

Agenda

**Human Resources Committee
Jefferson County Courthouse
320 S Main St, Room 202
Jefferson, WI 53549**

October 16, 2012 @ 8:30 a.m.

Committee Members: James Braughler, Chair; Greg David; Pamela Rogers, Secretary; Jim Schroeder, and Dick Schultz, Vice-Chair

1. Call to order
2. Roll call (establish a quorum)
3. Certification of compliance with the Open Meetings Law
4. Review of the Agenda
5. Citizen Comment
6. Approval of October 8, 2012 minutes
7. Communications
8. Discussion and possible recommendation of the proposed 2012 Compensation and Classification Study, including implementation, pay for performance vs. step system, and a classification review process
9. Convene into closed session pursuant to Wisconsin State Statutes Section 19.85 (1)(b), consideration of employee discipline
10. Reconvene into open session for consideration and possible action regarding items discussed in closed session
11. Set next meeting date and agenda
12. Adjournment

Next scheduled meeting: November 20, 2012 @ 8:30 a.m.

The Committee may discuss and/or take action on any item specifically listed on the agenda

Individuals requiring special accommodations for attendance at the meeting should contact the County Administrator 24 hours prior to the meeting at 920-674-7101 so appropriate arrangements can be made.

| | | Hourly | | Annual |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---------|--------------|
| | | difference | | Difference |
| JOB TITLE | DEPARTMENT | | | |
| Account Clerk/System Support | Finance | \$0.87 | 5.380% | \$1,807.52 |
| Accountant | Human Services | \$0.08 | 0.397% | \$168.48 |
| Advanced Fund Accountant | Finance | \$1.84 | 6.313% | \$3,816.80 |
| Asst Corporation Counsel | Corporation Counsel | \$0.04 | 0.132% | \$89.44 |
| Behavioral Health Specialist | Human Services | \$0.91 | 3.952% | \$1,894.88 |
| Benefits Specialist | Human Services | \$1.18 | 6.111% | \$2,454.40 |
| Central Duplicating Clerk | MIS | \$1.43 | 10.500% | \$2,976.48 |
| Child Support Director | Child Support | \$0.12 | 0.353% | \$251.68 |
| Chld Prot Serv Ongoing Prof I | Human Services | \$0.26 | 1.110% | \$547.04 |
| Chld Prot Serv Ongoing Prof I | Human Services | \$0.26 | 1.110% | \$547.04 |
| Chld Prot Serv Ongoing Prof I | Human Services | \$2.10 | 9.617% | \$4,372.16 |
| Chld Prot Serv Ongoing Prof I | Human Services | \$1.49 | 6.645% | \$3,105.44 |
| Chld Prot Serv Ongoing Prof I | Human Services | \$3.32 | 16.085% | \$6,905.60 |
| Chld Prot Serv Ongoing Prof I | Human Services | \$3.32 | 16.085% | \$6,905.60 |
| Clinic LPN | Health | \$0.81 | 4.515% | \$1,684.80 |
| Communications Operator | Sheriff | \$0.16 | 0.937% | \$328.64 |
| Community Outreach Worker | Human Services | \$0.77 | 4.745% | \$1,603.68 |
| Community Outreach Worker | Human Services | \$0.31 | 1.855% | \$644.80 |
| Community Support Prof I | Human Services | \$2.07 | 10.279% | \$4,309.76 |
| Community Support Prof II | Human Services | \$2.78 | 13.104% | \$5,774.08 |
| Community Support Prof II | Human Services | \$0.26 | 1.110% | \$547.04 |
| Community Support Prof II | Human Services | \$2.01 | 9.172% | \$4,187.04 |
| Community Support Prof II | Human Services | \$1.52 | 6.764% | \$3,157.44 |
| Comprhnsve Comm Srv Facilitatr | Human Services | \$0.26 | 1.110% | \$547.04 |
| Comprhnsve Comm Srv Facilitatr | Human Services | \$2.78 | 13.104% | \$5,774.08 |
| Comprhnsve Comm Srv Facilitatr | Human Services | \$0.26 | 1.110% | \$547.04 |
| Comprhnsve Comm Srv Facilitatr | Human Services | \$2.01 | 9.172% | \$4,187.04 |
| Data Entry Clerk | Register of Deeds | \$0.23 | 1.763% | \$480.48 |
| Dep Reg Prob/Lead Juvenile Cl | Clerk of Courts | \$0.80 | 3.723% | \$1,659.84 |
| Director of Human Services | Human Services | \$0.48 | 1.130% | \$1,000.48 |
| Emergency Management Director | Sheriff | \$0.09 | 0.327% | \$197.60 |
| Enforcement Specialist | Child Support | \$0.91 | 5.089% | \$1,888.64 |
| Fair Park Director | County Fair | \$1.08 | 3.430% | \$2,250.56 |
| Family Court Counselor | Clerk of Courts | \$2.01 | 9.172% | \$4,187.04 |
| Family Development Worker | Human Services | \$0.18 | 0.991% | \$382.72 |
| Financial Planner Rsrc Spec | Human Services | \$0.96 | 5.420% | \$2,005.12 |
| Financial Support Specialist | Child Support | \$1.89 | 11.197% | \$3,927.04 |
| Group Home Worker | Human Services | \$0.31 | 1.855% | \$644.80 |
| Group Home Worker | Human Services | \$0.77 | 4.745% | \$1,603.68 |
| Group Home Worker | Human Services | \$0.31 | 1.855% | \$644.80 |
| Human Resources Specialist | Human Resources | \$1.59 | 7.113% | \$3,309.28 |
| Human Services Professional I | Human Services | \$0.38 | 1.900% | \$794.56 |
| Intake/On Call Worker | Human Services | \$2.78 | 13.104% | \$5,774.08 |
| Intake/On Call Worker | Human Services | \$2.01 | 9.172% | \$4,187.04 |
| Intake/On Call Worker | Human Services | \$2.78 | 13.104% | \$5,774.08 |
| Intake/On Call Worker | Human Services | \$2.78 | 13.104% | \$5,774.08 |
| Intake/On Call Worker | Human Services | \$2.01 | 9.172% | \$4,187.04 |
| IT Specialist/Compliance | Human Services | \$2.53 | 10.914% | \$5,258.24 |
| Juvenile Justice Supervisor | Human Services | \$0.92 | 3.693% | \$1,903.20 |
| Legal Assistant II | Child Support | \$0.77 | 4.713% | \$1,593.28 |
| Marketing Assistant | County Fair | \$0.86 | 6.056% | \$1,788.80 |
| Mental Health Technician | Human Services | \$0.77 | 4.745% | \$1,603.68 |
| Micro Computer Specialist | MIS | \$0.08 | 0.397% | \$168.48 |
| Paralegal | District Attorney's Office | \$5.98 | 36.766% | \$12,430.08 |
| Paralegal II, Confidential | Corporation Counsel | \$0.17 | 0.761% | \$349.44 |
| Parks Supervisor | Parks Department | \$0.54 | 2.023% | \$1,131.52 |
| Public Health Tech (jail) | Health | \$0.81 | 4.515% | \$1,684.80 |
| Receptionist/Secretary | Sheriff | \$1.43 | 10.500% | \$2,976.48 |
| Sr Micro Computer Specialist | MIS | \$1.11 | 4.499% | \$2,300.48 |
| Support Services Planner | Human Services | \$0.77 | 4.745% | \$1,603.68 |
| Support Services Planner | Human Services | \$0.77 | 4.745% | \$1,603.68 |
| Support Services Planner | Human Services | \$0.77 | 4.745% | \$1,603.68 |
| Wraparound/Yth Srvcs Supervsr | Human Services | \$0.26 | 1.034% | \$547.04 |
| | | | | \$158,354.56 |

October 3, 2012

Carlson Dettmann Consulting

Jefferson County Classification and Compensation Study

Implementation Recommendations for Consideration

1. January 1, 2012: Move anyone whose current hourly pay is below the minimum of their proposed pay grade to the minimum of the grade and place all others at the next step in the proposed grade that provides an increase pay. Red-circle all employees whose pay is above the proposed maximum of their grade. We recommend that no employee's pay be cut. Different options of how to handle red-circled employees in regard to pay increase a can be explored.
2. Option Two would be the same as "Option One", however, any substantial increases would be implemented over a two to three year period. A defined dollar amount or a percentage of pay would be established to define "substantial". For example, any increases exceeding 5% of the employee's current pay would be spread out and implemented over a two year period.
3. January 1, 2012 bring employees to the minimum of their proposed pay grade and move people to the next step that provides an increase on their anniversary date. You can also implement any substantial increases over a two to three year period. Red-circled all employees whose pay is above the proposed maximum of their grade.
4. All on anniversary date, give step than into step system. If at max and going into system, no extra step. \$397,775.20
5. Green on 1/1, and step on anniv date. Everyone else on anniversary date and give step after going into system. \$493,448.87
6. Move everyone on 1/1 and give step if due for one on that date (those maxed start steps in 2014 - when??? Jan 1 move everyone or on hire date) \$568,131.41

\$378,153.99

\$321,159.92

\$304,502.47

Terris notes only

36. 254,842.21

October 12, 2012

Gary Petre, County Administrator

Mr. Petre,

After a thorough review of the Carlson Dettman recommended position grades and wage data for the Highway Department, I would like to recommend three classifications of employees be moved into a higher grade. Based on many years working in the highway and construction industry, and my history of recruiting employees for a variety of positions, I feel the grades of these classes [Equipment Operator, Highway Worker, Account Clerk] are below existing market wages. Along with the grade adjustment, I would also like to recommend all employees at the Highway Department be placed into a performance pay plan.

The changes I am requesting for the Highway Department are listed below:

- Adjust the proposed grades as shown below for the following titles: Equipment Operator II, Highway Worker, Account Clerk
- Place all Highway Department positions in a hybrid pay for performance plan, similar to plans developed by Carlson Dettman in other counties
- Provide more realistic starting wages (Less steps), to help new employee recruiting
- On January 1, 2013, move all employees into the next full step on the new classification range. All employees will be reviewed beginning in May, 2013 and all recommended pay increases will be incorporated into the 2014 budget
- Annual cost of proposed performance plan will average approximately a 2.5% to 3.0% wage increase. Cost to the Jefferson County taxpayers will average approximately 1.5% to 2.0% wage increase. (Ave. annual cost = \$40,000 to \$45,000)
- Similar to all other department pay plans, if budget levies or limitation force no pay increases or wage steps to be frozen, this amended pay plan can also be frozen

Classification Study

| <u>Position</u> | <u>Carlson Grade</u> | <u>Recommended Grade</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Equipment Operator II | 4 | 4.5 |
| Highway Worker | 3 | 4 |
| Account Clerk | 3 | 4 |

I believe if the above changes are implemented it will be a positive move that will match appropriate wage grades with position responsibilities, and will also add more accountability for all Highway Department employees. The budget impacts of this plan are modest, and on average, no greater than the impact of the proposed pay plan across all other departments.

Over the last ten years we have reduced our workforce significantly at the Highway Department, but the reductions came with a plan to have a smaller, versatile, adaptable, more cross-trained workforce, with high skills and technical abilities. I believe we have accomplished that goal with much higher productivity per employee, and a department full of highly skilled individuals that are very versatile and take tremendous pride in their work. The problem now is that this smaller, higher-skilled workforce plan does not work if the wages are going to go back a decade or so, when the expectations and skill needed were not the same as they are today.

We also need to acknowledge all the negative wage, benefit, and public sentiment heaped onto our county workforce over the last two years has damaged morale and created a lack of trust. I feel this amended compensation plan along with our departments bold actions in implementing performance measurement into our compensation plan will not only help improve morale, but will also improve the public perception of our employees. I believe the amended plan will also help our department compete with the private sector when recruiting qualified employees for all positions in our department.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit this proposal and I thank you for your consideration. Please contact me if you have questions or wish to discuss this proposal.

Sincerely,

William T. Kern, PE
Highway Commissioner

cc: Terri Palm – HR Director

CARLSON
DETTMANN
CONSULTING

October 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: Terri Palm

FR: Charlie Carlson

RE: Next Steps

The employee briefings were fairly well attended, and you taped them for anyone who could not attend or wanted a refresher. All in all, I thought they went well. Of course, employees would like to have pay increases, so not having a general increase puts more pressure on the classification system. The attention will turn to implementation and appeal policy, so I want to put before you several items in our project requiring County decisions now that a new pay plan is before the Human Resources Committee for its consideration. They are:

1. The Highway Commissioner's request to create a performance-based pay system for that department.
2. County Board action.
3. Appeal process.

Re item #1, we would like the County to approve pulling the Highway Department employees out of the pay structure covering other employees and direct our firm to offer an alternative pay plan with variable-based pay increases, base or bonus, beyond the range Control Points. In addition to creating a different range structure, it would require working with the Highway Department to make sure the County has a performance management instrument that will support this type of plan. We would recommend that any performance-based increases, other than steps to the Control Points, be awarded as non-base accumulative until your office has had an opportunity to review enough experience with the plan to sign off on its readiness to be a more permanent policy.

The alternatives, which would silence criticism from the Highway employees, are to raise their pay or remove them from the plan. We certainly will review pay plan placement; however, if the County is to remove them from the plan covering the majority of employees, we think the better option is to work with the Commissioner on his recommendations.

Re item #2, we have a calendar place-holder for a County Board presentation on October 23. Does the Committee want that to be an action item for the Board or an informational

Charles E. Carlson
carlsonhrconsultant@gmail.com
608.239.7991

presentation? Typically, our public sector clients want an information presentation before legislating at a later meeting.

Re item #3, our professional services agreement with the County calls for an appeal process AFTER Board adoption. Our standard process is for employees and/or department heads to submit a written appeal request based on the relevant Job Description Questionnaire, telling us why s/he feels we classified the position inappropriately in the pay plan. The department and your office would review the material for accuracy and completeness, and submit it to us for evaluation. We would review it with you, then we would submit a recommendation to the Committee for action.

A number of things would not be subject to appeal. Those items would be the County's selection of comparable organizations, data weighting, and market positioning; our data analysis; and the County's decisions on pay structure and implementation. The process I have described is quite similar to the process you have in place by policy governing classification reviews, and it is the one we contemplated in our service agreement. If there is a desire to manage this process otherwise, then we need to discuss the implications for potential delay and fees.

One of the questions that will be asked very soon, if it hasn't been already, is – Do I get to see my job evaluation point detail? That's up to the County. There are three distinct alternatives that clients are beginning to use:

1. The client decides that the points are our product as your Consultant, and they prefer not to have them and defer to our professional judgment. That approach is consistent with how Jefferson County has managed the classification structure to date. Waupaca County has taken this approach.
2. The client agrees to share points with individuals by request by appointment in the Human Resources Department. Calumet County is using this approach.
3. The client releases all point detail and the rating instrument as a public document. This is Dodge County's policy.

Someone may point out that Dodge County gave its department heads an opportunity to come forward with their classification concerns AFTER the Board adopted their plan but before the appeal process started. This shouldn't be necessary in Jefferson County because the Administration went through an internal review of the grade order list with department heads before we issued our pay plan recommendations. This was done in Dodge County because they wanted a pay plan completed in time for budget submission.

I am enclosing a copy of an appeal process that I think most accurately reflects Jefferson County's current classification review process. If this is acceptable, we only should have to resolve the question of grading detail access.

JEFFERSON COUNTY CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY APPEAL PROCESS

Jefferson County is using the following process for employee appeals of position allocations resulting from the Classification and Compensation Study.

The process used by Carlson Dettmann Consulting, LLC (the Consultant) in conducting the classification and compensation study involved substantial employee input and administrative review. Every employee was responsible for submitting either an individual Job Description Questionnaire (JDQ) or a group JDQ. Departments were responsible for reviewing all JDQ's for accuracy and completeness. In addition to analyzing JDQ's, the Consultant interviewed department directors to obtain an overview of their organizations. Job evaluation scoring detail is available for individual review.

If a County staff member feels that the Consultant committed a gross error in applying the Point Factor Job Evaluation System to his/her position, or if the employee's job has changed significantly since the original JDQ response, then the employee may supply additional information and ask for a re-evaluation.

GRADE REVIEW GUIDELINES

Basis for Appeal

Grade reviews must be focused on the JDQ. If an employee believes their job has been incorrectly graded, the employee must read through their JDQ and determine which areas they feel were evaluated incorrectly. Any comparisons with other positions must be based on documented evidence submitted by the appellant.

Each employee's department head must review, comment, and sign off on appeals. Human Resources will review all appeals to ensure guidelines are met before forwarding them to the Consultant.

Matters that are not subject to appeal include the policy decisions made by the County on market comparisons, pay structure, and pay plan implementation and related policies.

How to appeal:

Human Resources will provide a timeline for the appeal process. Employees wishing to appeal the pay grade placement of their position may do so by obtaining an "Appeals Form" from Human Resources. The appeal form must include a statement of the basis of the appeal, which is limited to the two appropriate appeal criteria explained above.

If the appeal involves a claim of additional responsibilities or significant changes to the position since the completion of the JDQ, the employee must attach a ***hard copy*** of their original JDQ, ***with any changes indicated on the JDQ itself.*** Changes can either be shown in handwriting, or if the employee uses the electronic form of the JDQ, changes should be made very clear using underlining or some other demarcation.

The Department Head must review the information provided by the employee, certify that it is factual and correct, sign the Department Head appeal review portion of the form and, at his/her discretion, provide additional comments. Department heads shall submit the appeals to Human Resources. Human Resources will forward the appeal to the Consultant for review and a recommendation.

The Consultant will consider the substance and merits of each appeal and in doing so, may find it necessary to gather further information from the employee and/or supervisor. The Consultant will prepare a brief written response on each appeal indicating if he feels the appeal has been upheld, or if not, his reason for recommending denial of the appeal.

The final decision on all appeals will be the responsibility of the County.

October 16, 2012

To: Human Resources Committee Members

RE: Implementation of the new Classification and Compensation pay plan

There are several options of methods of implementation of a new pay plan. Unfortunately, there probably is no single way that will please everyone. Therefore, the recommendation from Human Resources is to implement in the following manner:

1. Green-circled employees will go to the minimum step on January 1 (effective the first pay roll after January 1 in accordance with pay raise practice). If the minimum step is less than a step the employee would have received on their individual step-increase date (anniversary date), then the employee will move to the next step of the new pay plan on their step-increase date. Their step-increase date does not change. This affects approximately 30 employees.
2. If the minimum step is greater than a step the employee would have received on their individual step-increase date, the employee receives no additional movement in steps in 2013, and January 1 becomes the employees new step-increase date. This affects approximately 30 employees.
3. Red-circled employees remain at the current rate of pay until the new pay plan is adjusted upward to the point the employee now is placed on the top step of the applicable range. This currently affects approximately 50 employees.
4. Employees who are currently in steps, and will continue to be in steps in the new pay plan, will, on their individual step-increase date, receive the next step in the current pay plan/range, and use this rate to be placed into the step that provides an increase in the new pay plan. The employee retains their current step-increase date. This affects approximately 170 employees.
5. Employees who are currently at the top step ("maxed out" in steps) will, on their **hire date**, be placed in the new pay plan at the step that provides an increase. The employee's hire date becomes the step-increase date for future step increases. This affects approximately 150 employees.

The County has budgeted approximately \$165,000 in the 2013 budget for step increases in our current plan, as well as \$250,000 for plan implementation. The total gross cost of the above implementation is approximately \$386,000. I believe the County has sufficient funds to implement this plan in 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Terri M. Palm
Human Resources Director