#### PITTSBURGH COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS A G E N D A May 1, 1995

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ADOPTION OF MINUTES
- III. COMPLIANCE UPDATE
  - A. Intake Report
- IV. STAFF & COMMITTEE REPORTS
  - A. Executive Committee
  - B. Director's Report
  - C. Budget & Finance Committee
  - D. Community Relations Committee
  - E. Housing Committee
  - F. Personnel Committee
  - V. NEW BUSINESS
    - A. Election of Vice Chair
    - B. Team Building Retreat Review

ln

#### PITTSBURGH COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS

#### MINUTES May 1, 1995

Attendance:

George Board, Chair

Robert McClenahan Alma Speed Fox Harry Kunselman Father Lou Vallone

Staff:

Sofronia R. Harris, Director

Charles F. Morrison Yancy Miles James Pulford Christina Jumba Connie Miskis Zatek Lois Newton George Monroe

Byrd R. Brown, Solicitor

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:16 p.m. by Dr. George Board, Chair.

#### II. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Commissioner Kunselman indicated a need for a correction on page 4 of the Minutes, Topic #V, last paragraph regarding motion to amend Rule 3A1 of the Regulations. Commission Kunselman stated that a sentence should be added: The above motion carried and is effective immediately.

With the above correction noted, the Minutes of the April 3 meeting were unanimously adopted.

#### III. COMPLIANCE UPDATE

#### Case Activity

Charles Morrison, Compliance Supervisor, reported to date 83 cases have been submitted for EEOC credit under Title VII. An additional 25 must be processed and closed before September 30, 1995, the end of the contract. (The ADA portion of the contract was completed some time ago.)

Assignment of Commissioners to cases authorized for public hearing was made and staff is now in the process of contacting those Commissioners to set up hearing dates. Commissioner Vallone asked that a copy of the public hearing assignments be forwarded to him, as chair of the Public Hearing Section.

#### Distribution of Regulations

Solicitor, Byrd Brown, suggested that the Commission forward copies of the newly amended Regulations to attorneys who have cases pending before this Commission. To reduce expense, this might be done when an attorney's appearance is filed.

Commissioner Kunselman, agreed, stating that attorneys should be asked to pay for copies of the Regulations. He also suggested that availability of the Regulations for a small fee (perhaps \$5) be included with the Notice to Respondents and Complainants. Commissioner Fox moved that the amended Regulations be made available to attorneys for a fee equal to the cost of photocopying and postage, and that this availability be added to the Notice to Respondents and Complainants. She specifically asked that the Regulations distributed in this way "look attractive." The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kunselman and carried unanimously.

Following passage of the above motion, consensus was to also include the relevant portions of the City Code in with the amended Regulations.

#### Intake Report

James Pulford reported that intake had increased during the first quarter of 1995, and was available to answer questions concerning the statistics which had been mailed to Commissioners earlier. Commissioner Kunselman asked that statistics for case dispositions during the first quarter also be made available to Commissioners.

#### VI. COMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS

#### A. Executive Committee

Dr. Board commented that during the course of the Executive Committee meeting, discussion had ensued regarding the recent tragedy in Oklahoma City. As a result, the Committee was questioning the role of the Commission to deal with certain issues on a more pro-active way. Given the resources and scope of the problem, he asked Commissioners if there may be some activity which can be considered in dealing locally with the "angry white male syndrome." Dr. Board stated that the Commission has a number of mechanisms at its disposition, but needs to determine how to best work constructively and positively within the community.

Commissioner Fox stated the Commission has gone through many changes over the last 25 years. In the past, this Commission was always at the forefront of community concerns like the one mentioned in Oklahoma City. "But the Commission has changed in 20 years in that the Commission no longer has activists working with the community groups who know what is going on in those groups." Commissioner Fox agreed that the Commission needs to do something pro-active.

Commissioner Kunselman suggested that this activity may be something the Commission can include in the strategic planning started by Ambrose Consultants (Commissioner training). He suggested that the Commission could invite the public to bring their ideas to the attention of the Commission. Thereafter, the Commission can take appropriate action based on issues and approaches addressed by the community. A public hearing may be the proper forum to effectuate this community response, although a great deal of planning, preparation, etc. are needed.

Commissioner Fox stated that the Coalition to Counter Hate Groups is holding a seminar later in May. She felt the Commission should be at the forefront of such a meeting. Ms Fox also stated that statistics indicate that Pennsylvania is the fastest growing area for promoting hate groups. (A pamphlet outlining the seminar was distributed, and will be forwarded to absent Commissioners.)

#### B. Director's Report

- 1. A grass roots town meeting will be held May 2, 1995, 6 8 p.m. at the Hilton Hotel. The meeting is sponsored by the Department of Justice and will address "How to make technical assistance more effective to encourage voluntary ADA compliance." This is the only meeting of its kind which will be held in the Northeastern United States. Charles Morrison will attend on behalf of the Commission.
- 2. The follow-up summary of Ambrose Consultants was distributed to Commissioners. There was some discussion and disagreement as to the order of priorities as presented in the report. A copy will be forwarded to absent Commissioners.
  - 3. The Financial Statement required by the State Ethics Commission is due today.
- 4. On April 27, the Commission participated in the Third Annual "Take Our Daughters to Work Day" sponsored by the Ms Foundation. Julia Morrison and Danitza Zatek were honorary employees for the day and had an opportunity to tour the Mayor's office and Cable Bureau Studios, in addition to lending a hand at doing some worthwhile minor activities at the Commission.
- 5. The 1993-94 Annual Report is completed. Distribution is anticipated at the June Commission meeting. James Pulford and Connie Zatek were commended for their diligent work in seeing that the report was completed in a timely fashion.

#### C. Budget Committee

Commissioner McClenahan reported that the Committee had met in April to develop ways in which the Commission can become pro-active in the City's budget process. At that time, additional information was identified as being essential to better understanding the system. The next meeting is scheduled for May 25.

#### D. Community Relations

Yancy Miles stated that the Committee did not meet in April. An all-day training session with police is scheduled for May 23. Commissioner Burstin is working to expand this training to include veteran officers, too, and has spoken with the Director of Personnel in this regard.

#### E. Housing

The Director reported that a meeting was not held as, at the last minute, none of the Commissioners were able to attend.

#### F. Personnel

Father Vallone reported that the Committee had met on April 19 to discuss the Director's evaluation. At that time, they reviewed the points of the evaluation instrument developed in 1993 along with the comments of the six Commissioners who responded to the current evaluation request form. It was determined that the evaluation instrument currently in place is not acceptable as the information is based solely on the Director's job description and interaction with City personnel, not the Commissioners. Most of the questions are not within the scope or knowledge of Commissioners. Therefore, a decision was made to revise the evaluation instrument for future use.

Father Vallone met with the Director on April 26 as part of the evaluation, using the current form. Following the meeting, the Director was invited to submit a written response by a specific date.

Commissioner Proctor has agreed to devise new evaluation criteria. Once this new form is ready, it will be revised first with the Committee and then with the Commission. Thereafter, a meeting will be scheduled with the Director to review the evaluation criteria and an actual evaluation of the Director will be conducted one year from THAT DATE based on the new instrument only.

Dr. Board asked that Commissioner Proctor be encouraged to expedite the processing of the evaluation form. Father Vallone agreed to contact him as soon as possible.

Father Vallone reported that the Personnel Committee had drafted a policy statement prior to the resignation of C. Lu Conser and was under the impression that the statement had been circulated among Commissioners and voted upon in the February Commission meeting. Father Vallone went on to read the following statement:

"In the event that any member of the Commission staff attempts to personally contact any individual Commissioner about internal workings of staff or Commission that should more appropriately be dealt with by staff supervisors, it is the Commissioners' policy to ignore such communication, i.e. such communication will not be brought up by, discussed with, or brought to the attention of any Commissioner, the Commission as a whole, or the Executive Director. In short, any attempt to bypass appropriate procedures will be assiduously ignored."

Commissioner Kunselman stated the statement is a good one, but as drafted may have a chilling effect on interpersonal relationships with Commissioners and staff. He asked if there are currently similar policy procedures in writing. Commissioner Fox and Director Harris indicated that written policy similar to that proposed was distributed to staff during the chairmanship of Randal Forrester. The Director agreed to re-issue the memo and forward copies to the Commissioners.

Father Vallone stated that the intention of the Personnel Committee was to discourage staff from raising inappropriate topics with Commissioners. Commissioners who bring such topics to the table on behalf of staff should be ruled out of order. He stated that the standing policy is that the Director directs the staff, and should be allowed to do so.

Dr. Board stated that there were too few Commissioners present to vote on this policy statement. He asked that it be circulated to all Commissioners. He agreed that the intention of the policy statement was to educate Commissioners, not to curtail or suppress staff. The Chair asked that a copy of the current written policy also be forwarded to Commissioners prior to the June meeting. At that time, the policy will be discussed and adopted.

Father Vallone stated that his services of interim chair were completed with the presentation of these two reports. He, therefore, stepped down and recommended that the Chairperson make a formal appointment for Chair of the Personnel Committee. This will be taken into consideration and an announcement will be made at the June Commission meeting.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

#### 1. Election of Vice Chair

As no other nominations were forthcoming, Commissioner Fox moved that the nomination to elect Denise Hughey as vice chairperson of the Commission be approved. The motion was seconded by Father Vallone and carried unanimously.

#### 2. Team Building Seminar

A follow-up report of the recent Commission retreat was received from the consultant and shared with Commissioners. There was some discussion about the consultant's attempt to include more Commissioners in the retreat by offering a short concluding session after the May meeting. There were disadvantages, as well as advantages, experienced by many of the Commissioners who were not able to attend both sessions.

Questions were also raised as to the order of priorities as outlined on the follow-up report. As a result, the Commission is still left with the need to prioritize the basic issues in the areas of employment, youth and police.

The final chapter of this project will be completed when the Director makes a report to the Pittsburgh Foundation and forwards receipts for expenses. This report is due in September 1995.

The meeting was properly adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

CC: Geo. Beard Récordé caluation form to fallow-

Commission on Human Relations Personnel Committee Meeting Notes 1/22/95

Attending: Conser, Fox, Proctor, Samson, Vallone

### **Director's Evaluation**

It was strongly felt that the Personnel Committee must formalize evaluation procedures for the Executive Director. It is neither fair, effective, nor professional to allow the Director manage in a vacuum, with little feedback other than informal communication. In an effort to make up for the considerable time period which has elapsed since the last evaluation and to provide a "baseline" for future evaluations, the Committee will do an initial evaluation prior to the March CHR meeting, using the current City evaluation form and comments from current Commissioners. Within the following month, the Committee will revise the current tool, and will re-evaluate the Director before the June meeting as the first of the annual evaluations that will be done using the revised evaluation tool.

The evaluation form should be tracked to the job description, and should include measurable goals and performance standards. It was agreed that **Vallone, Proctor and Samson** will perform the initial evaluation in collaboration with the other members of the Committee, and will work together to revise the evaluation tool for subsequent use.

 $\mathcal{Q}_{_{m{b}}}$  Conser will write up evaluation procedures for use in the future.

The Committee urges that regular meetings be held with the Director, Commission Chair and Personnel Chair to discuss Commission management and personnel issues. Although informal, these meetings would actually formalize the current process of feedback, which is not done on any regular basis other than "as needed".

## Staffing Configuration

In an effort to address concerns generated by the increasing case load and the recent staff cut backs, Conser will meet with the Director to discuss the most efficient utilization of staff and any possible staff changes that would benefit the working of the CHR.

### Inappropriate Communication

Inappropriate and misguided communication between staff and Commissioners has hampered the efficient and professional working of the CHR. Only if appropriate procedures are followed can issues be dealt with effectively and accountabilities maintained. The Personnel Committee drafted the following statement to be jointly issued by the Commission Chair and the Chair of the Personnel Committee:

In the event that any member of the Commission staff attempts to personally contact any individual Commissioner about internal workings of staff or Commission that should more appropriately be dealt with by staff supervisors, it is the Commissioners' policy to ignore such communication, i.e., such communication will not be brought up, discussed, or brought to the attention of any Commissioner, the Commission as a whole, or the Executive Director. In short, any attempt to bypass appropriate procedures will be assiduously ignored.

The Committee asks that the Chair endorse and enforce this statement in the strongest possible way.

## Commission Independence

In discussing personnel issues, it became increasingly clear that the Commission's status as an independent body has been seriously eroded in recent years through a number of actions by both current and previous City administrations. These actions include the periodic mass turnover in Commission members with no thought to Commission functioning and the recent handling of staff layoffs.

The Personnel Committee urges the Commission Chair initiate a process to address these concerns about the Commission's independence and to clearly define and communicate the Commission's relationship with the City government.

[chrpcmin]

#### **GRASSROOTS PARTNERSHIPS TOWN MEETING**

#### with

LIZ SAVAGE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (formerly from Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund)
REPRESENTATIVE FROM EEOC
REPRESENTATIVE FROM ACCESS BOARD

# "HOW TO MAKE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MORE EFFECTIVE TO ENCOURAGE VOLUNTARY ADA COMPLIANCE"

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1995 6 P.M. - 8 P.M.

#### HILTON HOTEL

This meeting is part of the President Clinton's National Performance Review and is the <u>only</u> meeting that will be held for this purpose in Northeastern United States. Local government officials, service providers, people with disabilities, representatives of the business community, and other ADA "stakeholders" have been invited.



## U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Rights Division

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20035

## DOJ/EEOC ADA PARTNERSHIP MEETINGS

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will be conducting "Grassroots Partnership Meetings" on the Americans with Disabilities Act in four communities. This initiative is part of President Clinton's National Performance Review. Members of the business and disability communities and state and local government entities are encouraged to attend.

These meetings will focus on the agencies' ADA Technical Assistance Programs and how they can be improved to maximize voluntary compliance with the law. As President Clinton's National Performance Review has underscored, these meetings wil. provide an opportunity for the Department of Justice and the EEDC to learn from entities with responsibilities under the ADA as well as from individuals who are protected under the law. Our primary purpose will be to "listen" to the ideas and concerns raised by all affected groups. Suggestions for next steps will be incorporated in our ongoing national Technical Assistance Program.

The Department of Justice and the EEOC will also provide a brief update on ADA implementation and will answer questions about the law. Partnership meetings will be held in Houston, Texas, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Sioux Falls, South Dakota and San Jose, California. Meetings are being sponsored by a coalition of local business, government and disability organizations.

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: All Commissioners and Staff

FROM: James Pulford

Commission Representative

DATE: May 1, 1995

SUBJ: INTAKE REPORT - First Quarter, 1995

During the first quarter of 1995 seventy-two (72) complaints were filed. This activity reflects a 50% increase in comparison to the fourth quarter of 1994, when forty-eight (48) cases were filed.

Here's how the first quarter compares to the "first quarter" of other years:

1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st
790	191	792	193	194	<u>′95</u>
28	43	69	52	58	72

The attached exhibits provide detailed information concerning the complaints filed during the first quarter of 1995.

EXHIBIT	A:	Summary Data - First Quarter	Page 1
	B:	Intake Statistics for last thirteen quarters	Page 2
	C:	Referral Statistics for First quarter	Page 3
	D:	Bases of Discrimination	Page 4
	<b>E</b> :	Race and Sex of Complainants	Page 5
	F:	Issues	Page 6
	G:	Income Level of Complainants	Page 7
	Н:	Respondents-Type of Business	Page 8

	TIPOT OURDED	1005	EXHIBIT A
TNTAKE REPORT,	FIRST QUARTER	1777	

# I. SUMMARY DATA: ALL INQUIRIES

	JAN	<u>FEB</u>	MARCH	TOTALS
Telephone Inquiries  Case-Related Intake City/Commission Bus Community Relations Other Walk-ins  TOTAL REPORTED INQUIRIES	460 121 127 0 312 12	333 125 142 2 443 9	443 106 123 0 365 10	1236 352 392 2 1120 31
Complaints Filed:	29	23	20	72

# II. CASES FILED, FIRST QUARTER 1995

	JAN	FEB	MARCH	TOTALS
COMMISSION INITIATED	0	0	1	1
EMPLOYMENT	20	20	14	54
HOUSING	7	1	4	12
PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS	2	2	1	5
POLICE RELATIONS	0	0	0	0
COMMUNITY	0	0	0	_0
RELATIONS	29	23	20	72

INTAKE REPORT, FIRST QUARTER 1995 EXHIBIT B							_						
INTAKE STATISTICS FOR PAST THIRTEEN QUARTERS													
Maro O	1st '92	2nd '92	3rd '92	4th '92	1st '93	2nd '93	3rd '93	4th '93	1st '94	2nd '94	3rd '94	4th '94	1st '95
<u>Type</u>				2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Commission Initiated		<i>C</i> <b>A</b>	<i>c</i> 1	48	41	, 38	49	48	49	53	50	40	54
Employment	51	64	61	*** 0	4.7	50	~ •						
Housing	9	8	5	7	8	5	6	9	5	15	12	6	12
Public Accomodation	2	4	2	5	2	2	8	1	3	5	6	1	5
Police Relations	2	2	4	5	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Community Relations	<u>5</u>	$\frac{1}{79}$	$\frac{4}{76}$	<del>3</del> 70	<u>0</u> 52	$\frac{1}{47}$	<u>6</u> 69	<u>0</u> 60	$\frac{1}{58}$	$\frac{0}{73}$	$\frac{1}{69}$	$\frac{0}{48}$	$\frac{0}{72}$

## REFERRAL STATISTICS

The following is a percentage breakdown of referrals during the fourth quarter of 1995:

	10 5
<ol> <li>Referral Services         (including NAACP, Mayor's         Service Center, attorneys and         unions, HELPLINE)</li> </ol>	18.5
2. Telephone Assistance (including Tel-Tips, Blue Pages Directory Assistance and Donnelley Directory)	30.5
3. Personal knowledge	11.0
4. Co-workers, family and friends	14.5
5. Commissioners and staff	5.0
6. Former complainants	3.5
7 Modia (includes Cable TV, radio,	17.0
newspaper articles and bus signs)	100.0

# BASES OF DISCRIMINATION: FIRST QUARTER

### I. EMPLOYMENT CASES

Basis	Number	<u>Percentage</u>
Race Race & Sex Retaliation Sexual Orientation Race & H/D Race & Religion Race & Sexual Orientation Sex Sex and Sexual Orientation Race, Sex, Age & H/D Age TOTAL	26 7 7 3 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1	48.1 12.9 12.9 5.6 3.7 3.7 3.7 1.9 1.9
10111	- ·	

#### II. HOUSING CASES

Basis	Number	<u>Percentage</u>
Race Sexual Orientation Familial Status Handicap/Disability Race & Familial Status	7 2 1 1 — 1	$   \begin{array}{r}     58.4 \\     16.7 \\     8.3 \\     8.3 \\     \hline     100.0   \end{array} $
ТОТАТ	12	100.0

## III. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION CASES

Basis		Number	<u>Percentage</u>
Race Handicap/Disabilit Sex Age & H/D	Y TOTAL	2 1 1 	$\begin{array}{r} 40.0 \\ 20.0 \\ 20.0 \\ \hline 20.0 \\ \hline 100.0 \end{array}$

- IV. POLICE RELATIONS CASES None
  - V. COMMUNITY RELATIONS CASES None
  - V. COMMISSION INITIATED CASES

Basis		Number	<u>Percentage</u>
Familial Status	TOTAL	$\frac{1}{1}$	$\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ \hline 100.0 \end{array}$

EXHIBIT E

# RACE AND SEX OF COMPLAINANTS

## I. EMPLOYMENT CASES

Race and Sex	<u>Number</u>	Percent
African-American Males African-American Females Caucasian Males Caucasian Females	$   \begin{array}{r}     28 \\     17 \\     5 \\     \underline{4} \\     54   \end{array} $	51.8 31.5 9.3 7.4 100.0
II. HOUSING CASES	·	
African-American Females African-American Males Caucasian Females Caucasian Males	5 4 2 1 12	$ \begin{array}{r} 41.7 \\ 33.3 \\ 16.7 \\ \underline{8.3} \\ 100.0 \end{array} $
III. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION CASES		
African-Americam Females African-American Males Caucasian Females Caucasian Males	2 1 1 - 1 - 5	$ \begin{array}{r}  40.0 \\  20.0 \\  20.0 \\  \hline  100.0 \end{array} $
IV. POLICE RELATIONS	None	
V. COMMUNITY RELATIONS CASES	None	

EXHIBIT F

# ISSUES OF COMPLAINTS

## I. EMPLOYMENT CASES

Issue	Number	Percent
Discharge Different Terms & Conditions Failure to Promote Unjust Discipline Sexual Harassment Suspension Failure to Hire	$   \begin{array}{r}     30 \\     14 \\     3 \\     3 \\     1 \\     1 \\     2 \\     \hline     54   \end{array} $	55.5 25.9 5.5 5.5 1.9 1.9 3.8 100.0
II. HOUSING CASES		
Issue	Number	Percent
Denied Rental Eviction	$\begin{array}{c} 6 \\ \underline{6} \\ 12 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 50.0 \\ \underline{50.0} \\ 100.0 \end{array}$
III. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION CASES		
Issu <u>e</u>	Number	Percent
Failure to Accommodate Sexual Harassment	4 1 5	$\begin{array}{r} 80.0 \\ \underline{20.0} \\ 100.0 \end{array}$
IV. POLICE RELATIONS CASES	None	
V. COMMUNITY RELATIONS CASES	None	

# INTAKE REPORT, FIRST QUARTER 1995

EXHIBIT G

# INCOME LEVEL OF COMPLAINANTS: EMPLOYMENT CASES

Income	Number	Percent
Less than \$10,000 \$10,001 - 15,000 \$15,001 - 20,000 \$20,001 - 25,000 \$25,001 - 30,000 \$30,001 - 35,000 \$35,001 - 40,000 \$40,001 - 45,000 \$45,001 - 50,000 Over \$50,000	$ \begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 26 \\ 15 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline 0 \\ 54 \end{array} $	5.6 48.1 27.7 7.4 9.3 1.9 0 0 0 100.0

EXHIBIT H

# RESPONDENTS-TYPE OF BUSINESS: EMPLOYMENT CASES

	_
Hospitals	6
Colleges/Universities	5
Banks	4
Hotels	4
Manufacturing Plants	4
Nursing Homes	4
Fast Food Restaurants	3
Maintenance Firms	3
Security Firms	3
Utility Companies	3
Food Service Firm	2
Accounting Firm	1
Deli	1
Delivery Service	1
Display Company	1
Insurance Firm	1
Motion PIX Lab	1
Plumbing/Heating Firm	1
Restaurant	1
Retail Shops	1
Synagogue	1
Theatre	1
Union Local	1
YMCA	$-\frac{1}{54}$

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Employment Development Division

Dennsylvania

ANNOUNCEMENT OF A POSITION OPENING

4th floor City-County Building Pittsburgh, PA. 15219

<u>For</u>

DIRECTOR

SALARY: \$52,385 Per Year

DEPARTMENT: Commission on Human Relations

EXCELLENT FRINGE BENEFITS INCLUDING CITY PAID MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL INSURANCE, VISION AND LIFE INSURANCE, 11 PAID HOLIDAYS, 10 VACATION DAYS, SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE POLICY AND CONTRIBUTORY PENSION PLAN.

Any person interested in this position who weets the requirements listed below way obtain the required application in the Civil Service Office, Fourth Floor, City-County Building, between the hours of 7:30 A.M. and 5:30 P.M. Monday through Friday. APPLICATIONS, WITH REQUIRED RESUME, WILL BE ACCEPTED ON A CONTINUOUS BASIS UNTIL THE POSITION IS FILLED.

Directs the staff and activities of the Commission on Human Relations; oversees processing of complaints DUTIES: alleging discrimination in employment, housing or public accommodations; resolves inter-group tension in the community and ensures that City funds support Affirmative Action in selected areas; consults with Mayor's Office, City Council, Commission members, other departments or others to give information and/or assistance regarding human relations matters; submits ordinances and resolutions to Council; develops and submits Department's budget; oversees all expenditures; interviews and selects staff; organizes and plans work of employees; supervises assigned personnel; evaluates work; recommends and implements approved disciplinary and/or corrective action; provides training and/or technical assistance as requested or required; prepares agenda for Commission meetings; implements Commission decisions; works with other departments to implement joint projects as requested by Mayor or Council; reviews and acts on contractural relationships with EEOC; negotiates formal agreements, methods of implementation and executes vouchers for payment; reviews special cases and problems with appropriate staff and supervisor; does public speaking to community groups, the media, etc; participates in conferences; oversees implementation of approved City-wide policies where applicable (e.g., City Charter, Pittsburgh Code, union agreements, etc.); maintains records and prepares and submits accurate reports, including monthly report to Mayor's Office of the Commission's activities; develops, implements and monitors the departmental affirmative action plan ensuring compliance with applicable laws and guidelines and with the City-wide Affirmative Action Plan; plans, develops, directs, coordinates, organizes and controls the materials, equipment and personnel under jurisdiction toward the effective, efficient and economical attainment of program goals, including maximum convenience to the public and safety of employees; manages area of responsibility in strict accordance with applicable laws, regulations and established policy including union agreements to ensure fair and standardized treatment of employees; and performs activities and functions of related lower-level personnel and other related tasks and duties that are assigned or required.

KNOWLEDGE/ABILITIES: Extensive knowledge of Human Relations Ordinances and other relevant acts and orders, (e.g., Title VII and Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act pertaining to discrimination and the procedure for processing complaints of discrimination, the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission regulations, the Pittsburgh Code (Chapter 651 through 659), and Housing and Urban Development regulations pertaining to nondiscrimination in housing); and of investigative techniques and procedures including fact finding, analysis, formulating and presenting recommendations and negotiating resolutions to consented issues. Considerable knowledge of employment policies and practices that result in discrimination as well as their identification, causes and possible solutions; of the principles, practices and techniques of public administration, wanagement and supervision; and of relevant labor agreements and personnel policies and procedures. Ability to analyze information and testimeny impartially: to develop and monitor a budget; to understand policies, laws, legal briefs, etc., and to analyze actions taken consistent with these provisions; to supervise and manage a Department; to plan, monitor and evaluate the work of self and others; to maintain records and prepare accurate reports and to draft correspondence, ordinances and proposals; to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing; and to establish and maintain effective working relationships with supervisors, associates, outside agencies and the ganeral public. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

- 1. Applicants must be residents of the City of Pittsburgh at time of filing application and remain a resident up to and throughout employment with the City. Perification of City residency required at time of filing application.
- 2. Nost-present a current, valid Class 1 (or C) Pennsylvania Hotor Vehicle Operator's License at the time of application or prior to appointment. A valid driver's license must be maintained throughout employment. Written requests for a special accommodation on the basis of Section 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act will be considered by the Department of Personnel and Civil Service Commission on an individual basis.

EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENT: In order to be considered eligible for this position the application must clearly show a Bachelor's degree in Public Administration, Public Management, Urban Studies, Social Sciences or a related field. EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT: In order to be considered eligible for this position the application must clearly show 6 years progressively responsible experience in Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) enforcement and/or EEO compliance including 2 years of supervisory experience.

EQUIVALENCY: Education and/or experience in the required areas may be substituted on a year for year basis if the application clearly shows the required number of years to meet the posted requirements.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER M/F/H

LUZ/TCS/m1 A/070/91

ANNOUNCEMENT NUMBER: