

Personnel Committee
March 25, 2011
Minutes

Approved 4/19/11

The Personnel Committee of the Menominee County Board met on March 25, 2011 at 4:40 PM in the Jury Room. Present at the meeting were Com. Pearson, Com. Furlong, Com. Meintz, Com. Jasper, Com. Lang, Brian Bousley, Administrator, Sherry Smith, Admin. Asst.

Others Present: Mark Kleiman, Diane Lesperance, Pat Cheski, & other members of the audience.

Call Meeting to order: 4:40 PM

Agenda: The agenda was approved by Com. Furlong supported by Com. Meintz 5-0

Previous Minutes: Minutes of February 25, 2010 - Approved by Com. Furlong supported by Com. Jasper 5-0

Public Comment: Diane Lesperance: Suggest amend the agenda to reverse a & b.

Business: a. Job Classification/Salary feasibility study (DMG) ~ Discussion of having a new study done for all county employees. Com. Pearson: It's been ten years since it's been looked at overall in the county. There are a lot of people have job titles with a lot more functions than when they originally started. Brian did you come up with any preliminary info.? Bousley: I did find MGT – it's an off shooter from maximus that had done the original. If we were to do it like we did with the archer co. (we send everything to them) it would cost about \$10,000 if it's done "in house" (they come in to evaluate) it will cost about \$20,000 for the whole county. We weren't satisfied with what we had done previously (Archer Co.) they didn't give us enough supporting documentation to make a decision. Pearson: These DMG studies are done by them coming in house and base it on what's being done by other counties around the state, and they evaluate the position based on the standard in the state. Bousley: It's a benchmark system. They would take in the present job description vs. the previous job description. Lang: Years ago we commissioned what we called the Deter study. He came here and evaluated all employees. At some point the personnel committee thought they could do the evaluation better than Deters did. We could save ourselves some money. The committee came in with attitudes and put buddies where they thought they should. Once that started, the whole salary study was went out of whack, it lost its relevancy. This is where the DMG study came in. Griffin put the study back in scale. The understanding was that any time an employee changed a job description, the supervisor could call for a re-evaluation of that job description. Otherwise, if the job didn't change, they left it alone. Did this become irrelevant, or were there people that had job duty changes that weren't requested? What's the reason for requesting a whole study, it's gonna be pretty expensive. Pearson: Well, the first and primary reason is, its ten years old and do we have a proper evaluation of our employees now? After ten years things have changed. There's new technologies, there's computers, there's a lot of things people are doing that wasn't in their job description when they started; things have changed in the last ten years. I was a little set back at the cost of this. Lang: that's not the only cost. There's gonna be upgrades, I guess. According to this DMG, there were nine positions re-evaluated. Was that recent? That was last year. We started this in Feb. and it took until Sept. to get this back. Bernie: Who's archer? Where did they

come from. Bousley: He does the DMG through the Archer corporation. Meintz: Are we looking at doing an in-house employee evaluation that could cost \$20,000 dollars? Pearson: That's why we're having this discussion. We're looking at two possibilities, mail order – or an in-house. We've had one via mail where we filled out the forms and sent them where they go over them and send back their suggestions. Apparently a lot of people were dissatisfied. They didn't know some of the things that were going on. I think the in-house is the way we should go. But the cost is more than I guessed. Meintz: I do agree with Bernie, it sounds costly and possibility of the ramifications afterward. It may not be the standard type of wage for our area. That's gonna set off a budget turmoil with the employees. I think it's this boards responsibility to have as fair of pay as possible for the employees, but within reason. I have concerns if there's representation of the benefit program also, that is disbursed to the employees. Pearson: The benefit package is not part of this study at all. I'm sure they must take the area into consideration. I'm not sure we want to go with a full DMG study. Lang: It has nothing to do with pay schedules. It's simply evaluating how much work that the employees do. And come up with a pay grade. It's up to us to decide what each pay grade is worth. Meintz: But you did say that they don't take into consideration the benefit package. That should be included. It's not cash in hand, but its part of the security. Pearson: This is just to come up with pay grade schedule. The benefit package is the same whether the employee is at the top or low level of pay. I want to see if we can't research a company to come in and explain what their goals are. What can they do relative to a ten year old study? People didn't have the technology then that we do now. Jasper: If we let someone in, they're going to follow our direction. Pearson: The purpose of doing this is to prevent us from doing the buddy, buddy system; to keep it away from us. I think our input has to be limited. They have to come in study what an individual does and find out if their grade of pay is compatible what everybody else is doing out there. Furlong: When someone retires or transfers out and someone comes into that position is there any restriction on the dept. heads to evaluate the position at that time? Or is whatever that chair (position) was being paid, automatically the grade the new person gets. Lang: Is it necessary that we do the whole county or are there specific positions that can be requested individually? Pearson: When the last individual study was done, weren't all departments asked if they wanted to re-evaluate? Bousley: I asked, because of the personnel change, Marc, Diane and Deb's group came forth. Pearson: But all was informed that it was available to do? Bousley: Yes. Furlong: We have to look at technology. Technology is not a bad thing. Meintz: I agree with James, anything that I understand that we've tried to do in the courthouse here that involves more technology, is to "ease" the workload of the employees; unless I'm missing some things. Pearson: Technology has come in due to necessity, not so much to make things easier. The ability to move data back and forth at a more rapid pace is the reason for technology. I can not imagine anyone defining the reason for technology is to make our jobs easier. Lang: The old study is in play right now. The department heads can request individual changes as needed. Pearson: I agree, we've got a system in place and the people have the opportunity to have jobs re-evaluated. The need for putting in a whole new survey, I don't think is there. The consensus is to NOT have a county wide study done.

b. Previous job classification/salary study, September 28, 2010. (County Clerk, Treasurer, & E-9-1-1 Departments. ~ The Archer Co. submitted 9 positions that were re-evaluated. No action was ever taken with these recommendations. We had no supporting documentation, to explain. Pearson: What is indicated, that there are a couple that they recommended go up. But if you look at the itemized items, you're saying some of those are incorrect? Brian: What I'm saying is we have no basis for why they said, "this one remains the same", "this one moves up". We wanted more of an explanation. Meintz: were they not satisfied because they weren't increased? Bousley: There's no supporting factors; We're looking for an explanation. Furlong: Did we get a price on a limited scale...if we do this individually? Meintz: How many other companies have

we contacted about doing this type study? I've contacted three other companies. Only one has gotten back with me, the secretary called back and the person who does this was out of the office and would call when he's back in the office. Pearson: The purpose of these studies is to let us have a third party tell us where we should go. If we don't go by the study by Archer, then we have to get one done. Our difficulty with this is we've got employees that started this process two years ago and have still not gotten a response back. So do we take this info. and make a judgment whether or not they should move to these grades or should we start the process over again and maybe wait another year before we get this resolved. Lang: I think we need to operate on the recommendation of this company, but they need to explain to us how they got to where they are. Pearson: We need consensus, Should we start this process over again or do we use this one with the lack of info. that we need to make this decision. Jasper: I guess it comes down to how much is it going to cost us? Bousley: The Archer Company was going to charge us, \$200-250 for each individual. MGT knows how much they charged us and will give us the same pricing. They have been doing this for some twenty odd years. Pearson: Whatever they come back with is not cut in stone. We do not have to go with the recommendation, correct? Bousley: Right, it is ultimately up to the county board to decide. Meintz: The complaints with the archer company, were all the complaints that there was no increase in the pay scale? Were the complaints, that there were increases? Bousley: We just want to know why, there was no explanation. Furlong: We should try to put this to rest, especially with the Clerk, Treasurer and 9-1-1. Pearson: Can we have these positions re-evaluated by the new company and put them on a fast track? Jasper: how many people would this be? Furlong: We're looking at positions, and that would be six positions. Meintz: this is why I'm asking where the complaints are coming from. If we spend the money, and maybe it's the same or the opposite; are we going to be right back here having the same debate because the department heads aren't happy? Then we have the buddy buddy system with the department heads trying to protect their employees. If we don't do this, we'll have to get a bid process to have it done by a different company. We'll have to tell them we'll have to move right now. Pearson: Let's have Brian to get some bids on an evaluator for us. Bousley: We need to get some references from other counties. Pearson: We'll table this at this time with a note that it has to be moved very fast.

Correspondence: Lang: I'd like to make a comment on the letter received from CUPPAD in reference to Munetrix. They do a kind of a fiscal report card for Political entities. They rate the financial stress levels of counties. This may be a valuable tool for Menominee County. Munetrix.com has a video that I found quite impressive. I think everyone should take a look at this. Bousley: We put a copy in everyone's mailbox.

Any Other Items Members May wish to Present: None

Public Comment: Diane Lesperance: I am disappointed; I had hoped I could have some input. The question Charlie had, with the department heads not being happy with because the pay scale didn't go up. The questions I had were how they could determine a pay scale for a job that an employee was doing when they didn't even know what the job was? For instance, the PRE denials; when the report came back, instead of addressing it as a principal residence exemption, they listed it as the presidential resident exemption. If they don't even know what it is, how can they decide how much work that job entails? When this job was first created, what was said by the personnel committee then was, "just do what you have to do to get the job done and we'll take care of it". We have been trying to follow the rules all along. Kim started the added duties in July but couldn't get any pay for it till October (new budget) according to the personnel manual. Now it's a year later and she still doesn't have a raise. I don't think it's fair. Her workload keeps increasing but she just keeps getting kicked in the teeth. Maybe she should just go back to doing

her previous job. At least if you would have agreed to give her the pay that they recommended...it would have been something. Even though I thought it should be equal to Jessica's position; they are working together. At least she should have been given that raise until another study can be done. Other departments can just do a raise when they want. That's what is irritating. A yellow post it comes up that says pay this guy \$43.50 per hr on a job that is a union position. The highest position that office is \$22.62 per hour, but yet he was paid "as an employee" not a subcontractor at \$43.50 and hour. Where is that justified?

Pat Cheski, Library director was involved in the original DMG study in 2000. At that time the library employees were underpaid compared to the other county employees. I had to fight to include the library employees in the study. When it came back with my employees increasing in pay it took another year for the board to agree to give them the raise. I have to agree with Diane and the frustration she feels. I'm glad you're looking at a new company. With the new budget process coming, more jobs may be eliminated with those left, picking up the duties calling for yet another study of individuals.

Adjourned: Moved by Com. Lang to adjourn at 5:40 PM, supported by Com. Meintz