

WEST TISBURY PERSONNEL BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 11, 2015

Present: Matt Gebo, Norm Perry, Brian Smith and Kenneth Vincent

Absent: Gerry Gallagher

Staff: Maria McFarland

Also present for all or part of the meeting: Glenn Hearn, Skip Manter and Pam Thors. Sandy Stapczynski was present via conference call.

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 PM. Brian Smith presiding.

Minutes: Approval of the minutes of the February 9 meeting was tabled to the next meeting. The minutes of the March 9 meeting were approved as written.

Performance Reviews: A motion was made and seconded to approve the following performance evaluations each with a one-step increase. All in favor.

Bradley Cortez (Police)
Amy Hoff (Library)
Oliva Larsen (Library)
Tanya Larsen (COA)
Ginger Norton (Library)
Ann Quigley (Library)
Tammis Sprague (Data Collector)

Old Business

Police Department/Additional Study by Human Resources Services, Inc.

Sandy was present by conference call.

Ken started the conversation with Sandy by asking her to explain why she did a comparison using the average instead of the 75th percentile as she did for the base pay study.

Sandy replied that compensation and classification studies are done for the purpose of developing a pay scale for base pay using market data from other communities. This additional study looked at other types of compensation above and beyond base pay. She explained that if she had used the 75th percentile for this additional study, she would over inflating the data, so she looked at the median. These are two different types of analysis.

Sandy was asked how the Police Department can use this additional information for. Sandy replied that even though the West Tisbury police department does not get other benefits such as educational incentives or night differential; the town is very competitive in the police department base pay. The base pay may seem low for the lieutenant, but the position is paid overtime.

Members asked Sandy for her opinion on the changes to the ranking for the occupational risk factors for the Sergeant and the Lieutenant and the years of experience for the Sergeant.

Sandy explained that the Chief asked for a 15 percent difference between the grades for his department. The proposed classification plan has 10 percent between grades. Without any changes to the proposed plan there would be 20 percent between the patrol officer, sergeant and lieutenant positions. Sandy said a lot of the duties in this department overlap and she was trying to create a hierarchy within the department.

If the patrol officer position is moved from Grade 5 to Grade 6, the Sergeant position moved from Grade 7 to 8 and the lieutenant stays at Grade 9, the percent changes will be 20 and 10 respectively. In Sandy's experience, 3 years of prior experience is the norm to become a sergeant. West Tisbury's requirement of 5 years is high. She went on to say that it would not be appropriate for the lieutenant position to be placed at Grade 10 based on the market data. Raising the position one grade would have the town paying \$10 above the market. When the consultant places positions on the wage scale they move positions up or down if it as a better fit for the town. They don't just place it based on the total points arrived at using the grading manual. It doesn't make sense for the town to pay a higher wage than the market rate regardless of what the total score is.

Sandy ended by saying that when they write job descriptions they look at the market data and how a position relates to other positions in the town. Their grading of the position is a blend of all the factors. She gave an example of how a consultant uses their discretionary judgement when they assign a ranking to a factor that may place it a degree higher or lower.

The Board reviewed the following appeals and took the following actions:

Brian spoke about the appeals process. He asked whether the 7 appeals show that the Town did not give the consultant correct or accurate information during the various stages of the study. He questioned how the board could accept and implement the recommendation of the study if approving these changes will mess up the rest of the classification plan. Essentially we have a situation where department heads signed off on the job description, but now say that the information submitted to the consultant was incorrect.

Norm said he felt that the issuance of the grading manual may have tainted the process. In the past, the manual was not distributed as it was this time.

Matt reiterated the consultant's view of how employees respond to the results of a classification study; one-third like it, one-third says nothing and one-third dislikes it.

Ken added that having an appeals process in place shows that appeals are an anticipated part of the process. The board needs to determine if the appeal has merit because of a glaring mistake.

Based on the discussion with the consultant the following motions were made with respect to the Police Department:

Patrol Officer: A motion was made and seconded to increase the points for supervision given for the patrol office position that would move this position on the proposed classification plan from Grade 5 to Grade 6. The vote on the motion was unanimous. Matt abstained.

Sergeant: A motion was made and seconded to change the rating of the physical skills and effort, occupational risks and years of experience factors for the Sergeant position, and to approve the change in grade proposed by the consultant from Grade 7 to Grade 8. All in favor. Matt abstained.

Lieutenant: A motion was made and seconded to approve the change the rating of the occupational hazards and years of experience factors for the Lieutenant position. This will not change the grade. All in favor. Matt abstained.

Town Administrator: The Board of Selectmen has requested that the board look at lowering the Town Administrator position from Grade 11 to Grade 9. Ken noted that the proposed language changes gutted the supervision responsibilities of this position. He had originally thought Grade 10 was acceptable. He expressed concern about taking that much supervisory responsibility away and wondered how these changes would impact the hiring process the next time. It was noted that the consultant has not been asked to review these changes. Her memo dated February 9 recommended the position could be lowered to 10.

Brian said these changes are being asked for by the Board of Selectmen, not the Town Administrator. Skip said he would like to go the ranking of 7 of the factors the consultant used to grade this position but he didn't bring his paperwork with him because he wasn't scheduled to discuss the matter tonight. At the request of Skip Manter action on the town administrative position was tabled to the next meeting.

Building Maintenance Worker: Members reviewed the proposed language changes and compared the rating for physical skills and supervision received with the highway department positions for internal equity. A motion was made and seconded to increase the physical skills degree by 10 points and the supervision received by 5 points moving the position to Grade 2 on the proposed classification plan. The vote on the motion was unanimous in favor.

Data Collector: A motion was made and seconded to change the rating of the occupational risk factor by 5 points and the physical skills factor by 10 points and to approve a change in grade proposed by the consultant from Grade 3 to Grade 4. All in favor.

CPC: Pam Thors asked if she could address the board regarding her appeal. She asked what the stance of the board was as they look at individual appeals. Brian responded that the board will look for glaring mistakes in the original job description that were not caught by the department asking for the appeal.

Pam said that the CPC and Affordable Housing positions are very complex with a lot of responsibility. She expressed her opinion that the positions should have been reclassified before the study was done.

Brian told Pam that the proposed changes are in the verbiage, rather than changes in the minimum requirements for the position such as increase in the level of education, the amount of experience or the addition of supervisory responsibilities. Pam responded that she was not sure what the changes are and wasn't prepared to speak to the issue. Pam was asked to come to the next meeting with the chairperson of the CPC. No action was taken.

Affordable Housing: After a review of the proposed changes to the job description a motion was made and seconded that the changes further described the duties of the position but did not change the grade. All in favor. The Affordable Housing staff person will be asked to attend the June 1 meeting so that he board can explain its decision.

Administrative:

The following were reviewed and signed:

Job Certification Form/Summer Officer

Job Certification Form/Year Round Special

Job Certification Form/Finance Committee/AA

Noted for the record:

Vacation Carry-over and payment in lieu of vacation days/Conservation Commission

There being no new business, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM

Respectfully submitted

Maria McFarland
Board Administrator
APPROVED