Clackamas Fire District #1



SPECIAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING June 12, 2020

(This meeting was recorded.)

I. CALL TO ORDER PER ORS 192.610 TO 192.690 ORS 192.650 – The meeting is being recorded.

President Trotter called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

Present: Board of Directors Jay Cross, Thomas Joseph, Jim Syring, Don Trotter, and Marilyn Wall; Fire Chief Fred Charlton; Deputy Chief Doug Whiteley; Division Chief Mike Corless; Division Chief Brian Stewart; Division Chief Josh Gehrke; Division Chief Nick Browne; Battalion Chief Mike Carlsen; Battalion Chief Steve Deters; Battalion Chief Jason Ellison; Battalion Chief Melanie Kinne; Battalion Chief Ted Willard; Fire Marshal Shawn Olson; Finance Director Christina Day; Public Information Officer Brandon Paxton; Human Resources Director Trish Noble; Logistics Director DeAnn Cordes; Health and Wellness Director Heather Goodrich; Accounting Manager Anh Le; Volunteer Jerry Kearney; Captain and Local 1159 Shop Steward Greg Holland; BC 303; BC 301; Civil Service Commissioner Will Weatherly; Genoa Ingram from Court Street Consulting; Executive Assistant Rachel Trotman; and Executive Assistant Karen Strejc.

II. CHANGES TO AGENDA

None.

III. PRESENTATION - CLACKAMAS FIRE DISTRICT #1 FIRE CHIEF JOB DESCRIPTION AND SELECTION PROCESS – Chief Charlton

Chief Charlton thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Fire Chief Job Description

Chief Charlton explained that the Fire Chief job description had been updated. He shared that the job was different than it was in June 2011, in Fire Chief roles and responsibilities, the position of the District and formatting.

Chief Charlton shared that in 2019, CFD #1 went through a pay equity project. With this, they updated and reformatted all job descriptions.

Chief Charlton explained that the title for the job position was Fire Chief. The Fire Chief position was not a Civil Service status position and was not within the bargaining unit. The Fire Chief was part of the Fire Chief's office and reported directly to the Board of Directors.

Chief Charlton noted that legal counsel, HR Director Noble and the Board Executive Committee had reviewed the job description.

Chief Charlton noted the areas with significant changes included the update of the essential functions and major responsibilities of the Fire Chief. He explained that they reviewed other similar job descriptions from other Fire Departments as they looked at these. They tried to articulate the importance around delegation and empowerment, data driven decision making, and roles and responsibilities of budgeting.

Chief Charlton talked about the addition of the 14 Leadership Competencies. He stated that in late 2019, they asked inside and outside stakeholders for thoughts on 67 leadership competencies. Director Cross and President Trotter requested to have presentation skills and written communications added to the original 12 competencies. He shared that within these 14 competencies, they were defined in the job description.

Director Cross had a question around political savvy, and the words used in the description, such as land mines. He suggested using different verbiage such as challenges.

Director Wall had challenges with the competencies. She felt these were included with definitions that didn't have cohesion or make sense. She shared that they used words that she was not familiar with. She thought that these needed to be edited. She thought they were not tailored properly for the job description. Director Wall also felt that these were important, but that they were missing ones as well. She thought that financial management responsibility should be included.

Chief Charlton explained that they went back to the "For your Improvement" book and used the definitions from it. He added that an internal candidate could review and know where to find it. Director Wall felt it was embarrassing to send it out the way that it was, as incomplete sentences and unknown words.

Director Syring felt the wording didn't seem right and thought that proofing was needed. He suggested just listing the competencies and where the definitions could be found; or suggested that the staff and Board Executive Committee prepare definitions as they pertained to CFD #1. He thought they could modify them a little. He complemented the Board Executive Committee and staff for the newly reviewed job description. He felt that the competencies, skills and abilities were important for the job. He shared that the competencies could be more important than a degree that someone had.

Director Cross noted that he and President Trotter saw redundancies. They asked to not have too much redundancy included in the document.

Director Wall stated that there was a difference between competencies and job skills. She said that the competencies were more specific.

Director Cross explained that the Board Executive Committee put in definitions and not just bullet points for this meeting, for all to be able to review.

Chief Charlton shared that the competencies were valuable to use, in crafting scenarios and how candidates were developing in areas. He explained that no one will excel in all areas. He added that these were the tools to help employees grow and develop.

Director Joseph stated that the job skills were good to have. He felt that financial management was an important skill for the CEO to have.

Director Cross shared that the Fire Chief needed to have many skills. He thought they could include financial management as a required skill.

Director Syring noted that the previous job description had four areas, where the new job description only had two areas. He felt that competencies and job skills were important. He noted that the competencies already had definitions. He stated that all were important, no matter what they were called.

Director Cross noted a difference from the last job description, was that they asked the Fire Chief what he did. Director Cross shared that the list of competencies were listed to help the Fire Chief do the job.

Chief Charlton pointed back to the major functions and job responsibilities. He explained that they looked at how to set up the next Board and Fire Chief up for success. He noted that one of the challenges with the formal 67 leadership competencies, was that they did not have a specific leadership competency that listed specific things such as "financial management." They tried to capture a lot of feedback from others regarding these competencies.

Director Wall asked why motivating others was not included in the desired competencies. She shared that with those who responded, this was one of highest competencies listed. HR Director Noble explained that people were limited to essential, not essential, and not needed, in scoring. Director Wall did not know why it did not make the list, as it was one of the most selected and wasn't placed on list of desired competencies. She felt that one of the key jobs of the Fire Chief was to motivate others.

Director Cross stated that they could add motivating others to the list, if other Board members wanted it too. He suggested that if the Fire Chief had the listed competencies, the Fire Chief would automatically motivate others in the process. He thought that Lominger was a good program; it was focused not on any one trait, but on many, to help an individual become a more effective leader. He explained that it was not a complete list and there were other points that could be added.

President Trotter explained that back in 2011, all competencies were listed in the application document. He added that now, they had them under the job description as opposed to the application of what the District was looking for in an applicant.

Director Cross noted that this was a draft, not a completed document. He explained that they were meeting to work on this. Discussion followed.

Chief Charlton shared that the job description was on the agenda. He explained that the finalized packet would be presented to the Board in August. He said that the Board could make a decision today, but that they did not have to. He noted that they could take today's feedback to the Board Executive Committee to fine tune.

Director Joseph felt that financial management, fiscal responsibility, and motivating others should be included in the job description.

Director Cross asked if there was anything that anyone would take out. No comments were shared.

Director Wall noted that the competencies were a guide. She felt that when included in the job description, they needed to be internally consistent and make sense.

Chief Charlton shared that the next area that they discussed were updating some of the specific job skills. He noted they included what they Board had desired. He explained that some of these skills pointed back to the essential functions and major responsibilities.

Director Wall asked Director Cross about data driven responsibility.

Director Cross explained that data driven responsibility was making operational decisions on actual data and not perceived need. He gave an example of wanting to staff Station 18. Did the data show this to be efficient? Would there be a cost benefit?

Chief Charlton explained that at the Budget Committee Meeting, they had a presentation from BC Santos regarding the EMS Pilot Programs in the District and how they would help improve performance by sending the right type of apparatus to calls. This would be a data driven decision.

Director Joseph felt they needed to take into consideration what was good for citizens as well as being fiscally responsible.

Director Wall noted that the job skills seemed to mostly address operational skills. She asked about the skills related to moving forward, planning and having a vision for the future as well as the direction of the fire service. Director Cross explained that there was not anything other than financial planning listed. Director Wall stated that they needed someone to be proactive and not reactive.

Chief Charlton thought this was a great point that could be added under specific job skills. He also noted that under essential functions, they did include the mission, vision and values, the Strategic Business plan and long-range planning with staff.

Chief Charlton explained that the physical requirements were added, updated from Health and Wellness Director Goodrich.

Director Wall felt that driving a car and using a computer should both be frequent.

Chief Charlton shared that they could revisit the physical requirements.

Chief Charlton stated that he could meet with the Board Executive Committee and make edits and reviews. He asked President Trotter to pull the job description from approving today.

Fire Chief Selection Process Development

Chief Charlton noted that he worked with HR Director Noble, PIO Paxton, and EA Strejc on this development.

Chief Charlton noted that early on, PIO Paxton and he met with SDAO, the Board Executive Committee and reviewed with legal counsel. He explained that there was a number of actions that the Board would need to take with respect to this process.

Chief Charlton noted the components of the Selection Process

- Internal process per Board
- Six phases to the process
- Compensation range
- Minimum qualifications
- Preferred Qualifications

Chief Charlton explained that he recommended to not include the Executive Fire Officer Program, but they went to the Center for Public Safety Excellence Chief Fire Officer Designation.

Captain Greg Holland, 1159 Shop Steward, asked about the minimum qualifications, stating that no higher education requirements were listed. He asked what a Fire Chief should need.

Chief Charlton shared that he left the minimum qualifications as the Board desired.

Chief Charlton shared that he had an Associates, Bachelors, and Master's degree and all had helped him. He explained that in late 2000s, there was an emphasis on the Executive Fire Officer Program, and he felt it was a better fit for him to get his Master's degree.

Chief Charlton touched on the question of the value of formal education. He explained that he felt that there were three components to development and success: education, experience, and certification. He thought it was some combination of all three. He hoped that they could create a process for candidates, where they could use all three areas to explain why they were qualified.

Director Wall mentioned that they had looked at comparable qualifications for other Fire Chief job applications for other Fire Districts. She noted that many other Districts qualifications had a minimum of a Bachelor's degree from other districts job qualifications. She asked why CFD #1 was dumbing the minimum qualifications down.

Director Syring explained that last time, the process had the minimum qualification that the candidate had to be a Chief Officer at CFD #1. He said it was the same this time. He stated that if they decided to stay within, it left it open to find a candidate with the Chief rank and would give the chance to all possible candidates. He added that if they chose to go outside of CFD #1, they would have to have degree requirements. He felt that competencies and capabilities could be more important than a degree.

BC Ellison felt that seemed backwards to have requirements for the Division Chief position that were not required for Fire Chief position. He felt that it seemed important to have the same requirements moving up through the ranks.

Director Cross felt it was important to have as many candidates as possible apply for the process. He wanted to be inclusive, not exclusive. He noted that they had a consensus at an open board meeting to have these requirement.

Director Wall noted that things were different now than in 2011. She explained that they were a much larger District now, and had different needs. She did not agree with why they would have different requirements for outside candidates and inside candidates.

Director Syring shared that a BC on up should be more competency based. He felt that qualifications were inconsistent. He thought it was time to go back and reform processes to be consistent.

Director Cross asked what specific qualifications the Board wanted for a Fire Chief.

Director Syring stated that the minimum qualifications as listed was what he supported.

Director Wall noted that if they wanted to be comparable to other Fire Chief job descriptions, all minimum qualifications required a Bachelor's degree. She noted that CFD #1 had a generous program to support employees to get their degrees. She added that employees could look to the qualifications and see that they would need a Bachelor's degree and the Fire District would help them get it to move forward to obtain it.

Director Cross stated that they needed a description of what type of Bachelor's degree was needed. He thought it should apply to the District and Fire Service.

Director Joseph felt that the qualifications should be the key and same as for the other Chiefs. He stated that they would be a part of the qualified people. He shared that this was a competition.

Director Syring shared that TVF&R stayed within and the new Fire Chief did not have a degree. He felt that if they required a degree, they would have different issues. He shared that the last three times, they chose a Fire Chief, they left if open to Chief Officers.

BC Ellison shared that the qualifications for the BC were different now, than they were in 2011. He shared that they were limited in Chief Officers with a lot of Chief Officer experience. He thought they should give preference to those with higher education. He thought they should match the requirements they had for minimums for Division Chief or Deputy Chief.

Director Wall stated that minimum qualifications would be listed, but they could include something like, "or other substantial experience or qualifications." This would allow someone to share why they were qualified.

BC Kinne agreed with BC Ellison. She suggested using a term such as equivalency instead of inclusivity, related to educational status.

President Trotter concurred with Director Wall that with the minimum qualifications; that they could meet those things, but also that the Board could read through the applications and interviews, and still have candidates go through with the process.

Selection Phases

Chief Charlton noted that they would be looking at six phases.

1. Announcement / application period

• Go to the Board in August, at the Board meeting, to approve job description and announcement

2. Board review of applications

- In the announcement, they would state that the Board will intend to fill the position internally, unless they do not have qualified internal candidates.
- Chief Charlton explained that currently in draft, they had October 1 October 15 for the review period. Chief Charlton explained that some of these actions were timed around the board meetings.
- Directory Syring felt the timeline was appropriate
- Chief Charlton noted that they would bring back a final schedule timeline in August.

3. Stakeholder Presentation

- Chief Charlton shared that he and PIO Paxton met with SDAO, and they suggested these ideas for community participation.
- PIO Paxton shared that SDAO recommended that they interfaced candidates with the community and stakeholders.
- PIO Paxton explained that since they were in pandemic times, they would schedule this by Zoom with various stakeholders. The candidates would be put before labor, volunteers, community, civic groups, etc. This would not be a scored process, but would allow for general feedback from community participants.
- PIO Paxton shared that their idea was to put a topic in front of the candidates and hear their response. They would have one night of presentations for the stakeholders to see the candidates.
- Director Wall felt that phase three and phase four should be flipped. She
 wondered if the applicants be narrowed down by the Board first, before they were
 presented to the community. PIO Paxton said that he would defer this decision,
 on the order of the process, to the Board. He shared that this was the process
 presented by SDAO.
- Director Cross noted that he liked the idea of having the stakeholders hear all candidates, not just those suggested by the Board. He would not be opposed to

changing it. Director Wall shared that if they only had three or four applicants, it would be the correct order. PIO Paxton noted that the number of applicants could determine the order.

- Director Joseph noted that if they changed the order, applicants would know that
 they were in the final race. PIO Paxton shard that if they put their name in the hat,
 they would be a true competitor in the process and they could keep order of
 process.
- Chief Charlton wanted to get as much broad perspective around candidates and have lots of stakeholder feedback to help consider as interview candidates.

4. Board Interview

• Chief Charlton explained that these would take place sometime between November 23 and December 18. It would depend on the number of candidates.

5. Conditional Job Offer

• Chief Charlton shared that this would be a discussion with the candidate and board regarding the employment agreement and job.

6. Transition Period

Chief Charlton shared that they would built a program where they can meet the goals and objective whether they go internal or external for candidates.

Chief Charlton noted that they would bring the entire packet back to the Board in August. He suggested that they remove item B-2 from voting today.

President Trotter agreed. He felt that they needed to get the reviewed documents before coming to the full Board for approval.

Director Cross talked about modifications and asked get to get the Board Executive Committee together again before the next Board meeting.

Director Syring overall supported the minimum qualifications as stated, preferred qualifications as stated and the timeline for the job announcement.

Director Joseph agreed with Director Syring. He thought that if a candidate was eligible to be a Chief, they would be eligible to become the Fire Chief. He noted that if they had an education, they would have an edge.

Director Wall appreciated the work that staff had done. She felt that the minimum qualifications and requirements were critical. She noted that as a leader taking us in the future, the Fire Chief had to demonstrate his or her ability and willingness to work for the District.

President Trotter noted that when comparing the previous announcement to this one, in 2011, they listed various proficiencies, and attached definitions. He noted that they were not attached to the application.

Chief Charlton shared that they would prepare the dates and definitions for competencies in the packet for the Board for the August approval.

Director Syring appreciated the input from other Chiefs and staff. He hoped that many Chief Officers would apply for the position as it showed interest.

Director Joseph noted it would also show the quality of leadership that had been developed.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Greg Holland thanked the Board for listening to their comments and questions and giving their time.

President Trotter explained that items B-1 and B-2 would be postponed.

V. BUSINESS - Action Required

Postponed. No vote taken.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

President Trotter noted that the next Board meeting would be June 15.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 am.

UPCOMING EVENTS:

June 15 – Regular Board Meeting – 6:00 pm by remote video conferencing July 9 – Joint Board Meeting – 6:00 pm by remote video conferencing

Karen Strejc Executive Assistant

President Don Trotter

Secretary Thomas Joseph