

Clearwater, Florida, May 3, 2018

The Unified Personnel Board (UPB) met in regular session at 6:31 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: Ricardo Davis, Chair; Ron Walker, Vice-Chair; James Dates; Keith C. Dekle; Louise Dolsay; William A. Schulz II; and Joan M. Vecchioli.

Also Present: Holly J. Schoenherr, Director of Human Resources; Carl E. Brody, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Chris Bartlett, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk; and other interested individuals. *Minutes by Teresa Adkins and Arlene Smitke.*

AGENDA

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

- EAC I. Employees’ Advisory Council Representative
- Personnel Board II. CONSENT AGENDA
 - 1. Request Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Personnel Board Meeting held April 5, 2018
- Human Resources III. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
 - 1. Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the Personnel Board
 - 2. Human Resources FY19 Budget Presentation
 - 3. Classification & Compensation Study Update by Jeff Ling, Evergreen Solutions
 - 4. Human Resources Strategic Plan
 - 5. Other Informational Items

All presentations and handouts referred to in the minutes have been made a part of the record.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Davis called the meeting to order at 6:31 P.M.; whereupon, he led the Pledge of Allegiance.

EMPLOYEES' ADVISORY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE

EAC Chair Charles Toney provided the following update:

- The Appointing Authorities and EAC will meet on May 21 at 9:00 A.M. Topics of discussion will include paid parental leave, leave accrual, and merit pay.
- The guest speaker for the May 24 Delegate meeting will be Jeff Ling of Evergreen Solutions, who will discuss the Classification and Compensation Study.
- The awards committee is designing a new logo for the *Bright Ideas Award*, and it will be shared with the Board upon completion.
- The special committee continues to work on the leave accrual rate, with the focus of providing leave to new employees sooner. The members are considering the possibility of additional floating holidays during the first few years. Human Resources Officer Jack Loring is a member of the committee and continues to be helpful in gathering information.

Mr. Toney referred to the Informal Grievance Committee Appeal held at the April meeting and stressed the importance of the new anti-bullying policy, opining that had the policy been implemented sooner, the hearing never would have taken place. Noting that the appeal resulted in a tie vote and the action of the Committee was upheld, he suggested that the current Rule be reviewed to allow the Board the option of recommending alternative discipline.

Mr. Toney requested that Employee Advocate Lisa Arispe be allowed to comment with regard to the hearing, and responding to query by Ms. Vecchioli, Attorney Brody indicated that the appellant's rights have expired and the matter could be discussed.

Ms. Arispe acknowledged concerns regarding the length of appeal hearings, suggesting that they could begin at an earlier hour; whereupon, she expressed concern that she was not given the opportunity for rebuttal questions or to present a closing speech. Responding, Ms. Vecchioli related that the Rules state that closing arguments are at the discretion of the Board, and she does not believe it would have changed the outcome; that she agrees on the rebuttal issue; and that while an earlier hearing schedule had been problematic last year, she would be willing to consider it again in the future.

Attorney Brody related that last month's hearing was the first using recently adopted guidelines to streamline the process; that the goal is still to ensure that the parties have the opportunity to fully

May 3, 2018

present their case; and that rebuttal, surrebuttal, and closing arguments remain optional and can be heard at the discretion of the Board, noting that the purpose of the new guidelines is to reduce meeting length while focusing on the facts and legal considerations.

Ms. Vecchioli explained the rationale with respect to the tie vote issue, noting that the Appointing Authority bears the burden of proof in a termination appeal and the employee bears the burden of proof in a grievance appeal, and Mr. Dekle provided input.

CONSENT AGENDA – APPROVED

Upon motion by Mr. Walker, seconded by Mr. Dekle and carried unanimously, the minutes of the April 5, 2018 meeting were approved.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the Personnel Board

The document titled *Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the Unified Personnel Board* has been attached and made a part of the minutes.

Human Resources Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Presentation

Ms. Schoenherr indicated that the 2019 Human Resources budget target is approximately \$4.3 million; and that the amount was recently increased due to a change in Florida Retirement System employer contributions. Referring to a document titled *Standard Expenditures by Center – Detail % Change*, she pointed out various expenditures.

Responding to queries by the members, Ms. Schoenherr discussed the use of a recruitment firm to fill a Human Resources position. She related that the same firm was used for her position and is currently conducting the County Administrator recruitment; that she is unaware of other departments that use a firm; and that, while her department has established a reputation for providing outstanding recruitment services, it is limited with respect to having access to potential candidates for certain positions, and discussion ensued pertaining to the hiring of internal candidates.

May 3, 2018

In response to queries by Chair Davis and Ms. Vecchioli, Human Resources Officer Tim Closterman related that a salary variance in the Human Resources Department was caused by the conversion of a classified position to an exempt position; that the Office of Management and Budget requests that all departments expend no more than 99 percent of their budget; and that Human Resources was under budget at 95 to 96 percent in Fiscal Year 2017.

In response to query by Mr. Dekle, Ms. Schoenherr clarified that, in comparison to the private sector, County salaries are lower, but the benefits package is more generous, increasing the County's competitiveness with regard to the total compensation. Discussion ensued, and Ms. Schoenherr related that a priority of HR will be to conduct an educational campaign that informs employees of the value of benefits provided.

Ms. Schoenherr related that her May 10 presentation to the Board of County Commissioners will focus on what the HR Department has been doing and its priorities for the coming year. Referring to a PowerPoint presentation titled *Human Resources FY19 Budget*, she provided background information regarding the department, its mission, and the services it provides. She highlighted key 2017 accomplishments, noting that 74 percent of the employees participated in the Employee Voice Survey; and that nine in ten would recommend working for Pinellas County; whereupon, she presented charts showing key indicators from the survey for the HR Department and the Unified Personnel System as a whole, noting a substantial improvement in HR employee satisfaction over the results of the 2015 survey.

Mr. Dekle suggested that it would be beneficial to provide information pertaining to areas of weakness identified by the survey and what action will be taken, and Ms. Schoenherr related that the HR Department has identified the following areas, noting what is being done: work schedule flexibility, addressing poor performance, compensation with regard to performance, and overall staff morale.

Ms. Schoenherr identified the following departmental priorities for Fiscal Year 2018:

- Completion of the Classification and Compensation Study
- Dealing with issues relating to the aging workforce
- Continuing to work with the Appointing Authorities to establish action plans with regard to the Employee Voice Survey findings
- Establishing learning paths and training courses
- Educating employees about health, wellness, and financial issues

- Assessing benefits and wellness programs and making necessary adjustments
- Promoting workforce diversity and inclusion

Classification and Compensation Study Update

Ms. Schoenherr introduced Jeff Ling of Evergreen Solutions and, noting that the study is coming to a close, related that she has been meeting individually with the Appointing Authorities to discuss the study results; that they will meet on May 21 to collectively discuss moving forward on the classification and compensation proposal; and that recommendations will be brought before the Personnel Board at its July meeting for review and approval of the classification structure.

Referring to a presentation titled *Classification and Compensation Study, Pinellas County, Florida, Personnel Board*, Mr. Ling discussed the progress of the study, providing a high level review of the goals, project phases, employee comments and concerns, strengths and weaknesses of the current system, and Job Assessment Tool completion statistics, setting the foundation for the following discussion:

- Compensation Survey Results
- Total Compensation Results
- Solution Options
- Solution Pros and Cons
- Considerations
- Solution Example
- Next Steps

Mr. Ling presented results of the base salary and total compensation survey for the public sector, the private sector, and a blended comparison of the two indicating that, excluding benefits, the County is below the private sector in take home pay and aligned with the public sector; and that, including benefits, the County is aligned with the private sector and ahead of the public sector, with similar results in the blended comparison.

Mr. Ling provided three solution options regarding the survey findings, noting the overlap of options two and three; whereupon, he defined each structure proposal highlighting the pros and cons as follows:

Banded Structure

Option one combines job commonalities across different departments with varying compensation levels and is used extensively in State Government. Pros include: flexibility, system simplification, and accommodation of departmental growth and functionality changes. Cons include: elongated implementation time, amount of change management needed, technology costs, and communication to employees of the impact and benefits.

Minor Consolidation

Option two consolidates the current classification system, addressing employees who are not in the correct pay range and correcting for job overlap. Pros include: maintains current structure, ease of transition, and ease of employee acceptance. Cons include: fails to address current issues and make necessary changes, and it would be perceived as insufficient by employees.

Moderate Consolidation

Option three is a cumulative approach including the items that option two addresses with a larger impact on exempt positions. Pros include: maintains current structure, ease of transition, addresses classification issues, and improves career paths. Cons include: higher cost and more change management than minor consolidation, and requires employee communication and interaction.

Mr. Ling explained alternatives to be considered by the Board and Appointing Authorities, indicating that, after selecting the market approach and preferred solution option, an implementation strategy would need to be developed. Referring to a slide titled *Solution Example*, he discussed various options and their impact on the employee and ongoing budget.

Thereupon, Mr. Ling discussed the next steps and project timeline, relating that the project team has been working with HR and the Appointing Authorities and will work through June to address their concerns; that job descriptions will be updated during June and July based upon the preferred option; and that presentations will be made to the employees to review the process, recommendations, and selected alternative; whereupon, he thanked the Board members for their attention and indicated that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Responding to queries by Ms. Vecchioli, Mr. Ling related that the report will include recommendations pertaining to merit pay; that he suggests they be implemented after first addressing market issues; and that it may result in temporary compression.

In response to query by Mr. Schulz, Mr. Ling provided an explanation of the data collection and analysis process used to arrive at the cost variances between counties.

May 3, 2018

Responding to query by Mr. Dekle with regard to an employee option for receiving cash in lieu of a benefit, Mr. Ling related that such options were more popular prior to the recession and the implementation of Obamacare; that some employers offer non-financial benefits such as extra leave time; and that organizations that offer flexibility have better success in recruiting and retaining younger workers.

In response to queries by Ms. Dolsay and Mr. Walker, Mr. Ling indicated that the County could choose to implement Option 1 at some time in the future with a minimum amount of validation, which could be done by HR staff; whereupon, he discussed considerations related to the implementation of a pilot program, noting that it would provide a transition period to gain the support and understanding of the employees.

Ms. Vecchioli expressed concern as to the Personnel Board's role in the decision process, and Ms. Schoenherr explained that the UPB is responsible for selecting the alternative and establishing the classification structure and pay plans for the Unified Personnel System; however, they do not have control of the funds. She noted that certain Appointing Authorities are funded by revenue sources other than the Board of County Commissioners and are subject to financial constraints. Discussion ensued, and there was agreement among the members to seek input from the Board of County Commissioners and the Appointing Authorities due to the significance of the decision and the timeline for completion. Attorney Brody provided input pertaining to the budget process and discussed acceptable contact among the various parties with respect to the Sunshine Law.

In response to queries by Chair Davis, Mr. Ling discussed the consequences of a no-action decision on morale and recruitment and retention; whereupon, he pointed out that the turnover of employees within the market of peer employers is difficult to quantify due to the hesitancy of employees to be completely transparent during exit interviews.

Mr. Dekle inquired whether cost of living and merit pay issues will be addressed in the project report, and Mr. Ling explained that there will be a series of recommendations, which will be adjusted depending upon the County's selected structure alternative; whereupon, at the suggestion of Mr. Dekle, he agreed to add a paragraph explaining that the issues will be addressed at a later time.

In response to query by Chair Davis as to the frequency of pay range adjustments to ensure market competitiveness, Ms. Schoenherr related that staff conducts a regular review and analysis and generally brings adjustments to the Board on an annual basis.

May 3, 2018

Human Resources Strategic Plan

Ms. Vecchioli requested that the Strategic Plan presentation be deferred to the next meeting to allow more time for discussion, and following discussion, the item was deferred to the June meeting agenda.

Other Informational Items

The following miscellaneous informational items were received for filing:

1. Minutes of the EAC Representative meeting of March 21, 2018
2. Leadership Notes for April 2018
3. Training Calendars for April, May, and June 2018

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Davis adjourned the meeting at 9:17 P.M.

Chair



Human Resources Director

Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the Unified Personnel Board

The Human Resources Director, having been granted delegated authority to act on behalf of the Unified Personnel Board, has taken the following action from March 18, 2018 through April 14, 2018.

ADDITION

<u>SPEC NO</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>EEO4 CODE</u>	<u>OT CODE</u>	<u>PG</u>
15068	Market Intelligence Specialist	Para-Professionals	Exempt	P2

PAY GRADE CHANGE

<u>SPEC NO.</u>	<u>PRESENT CLASSIFICATION</u>	<u>PRESENT PAY GRADE</u>	<u>RECOMMENDED PAY GRADE</u>
15890	Claims Case Manager, RN	CL18	CL21

REVISIONS

<u>SPEC NO.</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PG</u>
21940	Business Development Manager	P1
18102	Veteran Services Officer	CL12