

## PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Monday, March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018 6:00pm

Mayor's Office

**Present:** Alders: Thomas Majewski (Chair), Kathleen Johnson (Vice-Chair), Matt Bartlett, Mayor Olson (ex-officio member) and Director Gillingham

**Arrived 10 minutes later:** Sid Boersma

**Also in Attendance:** Jamin Friedl, Lieutenant Dan Jenks, Sergeant Patrick Frisch, Sergeant Nathan Hartwig, Chief Greg Leck, Andy Johnson and Martin Seffens

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Majewski called the meeting to order at 6:00pm
2. **Approval of the Minutes** of the February 5, 2018 Personnel Committee meeting minutes.  
***Motion to approve Bartlett, second by Johnson, Approved 4-0***

### 3. **Communications**

Director Gillingham updated the Committee on:

- Human Resources has completed the 1094 & 1095 (Affordable Care Act reporting) reporting taking approximately 9 hours to complete
- Human Resources completed the Workers Comp Payroll report which reports all employees, their positions, salary, hours (regular & overtime) for 2017. This report took approximately 20 hours to complete. CVMIC uses this information to compute our premiums.
- Dispatch position has been filled-just waiting on a few details to be completed before the employee starts
- Police Officer testing was completed on February 24<sup>th</sup>. Meeting held tonight to determine from the applications and test scores who will be moving on in the process.

Majewski asked if anyone else had any updates to share. The response was no.

### 4. **Discussion and possible action regarding Police Retirement / Sick Time**

Director Gillingham asked that #4 be moved to the end of the meeting so that some of the police officers currently at the PFC meeting could be present during the discussion. Majewski moved it to the last item.

### 5. **Discussion regarding structure options for City Clerk position**

Director Gillingham asked for further direction on what information the committee would like her to gather regarding the structure of this position. Majewski tasked Director Gillingham with looking at other communities in regards to structure of the position as in his opinion the City's structure has failed. Director Gillingham asked if the committee wanted her to look at neighboring communities' job descriptions and compensation as well as the reporting structure. She explained that if the structure of reporting is different it would probably create a need for a compensation review.

**Director Gillingham was directed by Majewski to look at neighboring communities in regards to City Clerk structure options, position descriptions and compensation and to bring that information to the April committee meeting.**

**6. Discussion Utilities Water System Supervisor position description**

Director Gillingham explained that she had talked to Ann at Springsted to have the position graded and has been waiting for her to complete the grading. Director Gillingham stated this has been passed on to Dan Tesch who will give us a grading by the middle of this week. She asked if the committee wanted Human Resources to bring it to the next committee meeting or call a meeting sooner than April. She stated that Kardasz had said the position was not time sensitive. Majewski told Director Gillingham to bring it back to the April meeting. Director Gillingham asked if they would like an email update when the information was given to her by Springsted to which Majewski replied yes. Boersma asked about funding for the position. Majewski stated that would be Utilities finances are their issue. Director Gillingham asked if the position since it was already approved by Utilities, once graded, would it have to go back to Utilities. Mayor Olson stated that as a budget item it would go directly to Council since it has already been approved by Utilities. Director Gillingham stated that she would bring the description back to the April Personnel meeting for approval.

**7. Discussion regarding Performance Review form recommendation**

Director Gillingham stated she had met with Leadership as well as the Mayor and had narrowed the options down to two forms before she took them to leadership. Leadership agreed on the form presented tonight to Personnel. Director Gillingham told the committee there were tweaks needed to update the form. As an example she mentioned the rating scale and stated it would have to be tweaked as well as some of the wording within the categories. Director Gillingham stated that once the form was updated the next step would be to get together with Jean Cole who handles CVMIC's EPL (Employment Practices Liability) training. Jean would then come in and train our managers and supervisors on how to evaluation employee. Director Gillingham stated that this ties in with Springsted and she had sent an email to Ann at Springsted after the last meeting and again last week asking where we stand in the study as a whole, how we roll that out and what the cost would be moving forward. Director Gillingham explained that she had not heard back from Ann and that she and Mayor Olson would contact John Murray.

**Discussion regarding review of probationary Leadership**

Director Gillingham stated she did not know what her action was on this item because the performance evaluation form she just presented is for non-exempt non-leadership employees only. Bartlett stated the committee is looking for an evaluation of leadership as well as general employees. Majewski stated that once hired we never hear anything about an employee in a leadership position. He stated that there is no evaluation and no way to gage what the performance level is. Director Gillingham stated there have been two new leadership positions filled since this group has been together as a committee. Boersma asked who would be doing leadership evaluations. Majewski stated that the Mayor would because it would be part of her day to day duties. Boersma asked if a leadership evaluation would be done with her to which Director Gillingham responded not typically, typically it would just be run through Human Resources prior to the person giving the performance review. Unless there is a good reason. Boersma stated his concern that the person taking Mayor Olson's place may not have experience in performance evaluations. Director Gillingham stated that she would expect that in that executive level position she would normally expect the person to have experience but as this is an elected position, it is possible that the individual may not. Boersma stated that he would like to see Director Gillingham sit in on the leadership evaluations through the first round. Mayor Olson stated that there has never been a request from Personnel to do so before. Majewski stated he believes we need to treat leadership just like everyone else when it comes to performance and evaluation. Director Gillingham stated that you (the committee) are tasking me with developing an evaluation process and

form for leadership. Majewski responded yes. Johnson stated that at the bottom of the evaluation for it says "Human Resources signature". She stated that it made it sound as if the Human Resources Director will be seeing everything. Director Gillingham stated that as she told Boersma that ALL performance reviews will be received by Human Resources prior to being given to the employee. That way they can be checked to be sure there is nothing discriminatory and that there is nothing in them that is inconsistent. Johnson stated that Director Gillingham will be signing off on the evaluations prior to the employee receiving it. Director Gillingham stated that once she signs off it will go back to that Director to work on with whoever they are doing their review with. Example: Jamin is reviewing his staff at Utilities. Bob Kardasz will add a line to the evaluation form for Jamin to sign off as well.

**Director Gillingham was tasked with bringing leadership evaluation forms and developing a process policy to present at the April meeting.**

#### **8. Discussion regarding outsourced payroll**

Director Gillingham stated that the day after the last personnel meeting she had met with Carrie from the Payroll Company. She explained their process. Middleton uses the Payroll Company, they transferred from Paychex. Carrie told Director Gillingham that there is no savings of head count when you are moving the payroll from internally to externally. She said that the main reason they do it is the legality and all of the reporting that has to take place with payroll which takes the responsibility off the City's back. Director Gillingham stated that in speaking with ADT she has decided to steer away from them as they are way too big and too high priced. They charge \$5.95 per person per pay period. So you're looking at a cost of almost \$18 per employee per month. That does not include processing either, that is just the cost of system utilization. ADP is not an option. Director Gillingham stated she would like to move forward by talking to Middleton about the Payroll Company and how their experience since the beginning of the year has been. I would also like to ask them about Paychex to hear their reason for leaving that company. Then I would like to get back together with the personnel committee and talk about where to go from here with this project. Majewski asked how much time the City staff spends on payroll. Director Gillingham stated that we would have to talk with Tammy and Jamin to see what time is spent. Director Gillingham stated that she thought that the BS&A process from start to finish took about 4 hours. Director Gillingham stated that she thought the structure should be looked at as well as the software and what would be required if we had to switch on to their software. Majewski stated IT should be involved then as well.

#### **Discussion re: #4 on the Agenda:**

Director Gillingham stated that at the last Personnel meeting the committee reviewed the request to mirror the policy that was in place for the Union Represented Employees in regards to retirement at which time Director Gillingham was instructed to find the cost of that. She reviewed with them the spreadsheet that was sent to the committee. Looking at the Lieutenant and Sergeant's position in the event that all were to retire in 2018: based on moving them all into the union contract the cost to the City would be \$25,259. She also read a memo dated 9-3-15 that stated that when we were in negotiations in pulling the Sergeant's out of the Union it would be just the Sergeant's that were treated the same as the rest that are within the Union contract. Currently it states in the work rules only "sworn police officers" accrued sick leave. There is a financial impact and this is why it's been brought back to us. Boersma asked how the employees feel about this and Director Gillingham replied that regular staff, unassociated with the Police Dept. think it's ludicrous but you have the Sergeants who were pulled out of the agreement who say it was part of the agreement and that is what was agreed upon. We had a

lawyer present at that meeting and I recall on the Council floor that night that they agreed to a complete wrap around including “all sworn officers”. I’m not sure they understood. Majewski stated that essentially when pulling the Sergeants out of the Union the agreement and in doing so that upon retirement they would still get their same accrued sick time. Director Gillingham stated that upon retirement they would match the Union contract. Majewski stated that with the switch of a few words we now have a financial issue. The issue is with the upper echelon of the Police Dept. and because of that every other employee that is not union. There was discussion regarding how and when the wording “all sworn officers” came into it. Director Gillingham stated it started on the Council floor. Mayor Olson asked that Chief Leck be asked to the table to comment on the subject. Leck stated he could clarify. Leck stated that on Council floor I advocated for “all sworn”. He stated all of the members of the department are sworn members with the exception of Dispatch and there are many reasons the sworn officers are treated differently than other employees. They are protected in the Wisconsin Retirement System which recognizes officers as protected, they have earlier retirement, and have a higher pension benefits. Leck also stated that it is also widely recognized that because they are in a protected class that there are different requirements for the job. They are required every year to be recertified, all sworn officers have these same requirements. They must go to training every year in order to be recertified, required to pass all training routines. There was discussion regarding the WRS carve out for protected employees. Leck stated the payout encourages employees and gives them incentive not to use their sick leave. He also stated that it encourages officers to advance through the ranks. You only receive the payout if you retire, not if you quit. Leck stated that in his opinion with the requirements of their positions, sworn officers should receive the benefit. The Chief, Sergeants and Lieutenants would be given the same benefit as the union contract employees. If there’s a concern about why a general employee needs to take a lump sum payment, instead we need to look at them as 2 separate categories: general employees and sworn officers. Maybe we need to look at the lump sum payout for general employees but sworn employees should be separate from general.

***Consensus of the committee to reaffirm the decision made by Council in 2015 that all sworn officers receive the same retirement benefits and to notify the Finance Department so they are aware that as part of the reaffirmation that there will be financial ramifications and the funding needed, not just for sworn officers but for unfunded liabilities in sick payout for the general staff as well. There was some discussion regarding all unfunded liabilities including general staff, specifically the liability of sick leave payout which is not considered during the budget season.***

**Motion by Majewski to have Director Gillingham and other staff to look at the existing policy in regards to sick leave payouts at retirement for general employees as well as ways to fund them, second Boersma, All in Favor 5-0**

## **9. Future Agenda Items**

- Time sheet entry: Director Gillingham gave an update regarding self-entry into timesheets.

***Chief Leck reminded the committee about the idea of a Public Safety referendum and the importance of timing and preparation. Alder Majewski stated that should go to Finance, Public Safety and Public Works.***

***Motion to adjourn Boersma, Second Bartlett, Approved 5-0. Meeting adjourned 7:20pm.***