

May 25, 2012

Tauruson McMillian
11956 Centralia Road #104
Hawaiian Gardens Ca, 90716
562-673-1169

Long Beach Civil Service
333 Ocean Blvd, 7th floor
Long Beach Ca, 90802

RECEIVED

2012 MAY 31 AM 11:35

CIVIL SERVICE DEPT.

Agenda Item No.

16

Dear Long Beach Civil Service Commission,

Good day, My name is Tauruson McMillian and I have recently applied for the position of Gas Constuction Worker. I recieved a letter of denial in which I kindly request reconsideration due to my experience relevant to the position duties and expectations.

I am a former employee of the City of Long Beach and have extensive knowledge with the requirements and standards that the city expects from all employees. My training includes and not limited to construction (roofing and framing),plumbing (pipe fittings, valves and pressure checking),and refuse (sanitation collection) to name a few. I sincerley ask for special consideration for the position I applied for and granted an oppurtunity to take the exam test.

Most Sincere,

Tauruson McMillian

1 **DATE:** June 6, 2012
2 **TO:** Civil Service Commission
3 **FROM:** Melinda George, Deputy Director – Civil Service Department *mgeorge*
4 **SUBJECT: DISQUALIFICATION FROM GAS CONSTRUCTION WORKER**
5 **EXAMINATION – SHAWN WALLS AND TAURUSON McMILLIAN**

6 Correspondence has been received from Shawn Walls and Tauruson McMillian both
7 requesting the Civil Service Commission reconsider the disqualification of their
8 applications and allow them to participate in the examination for Gas Construction
9 Worker.

10 Staff presents the following information for consideration by the Commission.

- 11 • The classification of Gas Construction Worker is used exclusively in the Long
12 Beach Gas and Oil Department. Positions in this classification are involved in the
13 construction, maintenance and repair of Long Beach gas pipelines. Historically, the
14 classification generates a large number of applicants with a relatively small
15 percentage of the applicant pool actually meeting the minimum requirements.
- 16 • The current process was an open competitive examination that generated 258
17 applicants during the filing period, April 20, 2012 through May 4, 2012. Of the 258
18 applicants, 178 were not accepted due to insufficient experience and 80 applicants
19 were invited to the written examination.
- 20 • This examination process is designed to allow all candidates that demonstrate they
21 meet the minimum requirements to be invited to participate in the written
22 examination, weighted 100%. It is not designed to screen only the most qualified
23 candidates into the examination.
- 24 • As part of the application process, applicants were required to complete and submit
25 a supplemental application that included questions on related work experience,
tools usage and other experience in trench shoring, heat fusion and gas pipeline

tapping and testing. These questions were used to ascertain the basic minimum one-year requirement to file.

SHAWN WALLS

- Mr. Walls submitted an application verifying, by his response, that he had one year of required experience. His response to the follow-up question, when given the opportunity to describe the related experience, including stating the organization and amount of experience, did not demonstrate sufficient experience to meet the qualifications. Mr. Walls stated that he did, "plumbing around my house and family and friends."
- Mr. Walls' application was further reviewed in conjunction with his responses, but staff found that it did not provide supporting information to show that Mr. Walls had professional plumbing experience of the type necessary to offset the construction and gas pipeline related requirement. Although Mr. Walls stated he had over four years as a pipe fitter, he did not provide any detail, including employer or a description of duties. His responses to the questions on tool usage and other related experience did not provide information that would warrant his acceptance into the examination.
- Upon receipt of his notice that his application was not accepted for the written examination, Mr. Walls contacted staff and spoke to Melinda George, Deputy Director, who was conducting the examination. Ms. George explained to Mr. Walls that his application did not provide sufficient information to meet the one-year requirement. Mr. Walls requested that Ms. George have the Executive Director review his application. Mario Beas reviewed Mr. Walls' application and concurred that it did not meet the minimum requirements. Following this determination, Mr. Walls informed Ms. George that he did have the required experience and wished to

1 have the opportunity to have this experience considered. Mr. Walls was informed
2 that he could not amend his application after the filing deadline.

- 3 • Mr. Walls' request to the Commission acknowledges that he did not include
4 information on his application that might have influenced the outcome of the
5 screening process. If the Commission were to allow Mr. Walls the opportunity to
6 provide additional information for his application, his qualifications would still be
7 subject to review by staff to determine if he would meet the one-year requirement.

8 **TAURUSON McMILLIAN**

- 9 • Mr. McMillian completed his application confirming, by his response, that he did not
10 possess the one-year of required work experience. Additionally, when asked to
11 describe his related work experience, his written response was "none." Mr.
12 McMillian also responded, "none" to the questions when asked to describe other
13 related experience.
- 14 • Mr. McMillian's application was evaluated and not accepted for the examination, as
15 it did not demonstrate that he met the minimum requirements for the position.
- 16 • Mr. McMillian contacted Civil Service staff several times to discuss his application.
17 Ms. George explained that he did not submit sufficient information to qualify him for
18 the examination. Mr. McMillian stated he felt the questions were not clear and that
19 he did have the required experience although he did not submit the information on
20 his application. Staff also informed Mr. Millian that he could not amend his
21 application after the filing deadline.
- 22 • Mr. McMillian's request to the Civil Service Commission asks for special
23 consideration and offers a brief explanation of his qualifications.
- 24 • If the Commission were to allow Mr. McMillian the opportunity to provide additional
25 information for his application, his qualifications would still be subject to review by
staff to determine if he would meet the one-year requirement.

- 1 • Of the 178 applicants that did not meet the minimum requirements, 64 responded
2 similarly to Mr. McMillian, selecting “no” when asked, “ I have one year of related
3 experience?” None of these candidates were accepted or invited to the written
4 examination.

5 **SUMMARY**

- 6 • The application and supplemental application is considered a critical step in the
7 examination process. At this point in the process, if Mr. Walls and Mr. McMillian
8 were allowed to change their applications, it would be unfair to all other applicants
9 screened out of the process. Civil Service staff has the responsibility to evaluate all
10 applications fairly, based upon the information submitted by applicants. Staff
11 cannot make assumptions about the qualifications of candidates, either to the
12 positive or negative. Based upon the information submitted, staff believes neither
13 candidate submitted information in a timely manner that showed they met the
14 minimum requirements for Gas Construction Worker.
- 15 • The examination for Gas Construction Worker has been completed and the eligible
16 list submitted for approval by the Civil Service Commission at today’s meeting. If
17 the Commission were to approve the request of Mr. Walls or of Mr. McMillian, staff
18 would then re-evaluate the applications and, if qualified, administer the written
19 examination and amend the eligible list as necessary.

20 **RECOMMENDATION**

21 In accordance with Civil Service Rules and Regulations Section 6 – Disqualification of
22 Applicants, staff recommends the Commission deny the requests of both Mr. Walls
23 and Mr. McMillian to have additional information considered after the examination’s
24 established closing date.

25