



CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT TRANSMITTAL (FORM 22)

Refer to Civil Service Commission Procedure for Staff - Submission of Written Reports for Instructions on Completing and Processing this Form

1. Civil Service Commission Register Number: _____ - _____ =
2. For Civil Service Commission Meeting of: March 3, 2014
3. Check One: Ratification Agenda
 Consent Agenda X
 Regular Agenda
 Human Resources Director's Report
4. Subject: Report on the Position-Based Testing Program
5. Recommendation: Adopt the report
6. Report prepared by: John Kraus Telephone number: 415 557-4884
7. Notifications: **(Attach a list of the person(s) to be notified in the format described in IV. Commission Report Format -A).**
8. Reviewed and approved for Civil Service Commission Agenda:

Human Resources Director: *[Signature]*

Date: 2/19/14
9. Submit the original time-stamped copy of this form and person(s) to be notified (see Item 7 above) along with the required copies of the report to:

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

10. Receipt-stamp this form in the ACSC RECEIPT STAMP box to the right using the time-stamp in the CSC Office.

Attachment





Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

Date: February 14, 2014

To: Honorable Civil Service Commission

Through: Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

From: John Kraus
Assistant Deputy Director, Recruitment and Assessment Services

Subject: Report on the Position-Based Testing Program

The purpose of this report is to update the Civil Service Commission (CSC) on the Position-Based Testing (PBT) Program. It covers the period from July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013.

The CSC adopted Rule 111A on Position-Based Testing (PBT) on February 6, 2006. Under the PBT Program, local hiring departments or agencies are permitted to process recruitments in consultation with the Department of Human Resources (DHR). The program was intended to streamline the hiring of permanent employees by giving local agencies greater control over the recruitment and assessment process. The stated goal of the PBT Program is to adopt eligible lists resulting from merit-based examination processes within sixty days of the posting of an examination announcement.

The table below shows that, during the first half of the current fiscal year, the number of PBT examinations (143) continues to be large and is more than twice that of CBT examinations (60).

	PBT			CBT			Total Tests
	# of tests	% of all tests	Avg. # days ¹	# of tests	% of all tests	Avg.# days	
FY 2006-2007	120	52%	99	109	48%	113	233
FY 2007-2008	180	61%	82	117	39%	111	291
FY 2008-2009	106	67%	67	52	33%	81	187
FY 2009-2010	142	56%	63	110	44%	80	222
FY 2010-2011	333	69%	42	152	31%	54	387
FY 2011-2012	268	70%	48	113	30%	90	358
FY 2012-2013	243	68%	58	113	32%	73	356
1st Half FY 2013-2014	143	70%	62	60	30%	92	203

The table also shows that, if the number of PBT examinations that have occurred during the first half of this fiscal year continues as the same rate through the end of this fiscal year, we can expect this year's

¹ Average # Days in this table corresponds to the median time frame between the announcement closing and list adoption

total numbers to be lower than that of the prior three years. This drop during the first half of the year may be attributable to the City's transitioning to a new, automated Request-To-Fill (RTF) process, which required human resource professionals citywide to learn new business practices. Also, during several weeks in August the system's changeover required that certain personnel transactions be delayed. This may also explain why the average number of days from announcement closing to list issuance has increased slightly during this period.

It also should be noted that the sharing of PBT lists among departments is an efficient use of resources which helps to maximize an eligible list's utility. But, it also tends to lower the total number of PBT examinations that departments need to generate. Therefore, we believe that the sharing of PBT lists during the first half of this year has lowered the total PBT count that would otherwise be expected.

During the first six months of FY 2013 - 2014, five appeals involving PBT recruitments were submitted to the Civil Service Commission. One was an appeal involving the administration of 5602 Utility Specialist examination, which was heard before CSC on August 19, 2013 and denied. Another appeal pertained to the alleged misspelling of a word in the standardized Supervisory Test Battery examination for a Manager I recruitment (PBT 0922-062287). This was administratively resolved as there were no misspellings and the matter also was not appealable to the CSC. Two other appeals concerned the ineligibility of candidates to participate in the 8238 Public Safety Dispatcher (PBT-8238-060438) and 8262 Criminalist III Forensic Biology (DNA) – (PBT-8262-059714) examinations. These were also resolved administratively as the matters were not appealable to CSC. The last was an appeal from Local 261 of a PBT announcement posted by the Recreation and Park Department for 0923 Manager II - Superintendent of Golden Gate Park (PBT-0923-060661). The union believed that the announcement was issued to target a particular individual. The announcement conformed to standard practices and therefore the appeal was administratively resolved as the matter was not appealable to the CSC.

In addition, the Department of Human Resources received three protests of PBT examinations that were submitted directly to Director Micki Callahan. Two of these pertained to the ratings candidates received in an examination conducted by the City Planning Commission for Planner III (PBT-5291-060159). Both protests were denied. The third protest pertained to an applicant's untimely submission of application materials for the Department of Emergency Management's Public Safety Communications Dispatcher (PBT-8238-060438) examination. This protest was upheld.

To summarize, there were a total of eight appeals received across 143 separate PBT recruitments. This represents a relatively low appeal rate of approximately one appeal for every 18 examinations. Of course, if we calculated the appeal rate based on the number of applicants associated with these 143 examinations, it would be even that much lower.

In conclusion, the PBT program continues to be successful as demonstrated by the speed in which lists are generated, as well as the relatively low number of protests received.

Recommendation: Adopt the report.

c: Ted Yamasaki
Anna Biasbas