient operation of a department. The Civil Service Commission recognizes the need to make our workforce more efficient by providing managers with the necessary tools which conform with and anticipate changes in the work environment so as to avoid expending unnecessary personnel time and resources on duplicative or archaic practices.

In its effort to address City departments’ need for flexibility in personnel management, the Commission has an on-going process of seeking input from departments and responding to the needs expressed regarding the City’s merit system. The Committee on Policy and Rules Revision (COPAR), made up of various departmental representatives, Department of Human Resources representative and Commission staff convenes regularly to share concerns, provide advice and address the operation of the merit system. COPAR reviews, evaluates and makes recommendations on needed Rules changes. Commission Rules are evaluated to assure compliance with federal, state and local laws.

Meet and confer sessions are conducted by Commission staff before adoption of new and/or amended Rules.

Policies and Procedures

Service accessibility and utilization of its services is a priority of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has made available and expanded its on-line information through the Commission website. Policy and procedures on “Appeals and Requests for Hearings” and “Submission of Written Reports on Appeals” have been updated and available in on-line, electronic and print formats.

Membership of the Commission

The Civil Service Commission is composed of five (5) members, each appointed to serve a six-year term. Commissioners presently serving on the Commission are:

Morgan R. Gorrono
President, appointed February 2000 by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr.

Commissioner Morgan R. Gorrono is the former owner of The Bar on Castro and has been credited for turning the establishment into an upscale lounge-type meeting place and changing the gay bar scene in San Francisco. He was also the Chief Operations Manager of The Café and was instrumental in creating a diverse customer base and initiating an aggressive diversity-hiring program of bartenders and staff receiving full benefits. His efforts have made The Café the 2nd biggest employer in the Castro area. He sold his interest in the business and has a new business venture in home restoration and repair.

Commissioner Gorrono is active in numerous community service and non-profit organizations. His fundraising activities have benefited P.A.W.S, The AIDS Emergency Fund, The God Father Service Fund and Breast Cancer Research. His community service activities include: Board Member of Merchants of Upper Market and Castro (M.U.M.C.); Founding member and Vice President of the District 8 Democratic Club; Member of C.O.B., an oversight group working to create a Gay/Lesbian homeless youth shelter; Member of Upper Market Citizens Patrol; Member of Mayor Brown’s Lavender Steering Committee; Member of Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club; and is an active Member of the S.P.C.A.

Commissioner Gorrono is deeply interested in public safety and law enforcement and works closely with the Mission Police Station, the Police Department and the Police Commission on community safety and protection and officer safety programs.
Membership of the Commission

Linda Richardson
Vice President, appointed June 2001 by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr.

Commissioner Richardson is a former member of the Commission on the Environment and Planning Commission and served as president of the Southeast Community Facility Commission. She is a tireless advocate on behalf of the Southeast neighborhood community where she worked on issues ranging from environmental justice, health, land use and planning, and community revitalization. She has also led successful efforts on behalf of women and children. Ms. Richardson has advised and collaborated on citywide sustainable economic development.

Commissioner Richardson has held numerous positions in the City and County of San Francisco government; most notably, in the administration of Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr., on the San Francisco Planning Commission where she promoted economic growth, approved development of commercial and residential projects, which resulted in the creation of thousands of jobs and new businesses for the San Francisco economy. She also served in the administration of former Mayors Art Agnos and Frank Jordan.

Commissioner Richardson is frequently sought by businesses and corporations for advice on business development and neighborhood revitalization.

Commissioner Richardson has also worked on several community development projects with a variety of agencies to increase health and environmental services to the Southeast neighborhood and to create a clean and safe Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. She serves as a steering committee member to the Southeast Neighborhood Jobs Initiative Coalition; worked on the establishment of the Southeast Career Center, the MUNI Third Street Light Rail Project, the Southern Waterfront Advisory Committee, and led the efforts against building the proposed Applied Energy Services, Inc. power plant in the Bayview-Hunters Point area. She led the negotiations that resulted in the shutting down of the existing Hunters Point power plant and advocated and supports the use of sustainable alternative energy sources. This led to the State Legislature granting $13 million to the Southeast community for energy and health related projects. She co-founded the Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice (SAEJ) and the Health and Environment Assessment Task Force; helped secure $10 million to upgrade the Southeast Sewage Treatment plant, and chaired the Land Use, Planning, and Transportation Project Area Committee. Commissioner Richardson has extensive expertise in telecommunication and electronic data systems. She serves on a 12-member task force appointed by Mayor Brown to advise his administration, the Public Utilities Commission and the City on the proposed $4.5 billion capital improvement of the vast San Francisco public utility infrastructure.

Commissioner Richardson is an internationally recognized leader on environmental justice and economic development. In July 2002 California Governor Gray Davis appointed Commissioner Richardson to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), a regulatory agency with representatives from the nine Bay Area counties. The Commission was established to prevent the unnecessary filling of the San Francisco Bay, to increase public access to and along the Bay, great natural resources for the benefit of the public and to encourage development compatible with this protection. She has lectured, advocated and appeared before the United States Congress, various government institutions, academic, business, and community organizations. She received recognition from the United States Congress for her lifetime work on health and environmental justice. She also advises many African leaders on environmental, technology, and infrastructure assessment and development issues. Most recently, she was invited to provide counsel to several African nations and plans to facilitate trade opportunities between the United States and Africa.

Commissioner Richardson received the “Rookie of the Year” award from the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Democratic Club for her work in protecting persons with disabilities, the 2000 Martin Luther King Jr. Distinguished Community Service Award, and the Bank of America Employee of the Month Award for her work on interstate and large-scale technology projects.

She is on the Board of many civic and professional organizations including the League of Women Voters, National Women’s Political Caucus (NWPC), San Francisco Women Political Committee, and the Southeast Neighborhood Jobs Initiative Coalition.
Civil Service Commission

Membership of the Commission

Alicia D. Becerril
Appointed August 2003 by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr.

Commissioner Alicia D. Becerril is an Administrative Law Judge with the State of California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board where she conducts hearings and prepares decisions on the appeals of unemployment insurance benefit and disability insurance benefit cases. Prior to taking this position, Commissioner Becerril served as the Board’s Associate Chief Counsel.

Commissioner Becerril began her legal career in public interest law with the State of California, Agriculture Labor Relations Board, Energy Commission and the Department of Health. She later worked as an attorney in the private sector with law firms specializing in commercial litigation, products liability, employment law, and personal injury.

Commissioner Becerril has long been active in civic and community organizations and has worked to improve neighborhoods, ensure public safety and protect small businesses. She served as a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco. She is the current President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco and Instituto Laboral de La Raza. Commissioner Becerril has also served as a Commissioner on the City and County of San Francisco Human Rights Commission, Board of Appeals, Landmarks Advisory Board, and the City of Oakland Community and Economic Development Advisory Commission. She was formerly a member of the Executive Committee of San Francisco Partnership; Director, San Francisco International Trade Council, and past-President of the U.C. Davis School of Law Alumni Association.

Commissioner Becerril worked as a law professor at the University of Northern California in Sacramento, and adjunct professor of MBA courses on international business at Golden Gate University in San Francisco. She received her undergraduate degree in Social Science, teaching credential from Sacramento State College, and law degree from the School of Law at the University of California at Davis.

Commissioner Becerril’s son is a second-year law student at the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law.

Commissioner Becerril is proud to be a regular MUNI rider.
Commission Meetings

The Civil Service Commission held a total of 40 meetings during Fiscal Year 2002-2003. Of the 40 meetings, 20 were regular meetings and 20 were special meetings.

Regular Commission meetings are on the first and third Mondays of each month in City Hall Hearing Room 400. When the regular meeting falls on a holiday, the Commission meets on the next succeeding business day unless it designates another day to meet at a prior regular meeting. Special meetings are called by the President or a majority of the Commission. All meetings of the Commission are open to the public except as otherwise legally authorized.

Commission meetings are conducted in accordance with the Commission’s Hearing Policies and Procedures attached to each Agenda and Notice of Commission Meeting documents.

Regular Commission meetings are organized as follows:

- Call to Order and Roll Call
- Public Comment on Matters Appearing on the Agenda
- Public comment on Agenda items
- Approval of Minutes
- Announcements
- Changes to the Agenda, change in meeting schedule and other relevant information
- Ratification Agenda
  - These are non-contested matters to be acted by a single vote of the Commission. No separate discussion on the items unless requested; the item is severed from the Ratification Agenda and considered a separate item. Matters on Ratification Agenda are proposed personal services contracts that have been posted for seven (7) calendar days by the Department of Human Resources and no appeals were received during the posting period.
- Consent Agenda
  - All matters on the Consent Agenda will be acted upon by a single vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a request is made; in which event, the matter shall be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered as a separate item.
- Commissioners Old Business
  - Follow up of previously discussed policy, procedure, or items having impact on the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Membership of the Commission

Donald A. Casper
Appointed March 2000 by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr.

Commissioner Donald A. Casper is a member of the San Francisco law firm of Jacobs, Spotswood, Casper & Murphy LLP. He maintains a general civil practice serving the needs of small businesses and individuals in both transactional and litigation matters. His areas of concentration include professional, non-profit and closely held business corporations; contractual relations between business entities; real property and landlord-tenant law; and election law.

A fourth-generation San Franciscan, Commissioner Casper lives in the North Beach neighborhood. He has a long history of community involvement, both within his neighborhood and citywide. He currently serves on the boards of RCH Inc. (formerly Recreation Center for the Handicapped), the Salesian Boys’ and Girls’ Club, and the Columbus Day Celebration. He was chairman of the RCH Board of Directors from 1989 to 1988. Since 1994, he has chaired the board of Columbus Day Celebration, sponsor of the City’s annual Italian Heritage Parade. He also, has served as a director of the Italian-American Community Services Agency and the Tenderloin Senior Organizing Project.

In 1986, Commissioner Casper served as president of the St. Thomas More Society of San Francisco, an association of Catholic lawyers and jurists. He has been a member of the Legal Affairs Advisory committee of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco. From 1991 to 1994, he sat on the Community Advisory Board of St. Mary’s Hospital and Medical Center.

Commissioner Casper was chairman of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee from January 1997 until June 2002. Appointed to fill a vacancy on the committee in 1991, he was returned by Republican voters in the 13th Assembly District every two years between 1992 and 2000. His fellow committee members elected him chair three times. He also served on the California Republican State Central Committee.

Since 1993, Commissioner Casper has been a member of the governing board of the San Francisco State Building Authority, a state-local joint powers agency charged with the restoration of the Earl Warren State Office Building and construction of the adjoining Hiram W. Johnson Building, in San Francisco’s Civic Center. The complex houses the California Supreme Court, and the First District Court of Appeal, as well as regional offices of other state government entities.

Commissioner Casper attended Salesian Grammar School and St. Ignatius College Preparatory in San Francisco. He received his undergraduate and law degrees from Georgetown University. He was editor-in-chief of Georgetown’s undergraduate weekly newspaper, The Hoya, and was the first recipient of the university’s Edward Bunn Award for Journalistic Excellence. In 1982-83, he was president of the Georgetown Alumni Club of Northern California.

An avid long-distance runner, Commissioner Casper has completed nine marathons, including the 2001 Marine Corps Marathon in Washington, D.C.

Commissioner Casper served as president of the Civil Service Commission from June 2002 until June 2003. For civil service matters, he can be reached at civil-service@casper-law.net.
Rules, Policies and Procedures Administration

Civil Service Commission Rules

Foremost in the Commission’s agenda is to modernize and streamline the Civil Service Commission Rules, to protect the civil service merit system, and to control costs which result from practices which may not be conducive to the efficient operation of a department. The Civil Service Commission recognizes the need to make our workforce more efficient by providing managers with the necessary tools which conform with and anticipate changes in the work environment so as to avoid expending unnecessary personnel time and resources on duplicative or archaic practices.

In its effort to address City departments’ need for flexibility in personnel management, the Commission has an on-going process of seeking input from departments and responding to the needs expressed regarding the City’s merit system. The Committee on Policy and Rules Revision (COPAR), made up of various departmental representatives, Department of Human Resources representative and Commission staff convenes regularly to share concerns, provide advise and address the operation of the merit system. COPAR reviews, evaluates and makes recommendations on needed Rules changes. Commission Rules are evaluated to assure compliance with federal, state and local laws.

Meet and confer sessions are conducted by Commission staff before adoption of new and/or amended Rules.

Policies and Procedures

Service accessibility and utilization of its services is a priority of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has made available and expanded its on-line information through the Commission website. Policy and procedures on “Appeals and Requests for Hearings” and “Submission of Written Reports on Appeals” have been updated and available in on-line, electronic and print formats.

Membership of the Commission

Thomas T. Ng
Appointed May 2003 by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr.

Commissioner Thomas T. Ng is a former member of the San Francisco Fire Commission, past president of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (“Chinese Six Companies”), founder and chairman of the Hoy Sun Memorial Cemetery. He also served as board president of many organizations, including Chinese Hospital, the Hoy Sun Ning Yung Benevolent Association, the Chinese Cultural Services Center, the National (and International) Eng Family Association, and the Asia Society of Arts of America. His directorships include service on the Bay Area United Way, Chinese for Affirmative Action and numerous other community organizations.

Commissioner Ng’s community activities centers in promoting community involvement and civic participation by the influential and complex network of Chinese family associations. He helped foster a new spirit of cooperation in a Chinatown which had been divided sharply by overseas politics during the three decades following World War II.

Commissioner Ng received his education at San Francisco State University. He is fluent in English, Chinese and other different dialects. Commissioner Ng’s contributions to the community are recognized with his receiving the following awards: Chinese American Voters Education Committee, Chinese Charity Cultural Services Center, Bay Area United Way, Asian Women Resource Center; and Geen Mum Neighborhood Center.

An influential community and business leader, Commissioner Ng is the former owner of the popular Uncle’s Coffee Shop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of Service</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/08/1900-01/07/01</td>
<td>P.H. McCarthy</td>
<td>James D. Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/1900-01/07/02</td>
<td>John R. Quinn</td>
<td>James D. Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/1900-01/07/03</td>
<td>J. Richard Freud</td>
<td>James D. Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/01-01/07/03</td>
<td>P.H. McCarthy</td>
<td>James D. Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/02-01/07/03</td>
<td>Charles A. Murdock</td>
<td>James D. Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/02-01/07/05</td>
<td>Lois J. Ohnimus</td>
<td>James D. Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/02-01/07/05</td>
<td>John W. Rogers</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/03-01/07/04</td>
<td>Charles J. Williams</td>
<td>James D. Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/03-01/07/06</td>
<td>Joseph R.R. Mershore</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/20/03-01/07/06</td>
<td>George H. Bahrs</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/04-01/07/06</td>
<td>Charles J. Williams</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/05-12/15/05</td>
<td>John W. Rogers</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/05-01/07/08</td>
<td>Edward F. Moran</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/06-01/07/07</td>
<td>Richard Cornelius</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/06-01/07/09</td>
<td>George H. Bahrs</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/07-01/07/10</td>
<td>Richard Cornelius</td>
<td>E.E. Schmitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/08-01/31/10</td>
<td>Matthew I. Brady</td>
<td>Edward R. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/09-01/07/12</td>
<td>George H. Bahrs</td>
<td>Edward R. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/10-01/07/12</td>
<td>Frank C. McDonald</td>
<td>P.H. McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/10-08/26/10</td>
<td>Charles M. Leavy</td>
<td>P.H. McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/26/10-01/07/11</td>
<td>Benjamin B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>P.H. McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/11-01/07/14</td>
<td>Benjamin B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>P.H. McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/12-01/07/13</td>
<td>Harry E. Michael</td>
<td>P. H. McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/12-01/07/15</td>
<td>Earle A. Walcott</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/13-01/07/15</td>
<td>Matthew I. Brady</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/14-07/01/17</td>
<td>Benjamin B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/15-07/01/15</td>
<td>John J. O’Toole</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/15-07/01/18</td>
<td>Earle A. Walcott</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/15-06/30/21</td>
<td>John J. O’Toole</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/17-06/30/23</td>
<td>George A. Tracey</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/19-06/30/25</td>
<td>Earle A. Walcott</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/21-01/04/26</td>
<td>John J. O’Toole</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/23-12/18/23</td>
<td>George A. Tracey</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/24-06/30/29</td>
<td>John F. Davis</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/25-06/30/31</td>
<td>Earle A. Walcott</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/26-06/30/27</td>
<td>Hugh McKevitt</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/27-01/27/31</td>
<td>Hugh McKevitt</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/29-06/30/35</td>
<td>William P. McCabe</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
103 Years of Civil Service Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM OF SERVICE</th>
<th>COMMISSIONER</th>
<th>MAYOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/03/31-06/30/31</td>
<td>Lewis F. Byington</td>
<td>James Rolph, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/31-06/30/33</td>
<td>Howard M. McKinley</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/31-06/30/37</td>
<td>Lewis F. Byington</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/32-06/30/37</td>
<td>Harry K. Wolff</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/33-06/30/39</td>
<td>Howard M. McKinley</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/35-06/30/41</td>
<td>Milton S. Maxwell</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/37-06/30/43</td>
<td>Harry K. Wolff</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/39-01/21/41</td>
<td>Howard M. McKinley</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/41-06/30/47</td>
<td>Milton S. Maxwell</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/21/41-04/16/44</td>
<td>John W. Bender</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/43-06/30/49</td>
<td>Harry K. Wolff</td>
<td>Angelo J. Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/44-06/30/45</td>
<td>Allan E. Charles</td>
<td>Roger D. Lapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/45-07/10/47</td>
<td>Allan E. Charles</td>
<td>Roger D. Lapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/47-06/30/53</td>
<td>Francis P. Walsh</td>
<td>Roger D. Lapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/47-06/30/51</td>
<td>John M. Kennedy</td>
<td>Roger D. Lapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/49-06/30/55</td>
<td>Charles T. McDonough</td>
<td>Elmer E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/51-11/14/53</td>
<td>John M. Kennedy</td>
<td>Elmer E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/53-06/30/55</td>
<td>William Lahaniar</td>
<td>Elmer E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/53-09/30/58</td>
<td>Francis P. Walsh</td>
<td>Elmer E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/55-06/30/57</td>
<td>John E. Hogg</td>
<td>Elmer E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/55-06/30/60</td>
<td>William Lahaniar</td>
<td>Elmer E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/57-06/30/63</td>
<td>William Kilpatrick</td>
<td>George Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/58-06/30/59</td>
<td>Hubert J. Soher</td>
<td>George Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/59-10/23/64</td>
<td>Hubert J. Soher</td>
<td>George Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/60-06/30/61</td>
<td>Richard C. Ham</td>
<td>George Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/61-06/30/67</td>
<td>Richard C. Ham</td>
<td>George Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/63-06/30/69</td>
<td>William Kilpatrick</td>
<td>John F. Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/64-06/30/65</td>
<td>Dorothy Von Beroldingen</td>
<td>John F. Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/65-06/01/66</td>
<td>Dorothy Von Beroldingen</td>
<td>John F. Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/66-06/30/71</td>
<td>Yori Wada</td>
<td>John F. Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/67-11/17/71</td>
<td>John Molinari</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/69-06/12/72</td>
<td>William Kilpatrick</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/71-06/15/72</td>
<td>Gary P. Vannelli</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/71-06/30/77</td>
<td>William J. Chow</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/72-06/30/75</td>
<td>Robert J. Costello</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/15/72-06/30/73</td>
<td>Joseph C. Tarantino</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/73-03/07/79</td>
<td>Joseph C. Tarantino</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/75-10/25/75</td>
<td>Robert J. Costello</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Civil Service Commission held a total of 40 meetings during Fiscal Year 2002-2003. Of the 40 meetings, 20 were regular meetings and 20 were special meetings.

Regular Commission meetings are on the first and third Mondays of each month in City Hall Hearing Room 400. When the regular meeting falls on a holiday, the Commission meets on the next succeeding business day unless it designates another day to meet at a prior regular meeting. Special meetings are called by the President or a majority of the Commission. All meetings of the Commission are open to the public except as otherwise legally authorized.

Commission meetings are conducted in accordance with the Commission's Hearing Policies and Procedures attached to each Agenda and Notice of Commission Meeting documents.

Regular Commission meetings are organized as follows:

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Public Comment on Matters Appearing on the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Announcements
5. Changes to the Agenda, change in meeting schedule and other relevant information
6. Ratification Agenda
   - These are non-contested matters to be acted by a single vote of the Commission. No separate discussion on the items unless requested; the item is severed from the Ratification Agenda and considered a separate item. Matters on Ratification Agenda are proposed personal services contracts that have been posted for seven (7) calendar days by the Department of Human Resources and no appeals were received during the posting period.
7. Consent Agenda
   - All matters on the Consent Agenda will be acted upon by a single vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a request is made; in which event, the matter shall be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered as a separate item.
8. Commissioners Old Business
   - Follow up of previously discussed policy, procedure, or items having impact on the jurisdiction of the Commission.

103 Years of Civil Service Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM OF SERVICE</th>
<th>COMMISSIONER</th>
<th>MAYOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/25/75-04/26/79</td>
<td>Frank N. Alioto</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/75-06/30/81</td>
<td>Darrell J. Salomon</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/75-06/30/81</td>
<td>Genevieve Powell</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/77-11/15/77</td>
<td>William J. Chow</td>
<td>George R. Moscone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/77-09/26/78</td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>George R. Moscone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/26/78-09/10/79</td>
<td>Rolland C. Lowe</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/79-06/30/79</td>
<td>Carlota Texidor del Portillo</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/79-06/30/81</td>
<td>Allen Haile</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/79-06/30/85</td>
<td>Carlota Texidor del Portillo</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/79-06/30/83</td>
<td>Louis Hop Lee</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/81-02/17/82</td>
<td>Allen Haile</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/81-03/29/84</td>
<td>Darrell J. Salomon</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/81-06/30/87</td>
<td>Genevieve Powell</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/82-06/30/87</td>
<td>Howard Gloyd</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/83-06/30/89</td>
<td>Louis Hop Lee</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/84-06/30/87</td>
<td>A. Lee Munson</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/85-01/04/91</td>
<td>Carlota Texidor del Portillo (6)</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/87-01/29/88</td>
<td>Timothy L. Porter</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/87-10/04/93</td>
<td>Cleo Donovan</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/87-06/30/93</td>
<td>A. Lee Munson</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/88-10/04/93</td>
<td>Grant S. Mickins, III</td>
<td>Art Agnos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/89-09/11/89</td>
<td>Louis Hop Lee</td>
<td>Art Agnos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/89-09/02/90</td>
<td>Richard J. Tomoda</td>
<td>Art Agnos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/91-10/11/94</td>
<td>Emi R. Uyehara</td>
<td>Art Agnos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/91-06/30/91</td>
<td>Juan Rios</td>
<td>Art Agnos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/91-06/30/97</td>
<td>Juan Rios</td>
<td>Art Agnos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/93-06/30/99</td>
<td>Karen Clopton</td>
<td>Frank Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/93-02/03/00</td>
<td>George Kosturos</td>
<td>Frank Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/93-02/03/00</td>
<td>A. Lee Munson</td>
<td>Frank Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/94-06/30/95</td>
<td>Adrienne G. Pon</td>
<td>Frank Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/95-05/09/03</td>
<td>Adrienne G. Pon</td>
<td>Frank Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/97-08/13/03</td>
<td>Rosabella Safont</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/99-Present</td>
<td>Morgan R. Gororno</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/99-Present</td>
<td>Donald A. Casper</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/99-10/01/00</td>
<td>Karen Clopton</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/01-04/10/01</td>
<td>Johnnie Carter, Jr.</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/01-Present</td>
<td>Linda Richardson</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/03 – Present</td>
<td>Thomas T. Ng</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/03 – Present</td>
<td>Alicia D. Becerril</td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foremost in the Commission’s agenda is to modernize and streamline the Civil Service Commission Rules, to protect the civil service merit system, and to control costs which result from practices which may not be conducive to the efficient operation of a department. The Civil Service Commission recognizes the need to make our workforce more efficient by providing managers with the necessary tools which conform with and anticipate changes in the work environment so as to avoid expending unnecessary personnel time and resources on duplicative or archaic practices.

In its effort to address City departments’ need for flexibility in personnel management, the Commission has an on-going process of seeking input from departments and responding to the needs expressed regarding the City’s merit system. The Committee on Policy and Rules Revision (COPAR), made up of various departmental representatives, Department of Human Resources representative and Commission staff convenes regularly to share concerns, provide advise and address the operation of the merit system. COPAR reviews, evaluates and makes recommendations on needed Rules changes. Commission Rules are evaluated to assure compliance with federal, state and local laws.

Meet and confer sessions are conducted by Commission staff before adoption of new and/or amended Rules.

### Policies and Procedures

Service accessibility and utilization of its services is a priority of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has made available and expanded its on-line information through the Commission website. Policy and procedures on “Appeals and Requests for Hearings” and “Submission of Written Reports on Appeals” have been updated and available in on-line, electronic and print formats.

### 103 Years of General Managers and Executive Officers of the Civil Service Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>APPOINTED</th>
<th>APPOINTMENT ENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward F. Moran</td>
<td>January 1, 1900</td>
<td>December 18, 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aarons H. Powers</td>
<td>December 18, 1905</td>
<td>December 31, 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James J. Maher</td>
<td>January 13, 1908</td>
<td>December 1, 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Henderson</td>
<td>December 1, 1938</td>
<td>June 9, 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Dolen</td>
<td>June 9, 1943</td>
<td>February 14, 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Henderson</td>
<td>February 15, 1945</td>
<td>September 4, 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Albert (Acting)</td>
<td>September 11, 1958</td>
<td>November 14, 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Grubb</td>
<td>November 14, 1958</td>
<td>December 14, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard A. Orsi</td>
<td>December 15, 1971</td>
<td>March 1, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James F. Wurm (Acting)</td>
<td>January 9, 1974</td>
<td>June 6, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James F. Wurm (Acting)</td>
<td>August 26, 1974</td>
<td>January 7, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Walsh</td>
<td>March 3, 1977</td>
<td>March 29, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert C. Walker (Acting)</td>
<td>March 30, 1992</td>
<td>April 18, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell L. Pryor</td>
<td>April 19, 1993</td>
<td>December 5, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert C. Walker *</td>
<td>December 6, 1993</td>
<td>January 1, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Favetti</td>
<td>March 16, 1998</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Proposition “L” (11/93) Restructured Personnel function and created a Department of Human Resources separate from the Civil Service Commission. Albert C. Walker was granted permanent civil service status to Executive Officer, Civil Service Commission by the terms of Proposition L (1932 Charter Sec. 3.661, 1996 Charter Section 10.101). The position became appointive by the Civil Service Commission upon Mr. Walker’s vacating.
Important Events that have Shaped the City and County of San Francisco Merit System

1900 Establishment of the Civil Service Commission

The San Francisco Civil Service System was established under the 1900 Freeholder Charter.

- San Francisco Civil Service Commission was established, simultaneously with the establishment of the merit system for the City and County of San Francisco.

- The Civil Service Commission one of the oldest in the country, pre-dated only by just a few years by Chicago, New York, and a few other Eastern municipalities. San Francisco has the oldest civil service system West of the Mississippi.

- The first members of the Commission were P.H. McCarthy, John E. Quinn, and Richard Freud, who were appointed by Mayor James D. Phelan on December 30, 1899.

- The Commission’s first meeting occurred on January 5, 1900; Richard Freud was elected president.

- The first competitive examination was held on January 8, 1900, and as a result, Edward F. Moran was appointed “Chief Examiner and Secretary” of the Commission.

- The offices of the Commission opened to the public at noon, January 8, 1900, and by 5:00 p.m., 621 Laborers applications were received and hundreds of applications for examinations were issued.

1932 Charter Reform

- Enlarged the scope of duties of the Civil Service Commission

- Gave greater powers to the Civil Service Commission to enforce its rulings and included the following important components:
  - Control of the classification plan;
  - Restrictions on exempt appointments;
  - Provisions for practical, free and competitive examinations;
  - Persons appointed subject to a six-month probationary period;
  - Decision of Civil Service Commission on appeals is final;
  - Prohibition of political activity;
  - Central control to assure the unhampered operation of the merit system.
Important Events that have Shaped the City and County of San Francisco Merit System

1975 Expansion of Civil Service Commission

The electorate voted to:
- Expand the Civil Service Commission from three (3) members to five (5) members;
- Require not less than one member be a woman;
- Require a special oath upon appointment.

1979 Compliance agreement between the Office of Revenue Sharing and the City & County of San Francisco.

- Created open, competitive process for promotive examination;
- Allowed horizontal and vertical access to the promotive system;
- Permitted an accelerated examination process to address long-term temporary employees;
- Expanded recruitment efforts for city jobs to support the citywide equal employment opportunity plan;
- Established an in-house discrimination complaint procedure.

1991 Civil Service Reform and Collective Bargaining

The electorate approved four (4) ballot measures that:
- Removed a number of Charter provisions word for word and added them to the Civil Service Commission Rules to allow for negotiation on changes through a meet and confer process;
- Increased flexibility in classification of positions;
- Established the minimum certification Rule of Three Scores;
- Provided for collective bargaining subject to merit system carve-outs.

1993 Creation of the Department of Human Resources

Ballot measure approved by the electorate:
- To create the Department of Human Resources effective January 1, 1994;
- Redefined the Civil Service Commission role from an operational personnel department to a policy making/appeals board.
Important Events that have Shaped the City and County of San Francisco Merit System

1996 Charter Revision

- The 1932 Charter was revised, recodified and reorganized;
- The role of the Civil Service Commission was clarified to reflect the Civil Service Commission’s jurisdiction and the merit system in the new collective bargaining environment;
- Limits were placed in the Charter on the duration of provisional appointments;
- Required that not less than two (2) members of the Civil Service Commission shall be women.

1999 Creation of Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) (Proposition E)

- Voters approved the creation of the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) in November 1999 election;
- Preserved the role of the Civil Service Commission as to merit system issues in the Municipal Transportation Agency.

2001 Appeal to the Civil Service Commission of the Removal of the Director of Elections (Proposition E)

- Voters approved amendments to the Department of Elections in November 2001;
- The Elections Commission to appoint the Director of Elections from a list of qualified applicants according to the civil service provisions of the Charter;
- Removal of the Director of Elections by the Elections Commission may be appealed to the Civil Service Commission.

2002 Salary Setting – Board of Supervisors

- Voters approved Charter Amendment to provide that the job of the members of the Board of Supervisors is full time and that the salaries be set by the Civil Service Commission once every 5 years.
The Civil Service Commission is charged to oversee, regulate, and serve as final arbiter of the City and County of San Francisco civil service merit system. The Civil Service Commission fulfills its Charter and legal mandates by:

- Establishing Rules, regulations, policies, and procedures that provide the framework for the operation of the City and County personnel system. For example, the Commission approves Rules and procedures governing equal employment opportunity, applications, examinations, eligibility, duration of eligible lists, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, and other personnel related matters;

- Hearing of appeals of administrative actions and decisions of the Human Resources Director, the Director of Transportation and its Executive Officer, including discrimination complaints, and rendering final and binding decisions;

- Investigating and resolving charges and complaints of discrimination, sexual harassment, and otherwise prohibited nepotism and favoritism;

- Instituting legal proceedings, if necessary, to abate violations of the Civil Service merit system provisions of the City and County Charter and Commission regulations;

- Directing the Human Resources Director to take such action as the Commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service merit system provisions of the Charter;

- Directing the Municipal Transportation Agency Director to take such action as the Commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service merit system provisions of the Charter applicable to Service-Critical classifications at the Municipal Transportation Agency;

- Providing training and education of the merit system;

- Monitoring and auditing the operation of the merit system through Inspection services;

- Conducting salary and other personnel, human resources related surveys;

- Setting salaries and benefits of elected officials;

- Providing outreach, information and notification of the Catastrophic Illness Program (CIP); and

- Administering the City’s Employee Relations Ordinance.

The Civil Service Commission continues to focus on its Charter-mandated functions on formulating policy and creating the structure for the personnel system of the City and County.
Civil Service Commission

Morgan R. Gorrono, President
6/2/03 – Present
Donald A. Casper, President
7/1/02 – 6/2/03
Linda Richardson, Vice President
9/15/03 – Present
Rosabella Safont, Vice President
6/2/03 – 8/13/03
Morgan R. Gorrono, Vice President
7/1/02 – 6/2/03
Alicia D. Becerril, Commissioner
8/14/03 – Present
Adrienne Pon, Commissioner
10/8/94 – 5/9/03
Thomas T. Ng, Commissioner
5/10/03 – Present

Executive Officer
Kate Favetti

Senior Personnel Analyst
Yvette L. Gamble

Assistant Executive Officer
Anita Sanchez

Labor Negotiator
Gene D. Rucker

Appeals Coordinator
Gloria Sheppard

Rules, Personnel & Office Coordinator
Lizzette Henríquez

Administrative Staff Assistant
Elizabeth García
Rules, Policies and Procedures Administration

Civil Service Commission Rules

Foremost in the Commission's agenda is to modernize and streamline the Civil Service Commission Rules, to protect the civil service merit system, and to control costs which result from practices which may not be conducive to the efficient operation of a department. The Civil Service Commission recognizes the need to make our workforce more efficient by providing managers with the necessary tools which conform with and anticipate changes in the work environment so as to avoid expending unnecessary personnel time and resources on duplicative or archaic practices.

In its effort to address City departments' need for flexibility in personnel management, the Commission has an on-going process of seeking input from departments and responding to the needs expressed regarding the City's merit system. The Committee on Policy and Rules Revision (COPAR), made up of various departmental representatives, Department of Human Resources representative and Commission staff convenes regularly to share concerns, provide advise and address the operation of the merit system. COPAR reviews, evaluates and makes recommendations on needed Rules changes. Commission Rules are evaluated to assure compliance with federal, state and local laws.

Meet and confer sessions are conducted by Commission staff before adoption of new and/or amended Rules.

Policies and Procedures

Service accessibility and utilization of its services is a priority of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has made available and expanded its on-line information through the Commission website. Policy and procedures on "Appeals and Requests for Hearings" and "Submission of Written Reports on Appeals" have been updated and available in on-line, electronic and print formats.

Staff

Kate Favetti, Executive Officer
Yvette L. Gamble, Senior Personnel Analyst
Elizabeth García, Administrative Staff Assistant
Lizzette Henríquez, Rules, Personnel and Office Coordinator
Gene D. Rucker, Labor Negotiator
Anita Sanchez, Assistant Executive Officer
Gloria Sheppard, Appeals Coordinator

Budget

The Fiscal Year 2002-2003 budget appropriation was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>$464,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>99,523</td>
<td>$566,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special and Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>27,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and Leases</td>
<td>47,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of Other Dept.</td>
<td>54,495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, Supplies</td>
<td>6,654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>136,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget Appropriation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$703,459</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Civil Service Commission held a total of 40 meetings during Fiscal Year 2002-2003. Of the 40 meetings, 20 were regular meetings and 20 were special meetings.

Regular Commission meetings are on the first and third Mondays of each month in City Hall Hearing Room 400. When the regular meeting falls on a holiday, the Commission meets on the next succeeding business day unless it designates another day to meet at a prior regular meeting. Special meetings are called by the President or a majority of the Commission. All meetings of the Commission are open to the public except as otherwise legally authorized.

Commission meetings are conducted in accordance with the Commission’s Hearing Policies and Procedures attached to each Agenda and Notice of Commission Meeting documents.

Regular Commission meetings are organized as follows:

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

**Public Comment on Matters Appearing on the Agenda**
- Public comment on Agenda items

**Approval of Minutes**

**Announcements**
- Changes to the Agenda, change in meeting schedule and other relevant information

**Ratification Agenda**
- These are non-contested matters to be acted by a single vote of the Commission. No separate discussion on the items unless requested; the item is severed from the Ratification Agenda and considered a separate item. Matters on Ratification Agenda are proposed personal services contracts that have been posted for seven (7) calendar days by the Department of Human Resources and no appeals were received during the posting period.

**Consent Agenda**
- All matters on the Consent Agenda will be acted upon by a single vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a request is made; in which event, the matter shall be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered as a separate item.

**Commissioners Old Business**
- Follow up of previously discussed policy, procedure, or items having impact on the jurisdiction of the Commission.
Commission Meetings

**Regular Agenda**
Requests for hearing on examination, classification, certain compensation matters and appeals of the Human Resources Director’s decisions on certain administrative matters; appeals of the Director of Transportation’s decisions on merit system matters affecting service-critical classes at the Municipal Transportation Agency; and appeals of the Executive Officer’s decision.

**Separations Agenda**
Appeals of separated employees on future employment restrictions recommended by appointing officers and automatic resignations for certain employee groups.

**Commissioner’s Other Business**
Policy, procedures and matters impacting the jurisdiction of the Commission.

**Human Resources Director’s Report**
Report on merit system issues and items administered by the Department of Human Resources

**Executive Officer’s Report**
Report on merit system issues and items impacting the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

**Request to Speak on Any Matter within the Jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission**
Public comment on matters under the Commission’s jurisdiction

**Adjournment**

The Commission meets to review requests for hearing of employee separations from service, examination appeals, classification appeals, certain compensation appeals, and appeals of the Human Resources Director’s decisions on certain administrative matters. The Commission also hears appeals of decisions of the Director of Transportation on merit system matters affecting service-critical classes at the Municipal Transportation Agency. The Commission considers at its meetings proposed Civil Service Commission Rule and policy changes, and proposed Charter amendments.
Certification of Rates of Pay and Prevailing Wages

The Charter provides that the Commission certify the rates of pay for Police Officers, Firefighters, Registered Nurses, and the prevailing rate of wages of various Crafts, Janitorial Services, and Kinds of Labor paid in private employment for the City.

Setting of Salary and Benefits of Elected Officials

In addition, the Commission sets the salary and benefits of all elected officials of the City and County of San Francisco. Salary (except for Members of the Board of Supervisors) and benefits are within the parameters established by Charter Section A8.409-1 as stated, in part, that “Except as otherwise provided by this charter, the Civil Service Commission shall set the wages and benefits of all elected officials of the City and County of San Francisco as follows: wages shall be frozen for fiscal year 1994-95 and 1995-96 at the rates in effect on June 30, 1994, thereafter, wages and benefits may be adjusted on July 1 of each fiscal year to reflect upward change in the CPI as of the preceding January 1; however, wage increases may not exceed 5%. Benefits of elected officials may equal but may not exceed those benefits provided to any classification of miscellaneous officers and employees as of July 1 of each fiscal year.”

Setting of Salary for Members of the Board of Supervisors

On November 5, 2002, the City and County of San Francisco Electorate approved Proposition J, amending City Charter Section 2.100 - Composition and Salary to direct that Member, Board of Supervisors is a full-time position. The amended Charter Section also directs the Civil Service Commission to establish a five (5) year salary cycle, consider a salary survey of California cities and counties with full-time City Councils and County Supervisors, transmit its salary determination to the Controller in a timely manner to coordinate with City budget processes and related procedures, and set the salary of the Board of Supervisors once every five (5) years.

The Civil Service Commission conducted nine (9) Regular meetings and one (1) Special Meeting to provide direction for the salary survey and solicit public comment. The Civil Service Commission directed collection of additional information to supplement the salary data from California jurisdictions with full-time City Councils and County Supervisors including: total number of members and population represented; administrative responsibilities and/or job functions; total number of city/county departments and employees; budget; outside employment policy; internal and external committee structure; consumer price index; cost of living comparison; and examples of applicable charter provisions.
Wage Setting Responsibilities of the Civil Service Commission

Of California’s four hundred and seventy-seven (477) cities and fifty-eight (58) counties, four (4) cities had full-time City Councils and thirty-seven (37) counties had full-time County Supervisors. The Civil Service Commission also directed collection of survey information from nine (9) selected national jurisdictions with similar governmental structures.

The Civil Service Commission deliberated at length in setting the salary for the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors and considered numerous factors including: the determination that the position is full-time, the complex nature of the position, the importance of the position in the framework of City and County of San Francisco governance, the budget, the special nature of a combined city and county governing function, the salary in relation to staff, and comparison to other, similar jurisdictions.

In accordance with Charter Section 2.100, on May 19, 2003, the Civil Service Commission set the annual salary for the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors at $112,320 and established a one (1) year cycle, effective July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004.

In FY 2003-2004, the Civil Service Commission will again set the salary for the Board of Supervisors for a five (5) year cycle, effective July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2009.
The City and County of San Francisco Charter delineates the responsibilities of the Civil Service Commission and outlines the civil service merit system to include (but not limited to):

- the authority, purpose, definitions, administration, and organization of the merit system and the Civil Service Commission;

- the establishment of policies, procedures and Rules governing allegations of discrimination or otherwise prohibited nepotism or favoritism; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; leaves of absence; appointments; promotions; transfers; resignations; lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, retrenchment or completion of work; the designation and filling of positions, as exempt, temporary, provisional, part-time, seasonal, or permanent; status and status rights; probationary status and the administration of probationary periods except duration; pre-employment and fitness for fitness for duty examinations medical examinations, except for the conditions under which referrals for duty will be made, and the imposition of new requirements; classification; conflict of interest; and other matters not in conflict with the Charter;

- the ability to inquire into the operation of the civil service merit system to ensure compliance; and

- the hearing of appeals from an action of the Human Resources Director or the Municipal Transportation Agency Director.
Civil Service Commission Rules

Foremost in the Commission’s agenda is to modernize and streamline the Civil Service Commission Rules, to protect the civil service merit system, and to control costs which result from practices which may not be conducive to the efficient operation of a department. The Civil Service Commission recognizes the need to make our workforce more efficient by providing managers with the necessary tools which conform with and anticipate changes in the work environment so as to avoid expending unnecessary personnel time and resources on duplicative or archaic practices.

In its effort to address City departments’ need for flexibility in personnel management, the Commission has an on-going process of seeking input from departments and responding to the needs expressed regarding the City’s merit system. The Committee on Policy and Rules Revision (COPAR), made up of various departmental representatives, Department of Human Resources representative and Commission staff convenes regularly to share concerns, provide advise and address the operation of the merit system. COPAR reviews, evaluates and makes recommendations on needed Rules changes. Commission Rules are evaluated to assure compliance with federal, state and local laws.

Meet and confer sessions are conducted by Commission staff before adoption of new and/or amended Rules.

Policies and Procedures

Service accessibility and utilization of its services is a priority of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has made available and expanded its on-line information through the Commission website. Policy and procedures on “Appeals and Requests for Hearings” and “Submission of Written Reports on Appeals” have been updated and available in on-line, electronic and print formats.
The Civil Service Commission acted on October 4, 1999 to recodify and reformat the Rules to provide consistent administration, uniformity and easy readability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule Number and Title</td>
<td>Volume I Miscellaneous Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 1 Authority and Purpose</td>
<td>Rule 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2 Definitions</td>
<td>Rule 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3 Equal Employment Opportunity</td>
<td>Rule 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 4 Administration</td>
<td>Rule 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 5 Meetings and Hearings of the Commission</td>
<td>Rule 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 6 TWU Trust Fund</td>
<td>Rule 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 7 Rules Related to the Employer-Employee Relations Ordinance</td>
<td>Rule 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 8 Blank</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 9 Position Classification</td>
<td>Rule 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 10 Examination Announcements and Applicants</td>
<td>Rule 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 11 Examinations</td>
<td>Rule 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 12 Eligible Lists</td>
<td>Rule 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 13 Certification of Eligibles</td>
<td>Rule 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 14 Appointments</td>
<td>Rule 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 15 Rules Related to the Employment of Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>Rule 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 16 Medical Examinations</td>
<td>Rule 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 17 Probationary Period</td>
<td>Rule 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 18 Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>Rule 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 19 Resignation</td>
<td>Rule 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 20 Leaves of Absence</td>
<td>Rule 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 21 Layoff</td>
<td>Rule 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 22 Employee Separation Procedures</td>
<td>Rule 122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Effective Classification Plan

Class Consolidation Priority

The Civil Service Commission adopted in 1991, a policy directive to reduce the number of City and County classes to 1,000 or fewer by the year 2000. The Commission continues to pursue this goal directing its efforts towards rules, policies, and procedures that facilitate classification transactions conducted by the Department of Human Resources. The City now has approximately 1,368 classes, down 742 from over 2,100 in a 1991 peak (a 35% decrease).
Professional/Personal Services Contracts

The Civil Service Commission’s review of proposed professional/personal services contracts is consistent with its authority to oversee the merit system. This authority includes that where there is a merit system, services provided to the public use public employees.

The Civil Service Commission also determines whether the circumstance pertaining to the need to provide services in a particular situation (or situations) warrants the use of a professional/personal services contract or contractors in lieu of civil service employees. Professional/personal services contracts include agreements for services paid by the City and County of San Francisco with individuals, companies, corporations, non-profit organizations, and other public agencies. The Commission’s role and responsibilities are in accordance with City Attorney opinions and are consistent with the objectives of Proposition L (11/93) in that it places the Civil Service Commission in a policy making, rather than an administrative role in the selection of individual contractors.

The Commission adopted revised policies and procedures on December 5, 1994, which became effective on January 1, 1995. The revised procedures streamlined and expedited the processing of professional/personal services contracts by eliminating a significant amount of bureaucratic red tape. This was accomplished without loss of the monitoring and auditing of the contracting procedure placed by the Charter in the Commission’s jurisdiction. The procedures are periodically reviewed and revised by the Civil Service Commission.

Important points in the procedures include:

- An appeal procedure to insure merit system oversight;
- A streamlined Civil Service Commission approval process for professional/personal services contracts; the Civil Service Commission reviews proposed professional/personal services contracts for greater than $50,000;
- A Professional/Personal Services Contracts approval option that is consistent with the City and County’s budgetary process by providing departments with the ability to include contracted services as part of the departmental budget when being submitted to the Mayor’s Office.
The following chart is a breakdown of the approval types for professional services contracts.

**Types of Personal Services Contracts**

FY 2002-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%=146 Contracts Requiring Civil Service Commission Approval

Representatives from the Controller’s Office, Office of Contract Administration, Human Rights Commission, the City Attorney’s Office, Department of Public Health, Department of Aging and Adult Services and the Civil Service Commission conduct ongoing workshops available through the Department of Human Resources to train managers, supervisors, and contract administrators on Professional/Personal Services Contracts procedures.

Below is a breakdown of the type of service provided for professional/personal services contracts:

**Types of Service Provided for Personal Services Contracts**

FY 2002-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>FY 2002-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Parks &amp; Cultural</td>
<td>8  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Welfare &amp; Education</td>
<td>3  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>8  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services &amp; Corrections</td>
<td>12  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>5  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Trades</td>
<td>7  5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>9  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Administration</td>
<td>3  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Public Works/Utilities</td>
<td>37  25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>56  38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%=146 Contracts Requiring Civil Service Commission Approval
Civil service, also known as the merit system, was created to assure that the recruitment and retention of a qualified work force, and, the selection and promotion of employees providing public service and compensated by tax dollars is conducted in a fair and impartial manner and in a competitive fashion.

The demand for accountability, high performance and ethical standards require a visible, objective public personnel process provided by a merit system. This demand for accountability is reflected in the Civil Service Commission charter mandate to oversee the City’s merit system through establishment of Rules, policies and procedures, hearing of appeals, inspection and audit service, training, and reports from the Executive Officer on the operation of the merit system.

Oversight through Hearings and Appeals

The Charter provides that a major function of the Commission is to consider appeals on merit system and other matters under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. Consideration of appeals provides a mechanism for the Commission to monitor the status of the merit system.

The Commission also considers requests for hearings on separations and appeals on future employment with the City and County following employee separations from service: provisional, exempt, probationary; automatic resignations due to abandonment of position; terminations of temporary employees appointed from civil service lists, resignations certified as services unsatisfactory; and dismissals of permanent employees.

Appeals before the Commission cover a range of matters under the Commission's jurisdiction. Many are routine and a few are uncommon and unusual.

This fiscal year, the Commission for example, received an appeal by the Director of Elections in accordance with Charter Section 13.104. Charter Section 134.104 states in part, “The Director shall be appointed by the Elections Commission from a list of qualified applicants provided pursuant to the civil service provisions of this Charter. The Director shall serve a five-year term, during which he or she may be removed by the Elections Commission for cause, upon written charges and following a hearing. The Elections Commission shall present the written charges to the director no less than thirty days before the hearing. If the Elections Commission votes to remove the Director, he or she shall have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission. On appeal, the Civil Service Commission shall be limited to consideration of the record before the Elections Commission; however, the Civil Service Commission may independently evaluate and weigh evidence and may in its discretion consider evidence proffered to the Elections Commission that the Commission excluded and may in its discretion exclude evidence that the Elections Commission considered.”

The Director of Elections was terminated by the Elections Commission and appealed her termination to the Civil Service Commission;

The Civil Service Commission processed the appeal and held six (6) lengthy public meetings to hear the matter;
The Civil Service Commission decided based on the Elections Commission not following removal procedures stated in Charter Section 13.104 namely, “may be removed by the Elections Commission for cause, upon written charges and following a hearing,” returned the Director of Elections to her position. The Civil Service Commission also determined that the Director of Elections was not a probationary employee; The Elections Commission appealed the CSC decision to Superior Court; The Superior Court ruled in favor of the Civil Service Commission upholding its decision to reinstate the Director of Elections; The Elections Commission appealed the Superior Court decision to the Court of Appeal; The Court of Appeal in an unprecedential and unpublished decision reversed the Superior Court decision.

The Commission had 76 active appeals on file at the end of Fiscal Year 2001-2002: a total of 94 appeals and requests for hearings were received in the Commission office during Fiscal Year 2002-2003. At the end of Fiscal Year 2002-2003, 41 active appeals remained on file. The Commission reviewed and resolved 54 appeals and requests for hearing. Many appeals were successfully resolved administratively and did not require Civil Service Commission hearing, or, are still pending.
Merit System

Audit and Inspection Services

This fiscal year, the Charter mandated Inspection Service was fully implemented to review the operation of the merit system and to respond to merit system issues presented by applicants, employees, employee organization representatives, advocates and members of the public.

An inspection service request is an inquiry into the operation of the merit system and may be submitted by applicants, employees, departmental representatives, advocates, employee organization representatives or a member of the public by letter, telephone, email, or in person. Inspection service requests are also generated by Civil Service Commissioners in response to items heard at Civil Service Commission meetings or other venues.

Inspection Service investigations may include reviewing or auditing departmental records, determining departmental and merit system practices, interviewing relevant parties, reviewing related merit system publications, and applying relevant merit system rules, policies and procedures. The investigation may result in counseling on procedures for either the requestor or the department, incorporating information in training workshops on the merit system, publication of the Civil Service Adviser to clarify merit system policies and procedures, or a hearing of the matter at the Civil Service Commission with subsequent remedial action, as appropriate.

An example of an Inspection Service Issue:

An employee requests a Civil Service Commission review of the selection process because she has not been appointed to a Plumber position nor has she received any job notifications. By way of background, this person has been employed with the City and County of San Francisco for seven (7) years. Concurrent with her City employment, she completed a Plumber apprenticeship program and obtained all of the required licenses and certifications. She successfully participated in the City’s Plumber examination; however, she has been on the eligible list for nearly one (1) year and the eligibles ranked immediately above and below her have been appointed to Plumber positions. She is requesting that the Civil Service Commission department review the selection process because she has not been appointed to a Plumber position nor has she received any job notifications.

Civil Service Commission Inspection Service Review:

- Reviews the current job announcement and corresponding eligible list to verify that the employee is on the list;

- Reviews Civil Service Commission Rule Series 012 - Eligible Lists and Rule Series 013 - Certification of Eligibles and related policies, procedures, publications, practices, and Civil Service Commission actions;
Merit System

- Reviews the Citywide certification/referral for positions filled from the current list to determine if selections were made according to the examination’s Certification Rule;
- Contacts the employee to verify their current address and obtain any additional information as necessary;
- Contacts City departments to determine when referral letters were sent, when interviews were held, and who was interviewed.

If the selections are appropriate:
- Responds to the employee advising her that the appointments were made in accordance with Civil Service Commission Rules;
- Includes a description and/or illustration of the certification/referral process;
- Advises the employee that job notifications were sent; however, she didn’t receive them because she did not file her new address with the Department of Human Resources;
- Counsels the employee regarding appropriate address change procedures and provides her with the applicable form.

If the selections are inappropriate:
- Contacts the City Department Head to advise them of the areas requiring correction including scheduling the matter for Civil Service Commission consideration and action if necessary or appropriate;
- Notifies the employee of the results.

Following is an illustration of the inspection service requests for FY 2002-2003:

**INSPECTION SERVICE REQUESTS**

**FY 2002-2003**

- Certification and Selection: 37%
- Examination: 14%
- Exceptions to the Order of Layoff: 23%
- Other: 11%
- Civil Service Rights: 3%
- Personal Service Contracts: 3%
- Probationary Period: 9%
Employee Relations Ordinance

The Employee Relations Ordinance (ERO) was established in 1973 to promote employee-employer relations and to recognize the right of City and County employees to join employee organizations of their own choice and to be represented by those organizations in their employment relationship with the City and County. This Ordinance is administered through the Civil Service Commission and is part of the Administrative Code that authorizes the Commission to perform functions required for ERO administration.

The Commission is both neutral and impartial in its role of providing a reasonable foundation to resolve labor relation disputes. The ERO promotes communication between the City and its employees and their representative employee organizations. Civil Service Commission Rule 07 Series – Rules Related to the Employee Relations Ordinance, was adopted to provide specific administrative procedures to carry out these functions which were assumed by the Commission in August 1976.

State legislation, SB 739 that took effect on July 1, 2001 impacted the Commission’s administration of the City and County of San Francisco’s Employee Relations Ordinance. With the implementation of SB 739 which amended the Meyer-Millas-Brown Act (MMBA), the State agency known as the “Public Employment Relations Board” (PERB) was given the authority to administer and decide unfair labor practice charges previously filed and remedied at the local level. PERB is not limited to enforcing local rules regarding Unfair Labor Practices, and, it may look to the MMBA and other State and local laws for guidance. PERB is authorized to enforce local rule regarding representational issues. The City’s ERO remains in the City’s Administrative Code and is currently reflected in the Civil Service Commission Rules.

The various functions assigned to the Civil Service Commission by the City and County of San Francisco’s Employee Relations Ordinance includes, but is not limited to:

Unfair Labor Practice Charges

The Employee Relations Ordinance provides for the investigation and resolution of Unfair Labor Practice Charges. An employee or group of employees, an employee organization or management may file charges on the prescribed form (CSC 101) within the specified timeframe. Under the Rules, staff reviews the complaint to determine if it makes a “prima facie” case. If a “prima facie” case is not found, staff dismisses the charge. If there appears to be a “prima facie” case, staff attempts to mediate the dispute between the parties. If the parties do not agree to mediation or attempts are not successful, the charge is referred to an Administrative Law Judge for hearing and final determination.

Bargaining Unit Assignments

The Employee Relations Ordinance provides that the Department of Human Resources is responsible for assigning or reassigning classes to bargaining units. The Employee Relations Ordinance permits affected employees or registered employee organizations to file complaints over the allocation of classes to bargaining units. Complaints are filed on the required form (CSC 102) and must be received by the Civil
Employee Relations Ordinance

Service Commission no later than twenty (20) calendar days from the date of the original notice from the Department of Human Resources. Staff reviews the complaint to determine if it is timely and contains sufficient information to proceed. The Employee Relations Division Director is informed, and requested to prepare a response to the complaint. If the complaint is not resolved, it is referred to an Administrative Law Judge for hearing.

Management, Supervisory, Confidential Designations

The Employee Relations Division of the Department of Human Resources is responsible for placing Management, Supervisory, or Confidential designations to specific positions after consulting with department heads because of the nature of their functional role within a department. Designation assignments may be protested by filing a compliant by using the prescribed form (CSC 103) with the Civil Service Commission. Staff reviews the complaint, and attempts to mediate the dispute. If mediation is not possible, staff arranges for the issue to be submitted before an Administrative Law Judge for hearing and final determination.

Recognition Elections: Employee Organization Certification or Decertification

Recognition

A registered employee organization may petition to become the recognized representative for a Bargaining Unit composed of classes with similar duties and responsibilities for employees not represented.

Challenge Petition

Another employee organization submits a valid petition, which affords the employee organization an opportunity to be added to the ballot.

Decertification/Recognition

Concurrent election to unrepresent and elect a new employee organization on the same petition.

Formal recognition of an employee organization entitles it to rights and responsibilities as specified in the ERO. Validity requires a 30% show of interest from all employees in the affected bargaining unit.
State labor law (AB 2012) enacted on October 13, 2001 streamlined recognition procedures for public agencies by allowing a signed petition, authorization cards, or union membership cards showing that a majority of the employees in an appropriate bargaining unit desire the representation unless another labor organization has previously been lawfully recognized as the representative. Disputes, in these cases, are remedied in accordance with the procedures outlined in Government Code Section 3507.1.

Affiliation, Disaffiliation or Merger of Labor Organizations

The Civil Service Commission certifies employee organizations when they affiliate, disaffiliate, or merge with other employee organizations. An affiliation is the formal joining or association of an employee organization with another organization. The employee organization remains a legal entity, but its name may change. A disaffiliation is when two employee organizations agree to no longer affiliate. A merger occurs when two (2) or more employee organizations become a single new legal entity. The absorbed union(s) loses recognition for all it’s recognized bargaining units as recognition is transferred to the newly merged organization.
In Appreciation

In the course of carrying out our duties, the members and staff of the Civil Service Commission interact with a wide range of people both in and outside of City government. The Commission works closely with the Mayor and other elected officials, employee organizations, departmental management and staff, and community leaders and groups. These people contribute a great deal of effort and support to the Commission and we would like to express our sincere appreciation to all of them. Thank you!