

Clearwater, Florida, February 7, 2013

The Unified Personnel Board (UPB) met in regular session at 6:28 P.M. on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room, Fifth Floor, Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida, with the following members present: Daniel M. Andriso, Chair; Ricardo Davis, Vice-Chair; Andrea S. Daggett; Keith C. Dekle; Angela Outten; and Joan Vecchioli.

Also Present: Peggy Rowe, Director of Human Resources; Jason Ester, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Lisa Wombles, Employees' Advisory Council; Michael P. Schmidt, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk; and other interested individuals.

AGENDA

EAC

Item I. Employees' Advisory Council Representative

Item II. Consent Agenda

- | | | |
|---|----|---|
| Human Resources | 1. | Request Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Personnel Board Meeting held January 10, 2013. |
| Human Resources | 2. | Request Approval of Housekeeping Additions, Title Changes, Revisions, and Reinstatement of Class Specifications in the Pay and Classification Plan. |
| Environment and
Infrastructure
Finance and Solid
Waste Divisions | 3. | Request Approval of the Audit of Priority Positions within the Finance and Solid Waste Divisions of the Department of Environment and Infrastructure. |
| County Attorney | 4. | Request Approval of the Extension of One Temporary Law Clerk 1, Not to Exceed August 13, 2013, in the County Attorney's Office |

Item III. New Business

- | | | |
|-----------------|----|---|
| Human Resources | 1. | Request Approval for Delegated Authority to the Director of Human Resources for Administrative Actions. |
|-----------------|----|---|

Item IV. Information

- | | | |
|-----------------|----|--|
| Human Resources | 1. | The Pinellas County Human Resources' 2012 Annual Report, Setting the Course. |
|-----------------|----|--|

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Andriso called the meeting to order at 6:28 P.M.; whereupon, he led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

EMPLOYEES' ADVISORY COUNCIL (EAC) REPRESENTATIVE

EAC Vice-Chairman Lisa Wombles welcomed Ms. Outten as the most recent EAC appointment to the Unified Personnel Board; whereupon, she briefly discussed the agreement reached between Baycare Health System and the United Healthcare network, relating that the agreement is retroactive to the end of the previous contract.

Referring to the Florida Education Association's legal challenge to the retirement system changes concerning the mandatory three-percent employee contribution to the Florida Retirement System (FRS), Ms. Wombles related that because the Florida Supreme Court had recently ruled that the three-percent contributions were lawful, Pinellas County is no longer required to make the full contribution to the FRS; and that Pinellas County's savings, beginning in 2011 when the changes were instituted, have been approximately \$4,000,000.00 a year; whereupon, she reported that the EAC recommends that a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) of three percent be established for Pinellas County employees in Fiscal Year 2013-2014.

Thereupon, in response to query by Ms. Wombles, Mr. Andriso related that she would be allowed to address the Board regarding Item No. 3, Consent Agenda, and Item No. 1, New Business, later in the meeting, and no objections were noted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS NOS. II.1 THROUGH II.4 – APPROVED

Motion	-	Mr. Vecchioli
Second	-	Mr. Davis
Vote	-	5 – 1 (Mr. Dekle dissenting)

- #1 Minutes of regular meeting held January 10, 2013, approved as submitted.
- #2 Additions, title changes, revisions, and reinstatement of class specifications in the Pay and Classification Plan approved; changes reflect the current duties and responsibilities of the classifications, are housekeeping in nature, and will not affect the pay grade level of the classifications.

- #3 Audit of priority positions in the Finance and Solid Waste Divisions of the Department of Environment and Infrastructure (DEI) approved; Positions with pay grade changes resulting from the audit are:

FINANCE DIVISION

Reclassified from Classified Service to Exempt Service

<u>Present Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>	<u>Approved Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>
Accounting and Contracts Manager	CL20 (\$50,731 – \$82,014)	Department Administrative Manager	SM6 (\$64,055 – \$96,083)

Upward Reclassifications

<u>Present Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>	<u>Approved Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>
Accountant 1	CL13 (\$36,046 – \$56,056)	Accountant 2	CL15 (\$39,748 – \$62,420)
Accountant 2	CL15 (\$39,748 – \$62,420)	Finance and Accounting Analyst	CL20 (\$50,731 – \$82,014)
Accounting Services Coordinator	CL17 (\$43,825 – \$69,596)	Finance and Accounting Analyst	CL20 (\$50,731 – \$82,014)
Accountant, Senior	CL19 (\$48,318 – \$77,313)	Finance and Accounting Analyst	CL20 (\$50,731 – \$82,014)
Office Specialist	CL6 (\$25,625 – \$38,667)	Senior Office Specialist	CL8 (\$28,246 – \$42,806)

February 7, 2013

Upward Reclassifications (Continued)

<u>Present Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>	<u>Approved Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>
Mail Clerk, Senior	CL7 (\$26,915 – \$40,601)	Senior Office Specialist	CL8 (\$28,246 – \$42,806)
Senior Office Specialist	CL8 (\$28,246 – \$42,806)	Accounting Support Specialist	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)
Administrative Support Specialist	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)	Administrative Support Supervisor	CL14 (\$37,856 – \$52,092)

Downward Reclassification

<u>Present Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>	<u>Approved Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>
Craftworker 3	CL13 (\$36,046 – \$56,056)	Craftworker 2	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)

SOLID WASTE DIVISION

Upward Reclassifications

<u>Present Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>	<u>Approved Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>
Senior Office Specialist	CL8 (\$28,246 – \$42,806)	Accounting Support Specialist	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)
Scalehouse Services Specialist 1	CL8 (\$28,246 – \$42,806)	Scalehouse Services Specialist	CL9 (\$29,660 – \$45,011)

Upward Reclassifications (Continued)

<u>Present Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>	<u>Approved Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade (Salary)</u>
Scalehouse Services Specialist 2	CL10 (\$31,137 – \$47,777)	Scalehouse Services Specialist, Senior	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)
Solid Waste Program Coordinator	CL17 (\$43,825 – \$69,596)	Solid Waste Program Supervisor	CL18 (\$46,009 – \$73,174)
Environmental Specialist 2	CL16 (\$41,724 – \$65,998)	Environmental Specialist, Senior	CL18 (\$46,009 – \$73,174)

Pay Grade Change

<u>Present Classification</u>	<u>Current Pay Grade (Salary)</u>	<u>Approved Pay Grade (Salary)</u>
Utilities Operations Supervisor	CL17 (\$43,825 – \$69,596)	CL18 (\$46,009 – \$73,174)

- #4 Extension of one temporary position of Law Clerk 1 (Miles S. Belknap) for a period not to exceed August 13, 2013, in the County Attorney's Office, approved.

Discussion Regarding Consent Agenda Item No. 3

Ms. Wombles referred to Consent Agenda Item No. 3, and related that a number of employees in the Finance and Solid Waste Divisions of the Department of Environment and Infrastructure (DEI) have expressed concerns regarding how their positions were reclassified, and 18 in Solid Waste are planning to appeal the findings and decisions; whereupon, she stated that the process for appealing a classification determination is not objective because the HR employee who makes the original determination is the same employee who hears the appeal.

Ms. Wombles indicated that the employees submitted the lengthy, cumbersome Position Analysis Questionnaires (PAQs) over two years ago; and that employees have been told that the extended timeframe is due to organizational changes. She related that no determinations have been shared regarding the PAQs, no employees have been interviewed, and no justification has been provided for positions that remained the same

February 7, 2013

Thereupon, Mr. Dekle related that, in his opinion, it would be awkward for the Board to approve Agenda Item No. 3 knowing that there are going to be appeals.

During discussion and in response to comments and queries by Mr. Dekle and Ms. Wombles, Ms. Rowe explained that management is fully involved in the process of determining the duties and responsibilities that should be included in a position classification. She provided information regarding the market comparison process and how the value of a job is determined, relating that positions within the County are compared to similar positions in government and the private sector; and that only the responsibilities and duties of the actual job are compared, not the person performing the job; whereupon, she discussed the process for appealing a classification determination, pointing out that it is conducted in a different manner than a grievance appeal, and explained why the Human Resources Analyst attends the appeals hearing, relating that the analyst can provide valuable input with regard to the market and similar topics.

Ms. Rowe discussed the importance of obtaining an accurate market value analysis for each job, relating that a flawed analysis would make it difficult to attract and retain employees. She related that because not all employees are interviewed during the PAQ process, the appeals process provides an opportunity for employees to disagree with classification determinations; and explained that while an employee who engages in additional work may deserve a merit increase, it does not mean that the individual should be placed in a higher job classification; whereupon, Ms. Rowe pointed out that employees whose positions have been reclassified upward will not receive a salary adjustment should the agenda item not be approved and, in response to comments and queries by Mr. Dekle, indicated that because it is not known which employees are appealing their reclassifications, she would not recommend that the members attempt to bifurcate the item, and discussion ensued.

HR Coordinator Jack Loring provided detailed information regarding the PAQ process, and clarified that the position analysis and audit report pertains to the Finance and Solid Waste Divisions and involves 80 positions. He related that HR will determine the number of employees who have returned paperwork to initiate the appeals process; explained that an appeal is a conversational meeting between the employee, members of staff, members of management, and the analyst; and commented that while the most recent appeal of classification had been from an employee who had been raised by four pay grades, the employee retained the right of appeal.

Mr. Loring discussed how the position analysis was conducted, relating that four sets of individuals were assembled to create job evaluation teams, which included individuals from the Department of Environment and Infrastructure, including the Solid Waste Division; and that the individuals were selected because of their overall knowledge of county government and

February 7, 2013

familiarity with departmental operations. He related that all of the positions were thoroughly examined; that the process was completely transparent; and that obtaining input from the supervisors and employees was an integral part of the process; whereupon, responding to queries by Ms. Vecchioli, Mr. Loring explained the point factor system utilized to evaluate the positions.

Agreeing that the PAQ form is too long and the form should be shortened, Ms. Rowe related that DEI had requested that its employees go through the full process by completing the questionnaire and detailing their job duties. She related that the extended timeframe was atypical with regard to other department audits, noting that because Public Works and Utilities were merged into DEI around the same time that the classification review was being conducted, HR wanted to allow sufficient time for those approximately 800 employees to become settled in their positions prior to the evaluation process; and acknowledged that although many factors contributed to the length of the process, it should not have taken as long as it did.

During discussion and in response to queries by Ms. Vecchioli and Mr. Dekle, Mr. Loring related that while a number of employees have contacted his office to request appeal forms, no forms have been returned thus far; and that when the forms are returned, HR will know if a particular theme is associated with the appeals; whereupon, he related that following an appeal where the petitioner is denied the upward reclassification, the employee can appeal all the way to the Unified Personnel Board.

Thereupon, Mr. Andriso called for the vote; and following brief discussion regarding the process of amending a motion, Ms. Vecchioli indicated that her original motion to accept the Consent Agenda would stand, and the seconder concurred. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried 5 to 1, with Mr. Dekle casting the dissenting vote.

Following the vote and in response to queries by Mr. Dekle, Mr. Loring provided detailed information regarding the timeframe associated with the appeals process; whereupon, Mr. Dekle repeated his concerns, and again requested that reclassifications being appealed be separated from the Consent Agenda so that the item is not approved and subsequently appealed.

Ms. Rowe related that only downward reclassified appeals can come before the Board and downward reclassifications rarely happen; and respectfully stated that Mr. Dekle's request to pull out positions being appealed would only delay the process, create an additional step, and interfere with those employees who are not appealing their classification determinations; whereupon, Ms. Vecchioli indicated that because the Board actually has to approve the position reclassifications before the employees can assert their right to appeal, Mr. Dekle's request may not work, and discussion ensued.

Mr. Dekle indicated that he has complete respect for Ms. Rowe and her staff, and related that his goal is to try and avoid a conflict; whereupon, Ms. Vecchioli related that the role of the Board is not to micromanage the classification, but to approve it based upon the reasonableness of the audit; and that if there are individual instances or exceptions, those individuals have the right to an appeal, and brief discussion ensued.

NEW BUSINESS

PROPOSAL TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO THE DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS – TEMPORARILY DEFERRED

Ms. Vecchioli moved, seconded by Mr. Davis, that authority be delegated to the Director of Human Resources for administrative actions.

Ms. Rowe provided background information, relating that the item had been discussed by the members at a recent meeting. She indicated that while many administrative duties are delegated to her department through the Special Act, one of the things the Act does not delegate is the administration of items that are typically found on the Consent Agenda, such as position reclassifications or the extension of employment for temporary hires.

Ms. Rowe indicated that the changes currently being approved by the Board are prospective in nature; and provided examples of how a delay could negatively impact the County's operations, including slowing down the recruitment process and not being able to act on the results of an audit, such as increasing an employee's salary or changing a position's title, until the Board meets and approves the items. She requested that the Board consider granting her delegated authority to move forward with modifying rules pertaining to pay and classification; and that she be allowed to bring the items back to the Board after the fact as information items; whereupon, Ms. Rowe pointed out that the Board would have the ability to rescind the delegated authority at any time and the opportunity to rule on the information items when they are brought forward.

In response to comments and queries by Ms. Vecchioli, Ms. Rowe indicated that employees who received a downward reclassification would still have the ability to appeal to the Board. She discussed the difference between routine items that are listed on the Consent Agenda and those items where she would request prior approval; whereupon, Ms. Daggett commented that the request to delegate authority appeared reasonable and well thought out; and that if there are questions related to the appeals process, they would be detailed and part of the record.

February 7, 2013

Mr. Dekle reiterated that he has concerns regarding the appeals process; related that he is extremely concerned about those employees who are disgruntled and unhappy with their reclassification determinations; and stated that he objects to the Board's general delegation of authority and the loss of visibility with regard to reviewing pay and class changes, which is one of the foundations ascribed to the Unified Personnel Board by the Personnel Act; whereupon, referring to Ms. Rowe's memorandum regarding Delegated Authority dated February 6, 2013, Mr. Dekle opined that the statement regarding the delegated authority is too broad; that he would prefer the statement to be rewritten in order to spell out the exact items which are to be delegated; and that he would not support the item as written.

Ms. Vecchioli agreed that the delegated authority statement was perhaps written too broadly; and related that even though she would be willing to amend her motion if Ms. Rowe could articulate a way to more narrowly define the statement, she would not be in favor of only including upward classification changes since downward changes allow individuals appellate rights which can be redressed; whereupon, Ms. Rowe related possible items that would be included in the delegation of authority.

Following brief discussion, Ms. Vecchioli related that it would be beneficial if Ms. Rowe were to rewrite the statement with more specificity, allow sufficient time for it to be reviewed, and resubmit it at next month's meeting for the members to consider; whereupon, she withdrew her original motion to approve the item, and Mr. Davis withdrew his second.

Thereupon, Ms. Vecchioli moved, seconded by Mr. Davis and carried unanimously, that the item be deferred to the March meeting (Vote 6 – 0)

INFORMATION ITEM

PINELLAS COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES 2012 ANNUAL REPORT *SETTING THE COURSE* – RECEIVED

MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION ITEMS RECEIVED

The following miscellaneous information items were received for filing:

1. Management and Supervisory Notes for February 2013.
2. Training Schedule for February 2013.

February 7, 2013

3. Minutes of the EAC Representatives meeting of December 19, 2012.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:21 P.M.

Chair