

MEET & CONFER MEETING

December 10, 2015

Director Ryan greeted the group and addressed the following agenda items.

Item 1 – Director Ryan confirmed that members of AZCPOA and FOP – but no one from ACA - was present at the meeting.

Item 2 – Direct Ryan encouraged active participation by the Employee Organization representatives at the Fallen Correctional Employees Memorial Committee (FCEMC) meetings, acknowledging the participation of Richard Mehner. Richard provided status updates that include the consideration of various types, sizes, and prices of naming bricks, the 3D memorial modeling choices under development by the architect, and confirmation of donations by Hickman’s Family Farms and the Correctional Peace Officers Foundation. To date, all available funds have been donated. Donations will be solicited when the PayPal link by the 100 Club is ready for use. The 100 Club will host a 501(c)(3) sub-account to will manage donations to fund the memorial. Noteworthy to mention, is that all donations will be tax deductible. Chief Human Resources Officer Colleen McManus suggested that an article be prepared for the Directions Newsletter to help get the word out.

SUBMITTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions one through nine were posed by FOP. Questions ten through twelve were posed by AZCPOA. Questions thirteen and fourteen were posed by ACA.

FOP

These are questions from Officers in the Units collected by FOP Members:

Question 1 - AI Extensions: For Administrative Investigations, there is no procedure to advise the employee that an extension was requested by Administration and approved by the Director. FOP Requests that the principle be advised when and if an extension is requested, granted, denied for an investigation.

Answer 1 – Deputy Director Hood clarified that the statement is only partially accurate. DO 601.07, Subsection 1.6 requires that the “Warden, Administrator or Bureau Administrator shall periodically advise the employee's supervisor and the employee of the status of the investigation when appropriate or upon inquiry.” Although extensions are not specifically mentioned, an extension is relevant to the investigation status and therefore should be communicated consistent with this language. ADC will review and consider more specific language to further clarify this issue. For purposes of Administrative Investigations, the Warden, Administrator and Bureau Administrator are

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

referred to as the "Approving Authority" in the respective investigation. DO 601 will be adjusted to provide the employee notification of an extension.

Question 2 - MAP Grievances: DO 514 is still on the ADC intranet as policy. It gives the impression that the new MAP can still be grieved. Since this is not the case and MAP entries cannot be grieved, can the PACE policy be removed from the ADC intranet. As a side note, how does an employee address clear errors in MAP when the Supervisor is unwilling or will not correct the errors?

Answer 2 – Support Services Division Director Gail Rittenhouse explained that DO 514 has been under revision for some time due to ongoing changes in the MAP system. It is now in the administrative review stage and should be finalized in the near future to exclusively refer to MAP. In the interim, ADC will issue a DI to rescind the current language regarding grievances. Director Ryan requested that the DO be updated within 30 days.

An employee may address errors in his/her MAP by making a notes entry into the MAP system or by attaching a memo to his/her MAP. This documentation can also be included in the employee's personnel file upon the employee's request.

Question 3 - Digital Recorders: There has been previous discussion on allowing employees the ability to bring in to the Units a digital recorder when being interviewed by AIU. Per 601.07.1.1.7, the policy allows for the employee to record interviews, but nothing about bringing a recorder into the Unit. Can we get this authorized on a statewide level for interviews?

Answer 3 – Deputy Director Hood clarified that the current policy presents a potential conflict depending on where an interview is conducted. Security and contraband control are a priority. ADC is willing to consider resolving this situation along the following lines:

Since AIU investigators digitally record all interviews, a copy of that recording may be made available to a principal employee upon request. Per DO 601, employees are authorized to request and receive from the IG a copy of investigations, including AIU recorded interviews once the investigation is completed. A revision to 601 that authorizes an employee to request and receive a copy of the audio recording only, following the same request guidelines through the IG, may resolve this issue. The revision would dictate that a requesting principal employee may request a copy of his/her specific interview recording by providing a written request to the IG under the same requirements of requesting the entire investigation cited in current policy. The

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

request would be processed by the IG and an electronic copy of the recording would be provided to the principal employee within five days of receipt of the request, regardless of the status of the respective investigation.

Question 4 - Uncovered Employee Right to Review Disciplinary: Uncovered employees are receiving disciplinary letters that state that "...this action is not appealable within the agency or to the State Personal Board" FOP would like to have any disciplinary letter issued to add..."...this action is not grievable within the agency nor is it appealable to the State Personal Board, but a request may be sent to the Department Director for review; that review is at the sole discretion of the Department Director."

Answer 4 – Support Services Division Director Gail Rittenhouse shared that the disciplinary letters for uncovered employees will be revised to state, "This action is not grievable or appealable within the agency, nor is it appealable to the State Personnel Board." Deputy Director Hood explained that each such action is reviewed by Director Ryan and ADOA. Director Ryan added that the check and balance is that the CHRO and the Director ultimately have to be of one mind on the disposition.

Question 5 - Non-Employee to be Representatives: Under 38-1104(A) "with the employer's permission, the law enforcement officer's representative may be from the law enforcement officer's professional membership organization." FOP is requesting that the Department to allow members of FOP who are prior employees of ADC who separated without issue (retired or medically retired) to act as employee representatives. Because the representatives may have to enter a secured area within a State Facility, they may be subject to a background investigation per DI 315 and DO 602. FOP will be willing to pay for the background investigation of non-employee at a reasonable cost.

Answer 5 – Deputy Director Hood stated that ADC is not willing to consider such a modification to the existing policy at this time.

Question 6 - Electronic Cigarettes: Per DO 109 employees are currently allowed to carry their e-cigarettes with them on post and inside their units. Policy restricts them from bringing in accessories such as extra liquid refill. There is no limit to an employee bringing in two packs of cigarettes or two cans of chewing tobacco. We would like it to be considered to allow employees to bring in a liquid refill for their e-cigarettes limited to one bottle no greater than 30ml in size. This would be adequate for an employee being prepared to work two consecutive shifts.

Answer 6 – SROD Joe Profiri stated that ADC is not willing to consider such a modification to the existing policy at this time.

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

Question 7 - Grooming: Since the change to the inmate grooming policy DO 704 allows an inmate to grow a beard up to 1". Will staff be allowed the same privilege under DO 503?

Answer 7 – Division Director Carson McWilliams stated that ADC is not willing to consider such a modification to the existing policy at this time. Pursuant to DO 503, staff may submit individual requests for grooming and dress modifications to the Grooming and Dress Committee for review and consideration, and the Committee then considers the request and makes a recommendation to the Director. Requests may be submitted to COTA Commander Ivan Bartos, who chairs the committee. The problem with beards is fit testing for a face mask, because a poor fit around a goatee or beard is a safety issue.

Question 8 - Critical Minimums:

Complex/Unit		Was	Now	Complex/Unit		Was	Now	Complex/Unit		Was	Now
Winslow/Complex	Days	4	3	Winslow/Coronado	Days	8	5	Winslow/Kaibab27	Days	27	19
	Swings	4	3		Swings	8	6		Swings	27	19
	Graves	4	4		Graves	8	5		Graves	25	18
Complex	Unit	Was	Now	Complex	Unit	Was	Now	Complex	Unit	Was	Now
Perryville	San Carlos	12	9	Perryville	Lumley	17	16	Lewis	Eagle Point	7	5

Listed are the reported "Critical Minimum" numbers, which have been lowered at some of the facilities throughout the state due to the costs of overtime. These numbers do not represent a full complement of staff at any of the locations, only the absolute minimum number of officers the unit posts for the safety of the staff and inmates. Some facilities are at a point where they are in consideration of lowering the "Critical Minimum", they have not done so yet.

Some locations report that when there is an operations position that must be manned, such as kitchen or medical officer, the shift must give up one of their "Critical Minimum" Staff without being replenished.

With the newly implemented minimum staffing levels, inmates are as aware of the shortage of officers as we are. Presence has always been known as the first step in use of force, but it is how we manage the behavior of inmates on a daily basis. When there are not enough staff to address and redirect inmate behavior, the inmates escalate. This is what officers are reporting from many locations throughout the state. When officers see the escalation in the inmates they manage, the officer is all too aware that

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

there are not enough officers to provide a response of more than one or two staff if a response becomes necessary. At the current staffing levels, many are in a situation that having the 4 officers required to remove an inmate from a bed by policy cannot be met. The number of staff available to respond is not reflected in a "critical minimum". It must be considered that there are control room officers and floor officers that are not allowed to leave their assigned post, making those officers not available to respond to an incident. This number is driven even lower when there are functions such as Meal service, and recreation occurring. Officers are reporting that the current "critical minimums" are leaving them without the necessary level of support when an incident occurs.

Many staff are assigned to areas that have no inmate supervision. From CO II's to DW's and CO IV's. Can we take one for every 5 out of central office, and assign them to their closest facility temporarily to assist with staffing? If you have 2 CO III's and 3 CO IV's in central office, then 4 of them can take up a day of work for one and move that one temporarily to cover a post at a unit. This is equal to the current workload of a CO III within the institution.

Operations and CO III's now assume a post on one shift one day per week. Why has it not been implemented to have Captains, CO IV's, and ADW's also assume one shift post per week. This will not fix the staffing issues, but would provide one more body on a post to assist with the lack of staff on a yard. Some of these individuals worked posts when overtime was available, now that we are in such a crunch, they are not on any of these posts.

Will you implement all staff having moved up through security being required to assume one post per week until you can come up with a better solution to increase the number of staff currently posted?

Answer 8 – NROD Ernie Trujillo explained that this is a three-part question that requires a three-part response.

1. The statement that "critical minimum" numbers have been lowered at some facilities due to the costs of overtime is not accurate. For example, the number of 27 at Kaibab Unit represents full staffing if every post on the post chart was filled. The minimum number of staff for Kaibab had been established as 21. This ensures that all control rooms and each housing unit posts have at least one officer assigned. A review of the priority posting chart shows a need for additional posts to be filled, so the Winslow Warden adjusted the priority posting chart; staffing for the day shift and

MEET & CONFER MEETING

December 10, 2015

swing shift has been increased. This staffing model is consistent with other similarly configured Units at Tucson and Eyman. The minimum staffing at Coronado Unit is consistent with the Graham Unit at Safford and Eagle Point at Lewis. A large number of inmates are off-site at work assignments in those units - thus the lower number on day shift vs. swing shift. The staffing is based on zones that consist of two housing units per zone with one officer per zone and also includes a yard officer and a supervisor. Complex operations are staffed according to the post chart numbers. Graveyard is higher because two perimeter patrols are posted.

Lewis Complex has not changed the posting at Eagle Point. It is staffed similarly to Graham Unit and Coronado Unit. Perryville is adhering to the priority posting chart and has not reduced any minimum numbers. Lumley Unit has actually added an additional post to day shift and swing shift by placing them higher in priority for being filled. San Carlos has not lowered minimum staffing levels.

Review of staffing is done on a daily basis and shift to shift. Priorities can change and the staffing needs must adapt. Kitchen posting is based out of the day shift even though the hours are different with standard shift hours. Medical lines must be accomplished in order to meet the inmates' medical needs. The priority posting chart is what guides adding or collapsing of posts. When staffing levels fall below minimum levels, yard activities are curtailed in consultation with the Deputy Warden and/or the Duty Officer. Staff is routinely cross-leveled to ensure that minimum numbers are met for the safe, secure, and orderly administration of the facility.

A full complement of staff is not possible given the number of current vacancies. There are not enough overtime dollars to cover every vacancy with overtime. Contrary to apparent perceptions, ADC is not drastically reducing overtime opportunities for employees; it is merely reducing overtime to its historical levels in response to a recent and financially unsustainable spike in overtime. This is why priority posting is so critical, and for attendance to be everyone's concern, not just management's concern. This is also why attendance is so critical. High call-ins and high numbers of staff out for intermittent FMLA and/or extended FMLA seriously and negatively impact the ability to staff units beyond minimum levels.

2. Officer presence and professional communication are the best way to ensure that inmates are compliant with institutional regulations. Being in constant motion and fully engaged will generally bring good results. Emergency response assignments are made with a focus on safety and security. While control room officers cannot abandon their control rooms, floor officers - when assigned - can leave their floor to respond to an ICS

MEET & CONFER MEETING

December 10, 2015

activation. Floor officers also can escort their assigned dorms/housing units to meals, and spend time assisting with supervision of recreation activities.

3. There are no CO III's or Deputy Wardens assigned to Central Office. There are three CO II's assigned to Community Corrections for offender transportation and security at the Community Corrections headquarters. The CO II's assigned to front desks at Central Office are assigned there on a TWA and are pending return to full duty status. The CO IV's assigned there are responsible for ensuring that all inmate classification actions are completed, Protective Custody packets are reviewed, and inmate movement is properly scheduled and monitored. If these officers were assigned to a field post, these critical functions would stop and overall inmate movement would be in jeopardy of paralysis.

Captains, CO IV's, and ADW's are assigned as duty officers on weekends, holidays, and evenings/nights in order to maintain Command Staff presence at each facility. This is in addition to being required to complete their daily assignments. It is not practical to assign them to a mandatory post once a week in addition to their current duty officer assignments. An example of where an Administrator stepped in where needed was on Thanksgiving Day. A DW stepped in to provide coverage for an Officer — and that DW ended up working a double shift. DD McWilliams added that overtime increased by about \$700,000 per pay period from June to September. Two of the driving forces are hospital staffing and constant mental health watches inside the institutions. A position paper is currently being written to address changes in the hospital coverage, targeting the three highest usage institutions, with a goal to reduce staffing and overtime in a positive way. This goes back to people being at work.

NROD Ernie Trujillo explained what a big issue hospital staffing has become, sharing an example of a recent weekend where there were so many inmates at the hospital that there were fifty-two officers PLUS seven Sergeants stationed at the hospital! DD Hood explained that there has been a trend of mental health watches increasing on Friday and decreasing on Monday, when the medical and mental health staff return to work. After a meeting with Corizon leadership last week, Corizon will be adding appropriate positions to the rounds on the weekends. Director Ryan added that inmate mental health issues do not stop on Friday afternoons, it is a 24/7 issue. A recent modification is at Lumley. Those on continuous watch on the lower tiers are clustered adjacent to each other so that it takes fewer officers to watch. Those that are on intermittent watch can be covered by one officer in constant motion—a one to six run.

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

Director Ryan referred to the average monthly call-ins report, posted in break rooms. This is very telling in terms of which prison complex percentages are highest for CO absenteeism. Many of the complexes with lowest vacancy rates, particularly in the metropolitan area, have the highest call-in rates. At yesterday's Employee Awards Ceremony, one of the unit citations awarded was bestowed upon the Eyman complex, which had the fewest call-ins. The DD and RODs challenged each Warden and DW to impact the number of call-ins. The Employee Organizations could have or should have some influence on your membership to come to work.

Question 9 - CAC/NNTI: CAC was officially removed from policy. Now, Employee Relations has sent out a set of guidelines for how NNTI's are to be worded for call ins. (See attached) Why was CAC removed, if only to be unofficially reinstated? Will you provide a written policy on the procedure which has been implemented regarding call in's?

Answer 9 – Support Services Division Director Gail Rittenhouse explained that ADC does not agree with the characterization of the guidelines from Employee Relations. First, an NNTI regarding attendance issues is not a reinstatement of the CAC system, which was discontinued in July 2012. It is written guidance provided to an employee to specifically advise where improvement is needed. While chronic attendance problems may warrant disciplinary action, the NNTI, which is not disciplinary, is intended to alert the employee to the problem and give him/her an opportunity to correct it.

In addition, the statement about Employee Relations having sent a set of guidelines "for how NNTI's are to be worded" with regard to attendance issues is false. The wording originated some time ago at the Tucson Complex and was shared with Employee Relations, which provided this language to the field more than two years ago, merely as a suggestive possibility, not as required language for all NNTI's issued for similar reasons.

ADC is not willing to consider issuing additional written policy for call-ins at this time. DO 525 already adequately addresses the requirements regarding attendance and call-ins and provides for the issuance of NNTI's to address attendance problems. As with any situation when policy is not followed, an employee may be subject to corrective and/or disciplinary action, as is well documented in DO 601.

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

AZCPOA

On behalf of AZCPOA, the following questions were provided:

Question 10 - In personnel board proceedings ADC has repeatedly asserted:

(1) The "just cause" standard of ARS 38-1103 does not apply to corrections officers,

Answer 10 – DD Gail Rittenhouse clarified that ADC does not agree with this characterization of its position in Personnel Board proceedings. The Attorney General's Office has consistently contended on ADC's behalf that A.R.S. § 38-1103 and the "just cause" standard does apply to Correctional Officers, but only at the stage of the process when discipline is administered. This is consistent with DO 601. The standards of review relevant to Personnel Board proceedings are set forth in A.R.S. § 41-783: whether there was a preponderance of evidence to warrant the disciplinary action, and whether the agency's action was arbitrary and capricious. There is no provision in A.R.S. § 41-783 for the Board's review of agency actions based on a just cause standard. To the extent that the Attorney General's Office may have contended that A.R.S. § 38-1103 did not apply in a specific case, this contention would have been with regard to the applicability of the statute at that level of appeal, not whether the statute applied to Correctional Officers in general. In the absence of specific information regarding individual instances of employee discipline at a particular Personnel Board proceeding, ADC is unable to further respond to this allegation.

(2) That ARS 38-1101(H) does not apply to ADC when it reviews a personnel board order, and

Answer 10 – DD Gail Rittenhouse clarified that this statute was repealed by the Arizona Legislature nearly one year ago.

(3) That ARS 38-1101(K) (requiring a hearing officer to determine if just cause exists for discipline) does not apply to hearings involving corrections officers

Answer 10 – DD Gail Rittenhouse clarified that this statute was repealed by the Arizona Legislature nearly one year ago.

Question 11 - In the Superior Court ADC has asserted that ARS 38-1107 does not apply and that corrections officers are not entitled to superior court hearings.

Answer 11 – DD Gail Rittenhouse explained that ADC does not agree with this characterization of its position in Superior Court. The Attorney General's Office has not contended on ADC's behalf that A.R.S. § 38-1107 does not apply or that Correctional

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

Officers are not entitled to such judicial review. To the extent that the Attorney General's Office may have contended that A.R.S. § 38-1107 did not apply in a specific case, this contention would have been with regard to the express provisions of A.R.S. § 38-1107(F)(2), which provide that a law enforcement officer who is employed as an at will employee by an agency of this State is not entitled to judicial review by the Superior Court. The pendency of numerous cases precludes ADC from further response to this allegation.

Question 12 - In investigative matters (AIU) ADC has not fully complied with ARS 38-1104(E) requiring ADC, upon request, to provide a basic summary of similar discipline.

Instead of immediately complying with ARS 38-1104(E), ADC requires officers to submit public records requests to the public information unit.

Wardens imposing discipline are apparently unaware of the request and impose discipline before the summaries are produced to officers.

The problem is that ADC's refusal to follow the law has resulted in unnecessary lawsuits lost by ADC. *Berndt* at the court of appeals, and *Ayala* at the Superior Court.

In light of these decisions can't ADC simply agree that Title 38 applies to uncovered corrections employees?

Answer 12 – Deputy Director Hood clarified that ADC does not agree with numerous characterizations throughout these allegations. ADC has consistently and fully complied with A.R.S. § 38-1104(E), and its requirement that requests for information be routed to a centralized location does not violate this statute. The reference to the *Berndt* and *Ayala* cases is misplaced because neither of those cases involve an allegation of non-compliance with A.R.S. § 38-1104(E), and both of those cases remain pending in State Courts, not "lost" as alleged.

In an effort to more comprehensively address the erroneous perceptions upon which these allegations are predicated, and to further reduce administrative burdens on ADC and its employees, ADC will be amending DO language to ensure the following:

(1) Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-1101(8)(b), and subject to the provisions of A.R.S. § 38-1103(B)(2) and A.R.S. § 38-1104(F) and A.R.S. § 38-1107(F)(2), at the time of service of a Notice of Charge (NOC) Letter, ADC will provide a covered law enforcement officer with a basic summary of any discipline ordered against any other law enforcement

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

officer of generally similar rank and experience employed by the employer within the previous two years for the same or a similar violation. Letters will be modified to ensure acknowledgement of receipt of the basic summary when the employee acknowledges receipt of the NOC Letter.

The basic summary will be provided only to the following employees in the following positions: CO II's, CO III's, CCO's, and CCO Sr.'s. The basic summary will be provided only when ADC is contemplating disciplinary action for these employees as defined by A.R.S. § 38-1101(3), which means dismissal, or in the cases of CO III's, CCO's and CCO Sr.'s, demotion as well. The contemplation of such discipline is signaled by the service of a NOC Letter, which allows the employee three days to respond prior to the finalization of the disciplinary determination.

It is important for all employees to remember that the Arizona Legislature has repeatedly stated throughout Title 38 that these disciplinary privileges do not extend to at will employees of State agencies.

In A.R.S. § 38-1103(B)(2), the Legislature states, "This section does not apply to a law enforcement officer who is employed by an agency of this State as an at will employee."

In A.R.S. § 38-1104(F), the Legislature states, "This section does not apply to a law enforcement officer who is employed by an agency of this State as an at will employee."

In A.R.S. § 38-1107(F)(2), the Legislature states, "This section does not apply to a law enforcement officer who is employed as an at will employee by an agency of this State."

In compliance with these statutes, ADC will not be extending the disciplinary privileges expressly reserved for covered law enforcement officers to at will employees or to any employees not subject to statutorily-defined disciplinary action.

ACA

On behalf of ACA, the following questions are provided:

Question 13 - We are concerned that the standard "mistake vs. misconduct" as a measuring tool for disciplinary is falling by the wayside in the tidal wave of "zero

MEET & CONFER MEETING

December 10, 2015

tolerance” and based on observation of discipline in the last few years is in actuality no longer the standard. What is your response?

Answer 13 – DD Carson McWilliams stated that ADC does not agree with this characterization of the administrative investigations and employee discipline policy. DO 601.02 speaks for itself and confirms the existing policy involving the differentiation between employee mistakes and employee misconduct. While ADC certainly does have a zero tolerance for certain egregious behavior, such as sexual harassment, sex with inmates, and criminal activity, ADC continues to evaluate employee disciplinary matters in accord with DO 601.02. In the absence of specific information regarding individual instances of employee discipline, ADC is unable to further respond to this question.

Director Ryan referenced a recent article in the AZ Republic by Craig Harris where seven cases regarding sexual harassment or employee discrimination were described. Five of these incidences occurred before Director Ryan’s watch and two occurred under his watch. The behavior displayed by employees in these cases is intolerable. Every sexual harassment or employee discrimination is elevated and reviewed by Director Ryan personally. At a prior meet and confer session, the issue of employee arrests were discussed in this meeting and the people in this room were dismayed to hear what the numbers were – particularly for DUI and domestic violence. These are the same two criminal offences that occur repeatedly among law enforcement personnel. Although our intention was good by sharing awareness of this issue, it ended up being portrayed in a very negative way in the media. For DUI and domestic violence, ADC’s initial sanction has significantly increased from forty to eighty hours. This change in policy occurred in April, 2013 and any increase noted since then in hours of suspensions is due to this type of behavior and/or sexual harassment or employee discrimination. This is clear in the policy. If there is an incident, an IR is initiated. In a matter of five days, an Administrator is supposed to read the IR and make a decision. The majority - or 46% - of the disciplines are LORs. Dismissals are a miniscule number. Three or four meetings ago we discussed that over the course of a year this number was thirty COTA cadets and another 28 or 31 COs, out of 6,640 authorized positions. The distribution has leveled off in the last two years, in terms of the incremental sanctions.

Question 14 - While human beings cannot be held to a standard of perfection, they can be encouraged/admonished to pursue a standard of excellence. Why is the word Efficiency preferred over Excellence as a stated value in the PRICE acronym? The clear impression is that efficiency matters more than excellence. Do the topmost administrators of DOC really want us to strive to do our jobs with efficiency as a higher priority, as in, more expediently, not necessarily with excellence?

MEET & CONFER MEETING

December 10, 2015

Answer 14 – Director Ryan stated that this question reflects the personal beliefs of the person who is asking it. ADC considers the word efficiency - making every action count - to encompass excellence. Director Ryan shared comments from yesterday's annual Employee Awards Ceremony. All employees are encouraged and asked to perform their assigned duty to the best of their abilities, keeping in mind that no one is perfect; thus we should enthusiastically strive for continuous improvement. Our challenge is to find things that "move the needle" in our goals, performance measures, and daily/monthly activities. Governor Ducey has challenged all employees throughout state government to stretch themselves to better understand and fulfill expectations. Eight traits expected, include the following:

- Always look for savings and efficiencies
- Institute a customer service mentality at all levels within the agency
- Be wedded to promote the best and weed out the worst, philosophy
- Be a policy entrepreneur
- Promote team play
- Look for technology solutions
- Maximize use of data
- No surprises – report it up. We can't fix things if we don't know about them.

These are many of the same expectations that have been the foundation of ADC's productivity. Transparency has to be a "given" for us to succeed. Thorough and honest communications are imperative in our profession. Mistakes will occur; we should learn from them and try not to repeat them. We should also celebrate our successes and stay engaged with our fellow employees. Our agency is responsible for almost 43,000 inmates inside the wire, and another 5,500 in the community. It takes almost 10,000 employees working together to oversee and manage these populations 24 hours a day/365 days a year.

The acronym PRICE has great meaning. I have three coins or medallions I'm displaying. The first version was issued over twenty years ago with the acronym RICE on the back; responsibility, integrity, cooperation and efficiency. As time has gone on, the second generation of this coin was the same acronym. The latest version is now PRICE. The difference is that professionalism was inserted, responsibility remained the same, integrity remained the same, cooperation was changed to courage, and efficiency has remained a constant. Excellence is what we need to strive for. Continuous improvement to try to do things better, more efficiently, and to eliminate waste—this is

MEET & CONFER MEETING

December 10, 2015

what we strive for. We are always going to be trying to improve how we operate and how we do things. It is the nature of the business.

Think in terms of the Lean process. Yesterday at the awards ceremony, there were twenty unit citations or a whole host of team related improvements and processes. The first Lean project had to do with the CO RUSH process. The Lean team was led by Gail Rittenhouse, Denise Stravia was a coach, and the Director was the Executive sponsor. We are authorized for 6,640 CO positions. On a linear fashion it took 120 days for every step in the recruiting process. The Governor challenged twenty-three agencies to look at processes and see if they could reduce the time it took to do them by at least 50%. One of the most significant things we do is to recruit and retain people. Those who have been in the military remember the assembly line experience, where you go through the entire onboarding process in a couple of days and are quickly in basic training. In our CO hiring process, the first step in disqualifying someone is the criminal history check. By completing the criminal history check and making a determination early, we are able to retain or eliminate a person based on criminal activity — as opposed to going on with other steps that include the physical, psychological, or other testing only to learn the applicant had criminal activity in his/her background and wasn't qualified for employment anyway. This is one way to reduce wasteful steps in the process. Using a funnel diagram, our recruitment numbers formerly started at 10,000 contacts and through various reductions the result ended up being 1,000 hires. The process that was most intriguing was that of reference checks because it turned out to be completely non-value-added. When applying for a job, people do not provide bad references—in other words, people do not provide names of references who will give them a bad review. Through the Lean process, it was determined that the RUSH staff learn enough about the individuals that they do not need reference checks anyway, so they were eliminated from the process. The bottom line is that the Lean team for RUSH recruiting achieved more than the 50% goal. In March of this year we had 640 vacancies. Today vacancies are between 450 and 455; this is how much improvement has been made and how much ground gained - attributable to a far more efficient process. We are going to continue and hope in a few short months this will be a low 300 number. The more officers in the institutions, the better it is for everyone. The challenges with staffing have continued over the years. In 2006, 565 CO positions were abolished by the previous administration. (The funding was kept for a pay package.) In FY10 there was another 5% cut of non CO positions, and 487 positions had to be abolished. In less than ten years, more than 1,000 positions have been eliminated from ADC. We gained some back; 103 CO positions were funded. As a result of closing the Picacho and Maricopa units, we were able to transfer 47 positions from Douglas to

MEET & CONFER MEETING
December 10, 2015

Cibola in Yuma. When we took Picacho back to grade and returned to dirt, those positions were divided between Florence and Eyman. SACRC was repurposed from a small minimum unit for women to a community corrections center and most of those positions were moved to Tucson. The number one decision package for the upcoming session is a 5% pay increase for the correctional series. The number two decision package is for all others and is 5% as well.

Close:

The Director thanked those who attended.

cc: Executive Staff
Wardens
Paul O'Connell
File