UNIFIED PERSONNEL BOARD AGENDA

Date: March 7, 2019
Time: 6:30 p.m.
Location: BCC Assembly Room, Fifth Floor, Pinellas County Courthouse
315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

I. Citizens to be Heard

EAC

II. Employees’ Advisory Council Representative

Personnel Board

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Request Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Personnel Board Meeting held February 7, 2019

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Request Approval of Classification Plan Changes
2. Request Approval of a Reclassification of a HR Tech to a HR Specialist Associated with a Secondary Review
3. Annual Performance Review of the Human Resources Director

Human Resources

V. OLD BUSINESS

1. Benefits Advisory Committee Update (UPB Review of the BCC Resolution No. 18-90)

Human Resources

VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. Action Taken Under Authority Delegated by the Personnel Board
2. Classification & Compensation Study Update
3. Other Informational Items

Persons are advised that, if they decide to appeal any decision made at this meeting/hearing, they will need a verbatim record of the proceedings, and, for such purposes, they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is based.

Persons with a disability needing reasonable accommodation(s) to participate in this proceeding should contact the Office of Human Rights, 400 S. Fort Harrison Ave., 5th Floor, Clearwater, FL 33756 (727) 464-4062 (V/TDD) no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting.
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; Keith C. Dekle; Jeffrey Kronschnabl; Kenneth Peluso; 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.

AGENDA

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Personnel Board

I. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Unified Personnel Board

II. Citizens to be Heard

EAC

III. Employees’ Advisory Council Representative

Personnel Board

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Request Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Personnel Board Meeting held December 6, 2018

Human Resources

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. Action Taken Under Authority Granted by the Personnel Board
2. Performance Review Timeline for the HR Director
3. Classification & Compensation Study Update
4. Decision and Findings of the December Termination Appeal
5. Other Informational Items

County Attorney

VI. Workshop

1. General Procedure Guidance Discussion
2. Review of the Sunshine Law

All documents and handouts provided to the Clerk’s Office 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.
ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR OF THE UNIFIED PERSONNEL BOARD

Mr. Dekle moved, seconded by Ms. Vecchioli and carried unanimously, that Ricardo Davis be re-elected Chair.

Thereupon, Ms. Vecchioli moved, seconded by Mr. Peluso, that Ron Walker be re-elected Vice-Chair. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

No one appeared in response to the Chair’s call for citizens wishing to be heard.

EMPLOYEES’ ADVISORY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE

Outgoing EAC Chair Charles Toney introduced newly elected Chair Lisa Arispe to the members; whereupon, she welcomed the new Board members and provided the following update:

• The Merit Pay Committee is gathering cost information and working with Office of Management and Budget Director Bill Berger to discuss budget considerations. Further discussions with the Appointing Authorities will be part of the regular meeting in April.

• The February EAC meeting will begin an hour early in order to discuss the Human Resources Director review process and compile feedback in time to share it with the Personnel Board members for their review.

• The EAC complied with a recent investigation on whether its members violated the Sunshine Law. The County Attorney’s Office has since stated that no violation of the rules occurred.

CONSENT AGENDA – APPROVED

Upon motion by Mr. Peluso, seconded by Ms. Vecchioli and carried unanimously, the minutes of the regular meeting held December 6, 2018 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 made a part of the record.

Performance Review Timeline for the HR Director

Ms. Schoenherr introduced the item and related that the model for her review was put in place by the Board in the previous year. She noted that evaluation forms have been provided to the Appointing Authorities, which they will complete and submit by February 20, to be included with feedback from the EAC; and that the Board members will have until February 28 to complete their individual evaluations, which will be shared with Chair Davis, who will lead the discussion at the Board’s March meeting.

Mr. Dekle commented that unlike in previous years, he would like the Board to produce a summary of the evaluation and share it with the Appointing Authorities and other stakeholders. Attorney Brody noted that there is no structure in place to do so as part of the existing timeline; and that it could be added at the Board’s direction, and discussion ensued regarding what information might be included in the summary.

Following the discussion, Chair Davis noted that there was consensus among the members to extrapolate a simple summary of the evaluation from the minutes of the meeting and make the summary available to all stakeholders.

Classification and Compensation Study Update

Ms. Schoenherr stated that Phase I of the study is near completion; that extra time has been allowed to ensure everyone has had an opportunity to provide feedback regarding the changes to pay grades and classifications; and that Evergreen Solutions has provided their preliminary recommendations on several of the employee requests received during the secondary review process.

Ms. Schoenherr indicated that HR has been facilitating conversations between department heads, Appointing Authorities, and Evergreen to provide full information in order to help reach the best recommendation for each situation; and that possibly as soon as the following week, affected employees should begin to receive notification of their secondary review decision and recommendation. She noted that should an employee who has received a downward
reclassification be unsatisfied with the results, they may first appeal to HR and, if still unsatisfied, a further appeal may be made to the Unified Personnel Board; and that notices of eligibility for those appeals will be included as part of the notification information.

Ms. Schoenherr stated that HR has started working on Phase II of the study and discussed its three primary components: addressing exempt pay plans, developing alternatives to the career ladder issues impacted in Phase I, and looking at internal equity issues.

Regarding exempt pay plans, Ms. Schoenherr related that the UPB has authority over exempt classifications but not the pay plans themselves; that four constitutionals and the BCC have their own exempt pay plan; and that HR is working with each entity in order to understand the direction they wish to take as far as establishing any changes for their areas.

Ms. Schoenherr stated that some changes in Phase I disrupted certain existing career ladders; and that HR is exploring alternative ways to recognize career development and progression as an employee implements more advanced job skills within their current pay grades. She noted that HR is seeking feedback from the Appointing Authorities which will then be shared at a future EAC meeting and with other focus groups for further ideas and suggestions; and that a proposal could be available for the Board’s consideration as soon as April.

Regarding internal equity issues, Ms. Schoenherr indicated that compression will be addressed to ensure a supervisor’s pay rate has sufficient distance from those they supervise; and that range compression will be reviewed as to how employees within the same pay range are situated relative to each other. She noted that the BCC has allocated a certain amount of funding in the current fiscal year for addressing those types of issues; and that it may be necessary to request additional funding in the next fiscal year to complete the process.

Responding to query by Mr. Peluso, Ms. Schoenherr stated that while there is no formal plan for a Phase III in the study, it may be necessary depending on what issues remain to be addressed after the previous phases are completed.

Discussion ensued regarding the timeline for appeals, and in response to queries by the members, Human Resources Officer Jack Loring stated that HR responds to an employee’s request for appeal within 15 calendar days; and that the Appointing Authority is also contacted in that timeframe. Ms. Vecchioli noted that the Personnel Rules allow employees 15 calendar days to request an appeal before the UPB if they are not satisfied with the initial appeal to HR; and that the Board would then have 120 days to complete the process, and Attorney Brody concurred.
Decision and Findings of the December Termination Appeal

Ms. Schoenherr noted that the decision and findings are included in the agenda packet as follow-up to the previous meeting. Attorney Brody responded to queries by the members regarding what the former employee may or may not do to further pursue his action, noting that the employee could pursue a new case at the Federal level or appeal the Board’s decision to the State Circuit Court.

Discussion ensued regarding the level of investigation needed by the County to facilitate any future court action in the case or others in the future; whereupon, Ms. Vecchioli stated that the Board functions as a review board and not as prosecutors; that the Board reviews the evidence provided by the Appointing Authority to determine whether the Personnel Rules were followed, due process was applied correctly, and the proper discipline was administered; and that any further litigation would be a matter for the County Attorney.

Other Informational Items

Ms. Schoenherr introduced two new members of her staff, Human Resources Coordinator Tywanna McGee and HR Business Partner Maria Roberts. Ms. McGee thanked the Board for the opportunity to attend the meeting, and Ms. Roberts stated her appreciation for the supportive environment that she has experienced within the Human Resources Department.

The following miscellaneous information items were received for filing:

1. Minutes of the EAC Representative meeting of November 14, 2018
2. EAC Delegate Straw Poll Regarding the Classification and Compensation Study
3. Benefits Feedback and Communication
4. Communication Plan for 2019 Annual Enrollment
5. 2018 Benefits Satisfaction Survey
6. Minutes of the EAC Merit Pay Committee meeting of November 14, 2018
7. Minutes of the EAC Delegate meeting of November 15, 2018
8. Leadership Notes for December 2018
WORKSHOP

General Procedure Guidance Discussion

Attorney Brody related that the Board is informally guided by Robert’s Rules of Order but does not follow them in the strictest sense; that the Board does not have its own bylaws; and that a quorum of the Board is the majority of the full membership body, or four members.

Referring to a document titled *Chart for Determining When Each Motion is in Order*, Attorney Brody discussed the use of motions by the members to conduct the business of the Board, and specifically reviewed the use of motions to lay an item on the table, motions to amend, and motions to refer an item to committee, and discussion ensued.

In response to query by Chair Davis, Attorney Brody noted that the Board could decide to establish a set of bylaws; that it would be a way to address requirements of officers, a quorum, or other issues the members may see a need to address; and that he is not advocating for bylaws and has only brought it to the Board’s attention should any member wish to review the matter.

Review of the Sunshine Law

Attorney Brody conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *2019 Florida Statutes 119 and 286: “The Sunshine Law”* and discussed an individual’s right of access to inspect or copy public records. He related that anything created to help conduct the business of the UPB becomes a public record; and that written documents, texts, emails, and other public documents must be kept and made accessible to the public. He noted that personal notes taken by a member during a meeting are not considered public record as long as they are not shared with other members; and that any personal discussions unrelated to the business of the Board are also excluded.

Attorney Brody related that some records are exempt and can still be released at the Board’s discretion; and that there are confidential records that cannot be released under any circumstance. He discussed the procedures for responding to a public records request, noting that the Board has a Public Records Liaison who will comply with all legal requirements, and discussion ensued.

Attorney Brody indicated that a public meeting is created whenever two or more members of the Board gather to discuss a matter that may possibly come before the Board for consideration; that the meeting can be in person, through email or text, over the phone, or through social media and other means; and that accidentally creating a public meeting will violate the law in several ways. He noted that for regular meetings and work sessions, County staff ensures that the requirements
are met; whereupon, discussion ensued regarding how violations may affect the decisions of the Board.

Responding to queries by the members, Attorney Brody stated that the Board has discretion on when to allow a citizen to be heard during a meeting; that a person who wishes to speak specifically to an agenda item could be heard at the time the item is called or could instead speak to the item during the Citizens to be Heard section of the agenda; and that a person should only speak once on a matter as directed by the UPB Chair, and discussion ensued.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Davis adjourned the meeting at 7:45 P.M.

__________________________
Chair
To: The Honorable Chair and Members of the Unified Personnel Board

From: Holly J. Schoenherr, Director of Human Resources

Date: March 1, 2019

Subject: Adoption of Changes to Classification Plans

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the members of the Unified Personnel Board approve the following changes as a result of outcomes from the Classification and Compensation Study secondary review process:

1. Pay grade changes for 11 classifications
2. Title and pay grade changes for 7 classifications
3. Title change for one classification
4. Addition of 7 new classifications
5. Deletion of 2 classifications

A complete list of classification changes is attached to this memo. It is recommended that all changes are effective March 17, 2019, which is the first day of the next pay period.

Background:

On September 6, 2018, the Unified Personnel Board adopted comprehensive structural changes to the classification plan for Classified Service positions as well as new Classified pay plans, effective September 16, 2018.

Following adoption of the classification structure by the Unified Personnel Board, Classified employees were provided an opportunity to request from Evergreen Solutions a second review of their classification and pay grade assignment. Preliminary results of the secondary reviews were provided to Appointing Authorities to ensure their support of Evergreen’s determinations.

Any related pay adjustments will be made in accordance with Rule 3.C.1(d), Reclassification or Reallocation Increase, with an effective date of March 17, 2019.

The recommended actions outlined above are supported by both Human Resources and affected Appointing Authorities.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Attachment: List of Classification Changes
# Pay Grade Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Original Grade Determination</th>
<th>New Grade Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911 Quality Assurance Specialist</td>
<td>C20</td>
<td>C24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Engineering Specialist</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>C23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist 2</td>
<td>C23</td>
<td>C24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curator of Collections</td>
<td>C25</td>
<td>C26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Specialist 2</td>
<td>C23</td>
<td>C24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Construction Inspector</td>
<td>C27</td>
<td>C24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Technician 1</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>C22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Technician 2</td>
<td>C20</td>
<td>C24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Technician 3</td>
<td>C22</td>
<td>C26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Technician 2</td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>C21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Technician 3</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>C22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Title and Pay Grade Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Classification Title</th>
<th>Current Grade</th>
<th>New Class Title</th>
<th>New Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Coordinator</td>
<td>C31</td>
<td>Floodplain Administrator</td>
<td>SM6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Survey Support Specialist</td>
<td>C25</td>
<td>Survey and Mapping Support Specialist</td>
<td>C27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Survey Technician 1</td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Survey and Mapping Technician 1</td>
<td>C17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Survey Technician 2</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Survey and Mapping Technician 2</td>
<td>C20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Survey Technician 3</td>
<td>C21</td>
<td>Survey and Mapping Technician 3</td>
<td>C24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Research Technician 1</td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Survey and Mapping Research Technician 1</td>
<td>C20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Research Technician 2</td>
<td>C20</td>
<td>Survey and Mapping Research Technician 2</td>
<td>C22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Title Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Classification Title</th>
<th>New Class Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Administration Coordinator 2</td>
<td>Contracts Administration Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# New Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Title</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Specialist Supervisor</td>
<td>C31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomologist</td>
<td>C24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Courier 1</td>
<td>C13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Courier 2</td>
<td>C14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>C22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey and Mapping Assistant</td>
<td>C14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse Supervisor</td>
<td>C19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Deleted Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Administration Coordinator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Courier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: The Honorable Chair and Members of the Unified Personnel Board

From: Holly J. Schoenherr, Director of Human Resources

Date: March 1, 2019

Subject: Reclassification of Position in Human Resources

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the members of the Unified Personnel Board approve the following position reclassification in the Human Resources Department, effective March 17, 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position #</th>
<th>Current Title and Pay Grade</th>
<th>New Title and Pay Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRD/C35</td>
<td>Human Resources Technician C20</td>
<td>Human Resources Specialist C22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This action by the Board is necessary since the Human Resources Director’s delegated authority does not apply to actions within the Human Resources Department.

Background:

Evergreen Solutions re-evaluated a Human Resources Technician position during the secondary review process and determined that the position should be reclassified to a Human Resources Specialist.
To: The Honorable Chair and Members of the Unified Personnel Board

From: Holly J. Schoenherr, Director of Human Resources

Date: March 1, 2019

Subject: Benefits Advisory Committee

The purpose of this memo is to report the recommendations of the Appointing Authorities regarding the creation and function of a Benefits Advisory Committee.

Background:
Per BCC Resolution No. 18-90 adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on October 23, 2018, the Board of County Commissioners requested that the Unified Personnel Board (UPB) formally agree and accept the resolution that delegates authority to the Director of Human Resources regarding the management and implementation of employee benefit plans.

The UPB discussed this matter at its December 6, 2018 meeting and ultimately decided that no immediate action was necessary and requested further information and clarity regarding the desires of the Appointing Authorities related to the establishment of a benefits committee.

Recommendations:
The Appointing Authorities met on February 1, 2019, agreed that creating a Benefits Advisory Committee would add value in a variety of ways, and recommended the following purpose, scope, and membership of the committee.

Purpose:
• Evaluate existing benefits programs in relation to both cost/resource impact (to both employees and the employer) and quality
• Provide feedback on proposed benefits additions, deletions or changes
• Identify strategies to enhance (active and retired) employees’ understanding of program offerings
• Make summary presentations to the Appointing Authorities and other stakeholders regarding research and recommendations
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Scope:

• Benefits programs coming under committee review shall include:
  - Programs covered under the Employee Health Plan (i.e. medical plan, dental, short-term disability, wellness incentives)
  - Leave programs established within Unified Personnel Rules and Policies (i.e. annual leave, personal days, holidays, annual leave exchange)
  - Deferred compensation
  - Tuition reimbursement

• Benefits programs coming under committee review shall not include:
  - Programs that are legally required (i.e. Florida Retirement System, Family Medical Leave Act)
  - Training classes offered by Human Resources or other UPS departments
  - Programs implemented by individual Appointing Authorities (i.e. community service leave)

Guiding Principles:
It is recommended that a committee charged with evaluating health plan programs establish guiding principles to facilitate understanding and to manage competing interests of committee members. Guiding principles may include those currently followed by Human Resources as it evaluates and considers program changes:

• Programs/design shall align with the Unified Personnel Systems’ total rewards strategy and corporate values, such as recruiting and retaining top talent.
• Programs/design should promote increased employee accountability and ownership.
• Program evaluation shall include projected return on investment.
• Trustworthy research and data shall be preferred over individual interests and opinions.
• Funding impacts shall reflect responsible stewardship of public funds.
• All recommended program modifications shall be vetted through health plan consulting services (as a neutral third party) contracted by the County, as well as legal counsel, budget, and finance for cost/risk analysis.

Committee Structure and Membership:
To facilitate a constructive evaluation process, it is important for committee members to receive considerable training or to be already highly experienced in health plan design. Health plan program decisions involve factors and information that often require years of experience and education to understand. It is further recommended that committee members agree to the following responsibilities:

• Attend scheduled meetings prepared to fully participate in discussions.
• Follow established guiding principles.
• Represent respective constituent group by sharing meeting agendas and minutes; conduct surveys as necessary to collect employee perspectives.
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- Assist Human Resources in educating the workforce regarding employee benefits and the concept of a self-insured health plan.

The Appointing Authorities recommend that the committee function as a staff committee of the Appointing Authorities instead of an advisory committee of the Board of County Commissioners. A BCC-created committee would be a Sunshine body; the Appointing Authorities are concerned that operating as a Sunshine body will present significant limitations to the committee’s ability to function and communicate. Further, BCC Resolution 18-90 only deals with benefits related to health coverage; and Appointing Authorities wish for the benefits committee to address all benefits, including those not covered under the BCC-sponsored health plans. In light of Appointing Authority agreement on these issues, County Administration is preparing to ask the BCC to amend its resolution to remove reference to the creation of a benefits committee.

The Appointing Authorities recommend the following membership for its Benefits Advisory Committee:

- One representative from each Appointing Authority
- Two members selected by the Employees’ Advisory Committee (EAC), but limited to no more than one EAC Representative due to Sunshine issues
- A retiree representative
- A representative from the Office of Management and Budget
- A representative from Clerk’s Finance
- Other members as determined collectively by Appointing Authorities

Attachment:
- Jan. 25, 2019 Memo from Senior Assistant County Attorney Carole Sanzeri
- BCC Resolution No. 18-90
TO: Jewel White, County Attorney
FROM: Carole Sanzeri, Senior Assistant County Attorney
SUBJECT: BCC Resolution
DATE: January 25, 2019

In December Ken Burke raised some questions concerning the Board of County Commissioners’ (BCC) recent amendment to a Resolution delegating authority relating to the provision of benefits the Board sponsors to the Human Resources Director. In preparation for discussion at an upcoming meeting, the following responses are offered.

Request: It would be helpful to have the County Attorney educate the Appointing Authorities as to the Special Act and any duties assigned to the UPS Board as it relates to benefits.

Response: The Special Act does not specifically authorize the Unified Personnel Board (UPB) to exercise any authority over benefits. The Special Act outlines the Director of Personnel’s duties as the executive head of the Personnel Department and one of those duties is to foster and develop programs, including for “insurance” and “health.” The Special Act further provides that such programs may only be implemented upon approval of the UPB. There has never, to my knowledge, been any interpretation of that provision (or any other in the Act). To the extent that the HR Director wanted to foster and develop such a program, she would need approval of the UPB. However, the BCC has authority to enter contracts and offer health coverage (and the like) for officers and employees and their dependents pursuant to Florida Statutes, §112.08 (2)(a) which provides:

Notwithstanding any general law or special act to the contrary, every local governmental unit is authorized to provide and pay out of its available funds for all or part of the premium for life, health, accident, hospitalization, legal expense, or annuity insurance, or all or any kinds of such insurance, for the officers and employees of the local governmental unit and for health, accident, hospitalization, and legal expense insurance for the dependents of such officers and employees upon a group insurance plan and, to that end, to enter into contracts with insurance companies or professional administrators to provide such insurance or with a corporation not for profit whose membership consists...
The BCC can make legislative findings about expenditures in the best interest of the County and implement programs absent any other entity’s approval authority. In addition, it can ask (and has through the Resolution) the HR Director to administer its programs which, with her employer’s agreement, she certainly can. I think the Resolution (as it stood prior to recent amendment and as it stands now) should be seen as such request.

The law also requires that the County offer (but not necessarily subsidize) the same life, health, accident, hospitalization, or annuity insurance to retirees. See, Florida Statutes § 112.0801.

Request: The Resolution comes from one Appointing Authority. It would be further beneficial if the County Attorney can opine if each Constitutional Officer wishes to consider doing the same.

Response: The Resolution comes from the sponsor of the plans, the BCC, which is not an Appointing Authority under the UPS although it is the employer of the County Administrator and County Attorney who are Appointing Authorities. The BCC contracts with providers to make the benefits available throughout the Unified Personnel System. None of the other Appointing Authorities sponsor any benefit plans of which I am aware so there would be no reason for any of them to have a resolution about this. Of course, any of them could officially state that they are in favor of, or against, the Resolution and each has the authority to choose to participate or not.

Question: What benefits are covered by the Resolution?

Response: Ken pointed out that the Resolution adopted by the BCC deals only with health insurance and related issues but that he thought that what was discussed and agreed upon at the Appointing Authorities meeting was that a benefits committee would study all benefits.

The Resolution does only deal with benefits related to health coverage (the plans sponsored by the BCC). I have been advised that the discussion at the Appointing Authorities meeting was not a full discussion on this topic so it might be wise for the group to discuss what the Resolution is intended to do and their positions on that and, separately, what other things the group might be interested in asking Holly Schoenherr to pursue.

One option to move forward is to ask the BCC to amend the Resolution and eliminate the Benefits Advisory Committee as it was created and ask HR to create a staff committee to review specified benefits. Such a committee would have no delegation of authority from the BCC.
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE AUTHORITY OF THE
HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR TO ACT AS PLAN
ADMINISTRATOR OF BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS SPONSORED EMPLOYEE BENEFIT
PLANS, PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, in the course of administering employment related benefit plans, the
Director of Human Resources must make decisions regarding the management and
implementation of Employee Benefit Plans; and

WHEREAS, such decisions allow the Board of County Commissioners sponsored
benefit plans to be administered consistently and within approved budgets; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners finds that the Director of Human
Resources is the most appropriate official to make such decisions; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners desires to confirm past practice
and vest authority for such duties in the Director of Human Resources; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners wishes to establish a Benefits
Advisory Committee comprised of the Appointing Authorities or their designees, 2 members
selected by the Employees’ Advisory Committee (EAC), and a Retiree representative from the
Retired Employees of Pinellas County (REPCO) organization; and

WHEREAS, the Benefits Advisory Committee shall be responsible for evaluating
existing benefit plans and offerings on an annual basis and advising the HR Director on plan
design changes; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Human Resources shall formally present proposed changes
to Employee Benefit Plans to the EAC, Benefits Advisory Committee, Appointing Authorities,
and the Unified Personnel Board for review and feedback prior to the annual enrollment period
with sufficient time for review and feedback; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners recognizes that the Unified Personnel
Board oversees the performance of the Human Resources Department and Director, and requests
that the Unified Personnel Board formally agree and accept this resolution that delegates authority
to the Director of Human Resources.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County
Commissioners, at a duly assembled meeting held on this 23rd day of October that
the Director of Human Resources be vested with authority to act as Plan Administrator on
all Board of County Commissioners sponsored Employee Benefit Plans for the good of
the County and, in doing so, exercise authority over the following:
- Contract administration for all third party administrator contracts;
- Implementation of programs offered through contracts, e.g. pharmacy management
  and consumer driven health plan options;
- Implementation and management of health and wellness incentives;
- Design of the Plans, including coverages, exclusions, co-pays, deductibles and
  maximums consistent with approved budgets;
- Overall management of the Plans, including claim review, unless otherwise
  contracted, and formal appeal authority on benefit denials;
- Implementation of changes to and overall management of retirement and other
  savings plans offered by the County; and
• Acting as designee of the Plan Sponsor on all HIPAA privacy and security issues; and
• Implementing any time-sensitive legally mandated changes.
• Approve and execute contracts and applications to participate in programs related
to provision of benefits under existing contracts when there is no increase cost to
the County or extension of the term of underlying benefit contracts approved by the
Board of County Commissioners or County Administrator, including applications
to participate in rebate, reimbursement and other money saving programs.
• Formal updates to appropriate stakeholders (EAC, Benefits Advisory Committee,
Appointing Authorities, and the Unified Personnel Board) on proposed changes to
Benefit Plans prior to annual enrollment with sufficient time for review and feedback.
• Provide the County Administrator with a quarterly report of actions taken under the
delegated authority for placement on the Board of County Commissioners’ meeting
agenda.

In the event that a time-sensitive legally mandated change not within the designated authority
of the Plan Administrator must be implemented prior to Board of County Commissioners'
approval to protect the county or comply with legal obligations, such implementation will
be brought to the BCC for ratification at the next available BCC meeting.

All other plan design changes or amendments, including those governing law requires the
Plan Sponsor or governing body to approve, shall be approved by the Board of County
Commissioners.

The discretion and delegation provided to the Director of Human Resources pursuant to this
Resolution does not include authority to approve comprehensive, structural or other substantive
changes to the Employee Benefit Plans without consultation with the EAC, Benefits Advisory
Committee, Appointing Authorities, and the Unified Personnel Board.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This Resolution shall become effective January 1, 2019.

AYES: Welch, Seel, Beyrouti, Eggers, Gerard, Justice, and Long.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT AND NOT VOTING: None.

APPROVED AS TO FORM
By: Carole Hargrave
Office of the County Attorney
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 **January 20, 2019 through February 16, 2019**.

**TITLE CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEC NO.</th>
<th>PRESENT CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>PG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17514</td>
<td>Accounting Manager 1</td>
<td>Accounting Manager</td>
<td>C28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18812</td>
<td>Accounting Supervisor 1</td>
<td>Accounting Supervisor</td>
<td>C23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEC NO.</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>PG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10130</td>
<td>Accountant 1</td>
<td>C22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10140</td>
<td>Accountant 2</td>
<td>C27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10108</td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Finance Clerk</td>
<td>C15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10100</td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Finance Technician</td>
<td>C18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17514</td>
<td>Accounting Manager</td>
<td>C28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10146</td>
<td>Accounting Services Coordinator</td>
<td>C25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23044</td>
<td>Accounting Specialist</td>
<td>C23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18812</td>
<td>Accounting Supervisor</td>
<td>C23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16974</td>
<td>Business Support Specialist 2</td>
<td>C22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18814</td>
<td>Clerk’s Accounting Supervisor</td>
<td>C27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18809</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Accounting Analyst 2</td>
<td>C31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18798</td>
<td>Finance Operations Specialist</td>
<td>C21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18726</td>
<td>Fiscal Records Specialist, Senior</td>
<td>C18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary Review - Total Positions Included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Secondary Review Requests</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Changes (resignations, retirements, promotions, etc)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Secondary Reviews</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions Adjusted - No Review Requested *</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Positions Included</strong></td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reasons for adjustments may be due to the reallocation of an entire classification or due to information provided by the Appointing Authority.

Recommendation Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Details</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position Correctly Classified - No Changes Recommended</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Reclassification or Reallocation Recommended</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward Reclassification Recommended</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Reclassification Recommended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Positions Included</strong></td>
<td>508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of employees with a downward movement that have additional appeal rights after secondary review.

62
Human Resources held five listening sessions in January 2019 to understand employees’ concerns and determine how to make improvements moving forward. See the attached summary of the listening sessions.

The table below provides a breakdown of the participants at the listening sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointing Authority</th>
<th>Number of Staff Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Court</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Appraiser’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked to answer a brief survey about the listening sessions. We received a total of 41 responses from the 114 participants which is a 36% response rate.

The responses are summarized on the following pages.
Q1 I have a better understanding of the Classification and Compensation Study process after attending the Listening Session.

Answered: 40   Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 I have a better understanding of the next steps in the process.

Answered: 41  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>21.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 I felt I was heard when I expressed my comments.

Answered: 41   Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 The Listening Session was helpful.

Answered: 41   Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>29.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 5 Is there anything else you’d like to share about the Listening Tour?

NOTE: Specific identifying information such as position titles and department names was removed to ensure anonymity of responses.

- I felt we were given very blanket answers instead of detail and justified answers to our issues. Also, information we were told at the session was not valid and we are still awaiting answers from the secondary review. Instead of giving us false dates of when we would hear something, just be honest and say we don’t know.

- Why a survey over a month after the meeting? The best time would be right after when the memory of the meeting was fresh. The whole study has taken way too long and the information gathering process appears to be flawed and badly managed. Consultant, by the appearance of the product so far, did not seem to educate themselves on the specifications of the positions in Pinellas County government.

- Phase II for the Exempt Study - the JATs were done two years ago. Shouldn’t that information be updated prior to analysis and recommendation? What about positions/people that have changed?

- I know you all are doing your best with this but there still seems to be confusion even with HR on how to answer our questions.

- Holly answered all the questions that was presented to her. The response from most of the people where mostly negative which is to be expected seeing they had already a perceived idea (on what they wanted to here).

- Still waiting to hear back on the appeal process. Hard to move forward when process is not complete.

- The session went over the alloted time. it would be better to allow additional time in the future.

- Comment was made about my position and a appeal was submitted (not by me) concern was expresses as to why no one contacted our supervisor on our ever expanding job responsibilities and everyday task. (title removed) do much more then any other county in regards to our position.

- I arrived a little disgruntled that my pay had remained the same but left feeling much better after hearing: The methods used by HR, but more importantly that there were many employees who had been downgraded or lost upper levels to attain. I still think the (title removed) are underpaid but at least we didn't lose pay for now. I trust that HR will work on merit pay system soon. Thank you for your candor in the meeting.

- At the JAT required training meeting, an attendee asked the instructor if the results would cut anyone's pay and the answer was "definitely not" and that Evergreen was only making recommendations and it was up to the county to implement them if they chose to do so, but that pay would remain the same or increase only. I feel that we are being lied to and have lost trust in Pinellas County HR.
• The Listening Tour was helpful as those of us who had completed second JATs were in limbo at the time. We were not receiving good communication prior to the Listening Tour and folks were frustrated not knowing when the second reviews were to be completed. We were also expecting to be compensated as the rest of our colleagues were back in September. For those who might be receiving an upward classification in March we can never recover the dollars that we have lost since mid-September when the rest of our colleagues received their upgrades. How is this fair? The Listening Tour was too little too late. There was a lot of animosity and understandably so. I personally appreciate you offering the Listening Tour to hear our concerns.

• When I brought up that the study also discovered that we had less amount of time off (vacation/sick/personal days) I was surprised that Holly was not aware of this. When the meeting was over I came out and spoke with employees who were at the same meeting as I was and they also remembered that this issue as well. Also, with all folks from (department names removed), anyone else really did not have a lot of time to speak. I got the feeling that Human Resources knew that these two depts. were going to have lots to say. With this in mind, it might have been better to meet separately with this employees.

• I felt that all answers given in the listening session were condescending and half-answered. Holly and Mr. Loring were not genuine in their answers. The answers given were clearly scripted. Most of the blame was placed on others. Employees have suffered financially for the mistakes made by Evergreen and HR, and the attitude set forth in the listening session was perceived as non-caring. This has dragged on for 5 months; months that employees are not getting paid what they should be since the initial classification downgrade was a mistake. A clear mistake. The job hasn't changed. Any employee that will be upgraded in classification or pay has not suddenly had their duties changed. The duties are the same. The review of the JATs was the problem. Not giving employees back pay because the County is not compelled to do so by law is offensive. HR has lost all trust from me. There needs to be a huge change in HR in order to repair the damage done to morale and the relationship between employees and the HR department.

• Entering my second year at PCG, I am open to exploring job opportunities outside of Pinellas County because I do not feel PCG is competitive enough in its pay or benefits. There is no other position like mine in the BCC which creates all sorts of issues like that this study is trying to categorize/classify a position that is unique (and that it requires a unique set of skills to succeed). My performance is based upon metrics, not simply showing up and completing a job or task. Recognizing that, I am aware that sadly, as much as I like working for PCG, I’m not going to peak in my career here when I can get paid more elsewhere.

• 3 months after the secondary review was promised to be completed, employees still have no responses to their review requests except that it will be "soon". this has been pushed off numerous times with new deadlines provided however none of the deadlines have been met and indications were that any pay increases as a result of the secondary review will not be retroactive. Each pay period that there is no determination is lost pay in cases where the secondary review results in an increase.

• The Listening Tour was an exciting experience it gave the feeling of the County/Department caring about informing me, and not just throwing information at me hoping I understand. Thanks

• Thank you Ms Holly for your visit to (department name removed).

• I think the study was bias
Hi Holly. There appears to be a disconnect between HR and the Appointing Authorities as to their ability to start a Classified employees at a salary within a pay grade that is commensurate with his/her experience and qualifications. To wit, I came to my current position with a BA degree, 35 years or major market (field removed) experience, knowledge of our community as a Pinellas County native, and knowledge of our departments and processes, and was presented a “take it or leave it” offer at the minimum of the pay grade. Even now, having proven myself in the position, my salary is 1.9 percent above the adjusted pay grade minimum. A coworker doing the same job with comparable qualifications earns $24,918 more in base salary, (54 percent), and the spread is greater when factoring in standby pay. As outlined in my request for secondary review, my pay is inequitable to everyone doing comparable work in our department. I respectfully submit that a Classification and Compensation Study that does not address inequities like this would be superficial and inadequate. I love my job with the county and want to find a way to make it work. As our Exempt Plan recognizes, time spent at one’s desk should not be the overriding determiner of an employee’s pay. Experience and skills gained elsewhere are every bit as valuable to an organization as those acquired in-house.

Should have waited until it was over...we waited another month of not get compensation for the lack of competence evergreen did. Back pay better be an option....there will be more noise if not..

Appreciated time and effort of HR Director and Staff in meeting with everyone.

Myself as well as my employees who attended different sessions all felt very disappointed in the session. That there was zero compassion shown to people who have been effected. Or actual answers to questions brought up by many different employees in the sessions. It was a typical round and round, defending the process and results, when there was an obvious mistake in rushing to pick something. There was zero requirement to pick a suggestion from Evergreen. Instead, now the moral of most of the county has been crushed. Regardless of small pay increases for some. From entry level to managers, all disagree with the results and haste at which it was done. I specifically asked 1 question. "What was the benefit to the County?" After 5 minutes of talking in circles and repeating stuff we all knew about the 3 options and some including more consolidation of positions, her direct answer was, "It could have been worse". How is that a benefit to the County? You pick the lesser of 3 evils, when no picking was required, and that is the official answer from the head of HR to the benefit to the County, "It could have been worse". That is totally unacceptable. When peoples lives are effected, show compassion and understanding. There was talk that it is just a title change, and that people got more money. Therefore they should be happy. But those titles in certain lines of work are extremely important and hold a lot of weight. Why does Holly Schoenherr feel the need to put (Ph.D., SHRM-SCP) after her name on everything? Why, because it holds weight and an understanding of certain requirements met by that person. That means a lot when you are writing a Scientific paper, or representing the County as a subject matter expert as we commonly do. We want to be the best government agency, but continue to shot ourselves in the foot and make us look bad to other agencies. Since I have asked everyone from the bottom to the top, and have yet to get an answer, I will ask 1 more time. "What was the benefit to the County to follow Evergreen's suggestion?" I will not hide behind anonymity, so please feel free to reach out to me to discuss if you have any further questions.

I am not sure HR understood the negative effects of implementation of the C&C study
Classification and Compensation Study
Listening Tour Sessions Overview - January 2019

This is an overview of common topics raised throughout all five listening sessions held in January. While some employees raised concerns regarding individual positions, this summary addresses general areas of concern represented by participants.

Purpose

As we work through the complex process with various employee groups, it is evident that there are questions and concerns regarding the Classification and Compensation Study implementation. Human Resources Director Holly Schoenherr and other HR staff members held five Listening Tour sessions in January to understand areas of concern and determine how to make improvements moving forward.

Current Status

Phase I: Focused on classified service, we are concluding Phase I with secondary review results. At the time of the Listening Tour, the final results hadn’t been shared with employees as Human Resources, Evergreen and impacted departments were ensuring that all recommendations were thoroughly reviewed and supported by management before final results were shared with employees.

- 43% or 1,031 classified employees received an increase in pay in September 2018
- 82% of classified employees moved to a pay grade with a higher midpoint than their current pay grade
- 523 employees requested a secondary review of their results

Phase II: Begins with exempt classification, exempt pay plans and recommendations to the Personnel Board about new methods to address and recognize career growth. We will then turn our attention to internal equity rank compression (similar pay for supervisor and their employees) and range compression (employees in the same job with different levels of experience earning the same pay). We began discussion with Appointing Authorities in February.

Listening Tour Dates & Locations

January 17, 8:30 to 9:30 a.m. | Utilities Building, 14 S. Fort Harrison Avenue, 4th Floor, Clearwater
January 22, 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. | GMD North, 3900 Dunn Drive, Room 109, Palm Harbor
January 23, 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. | Extension, 12520 Ulmerton Road, Magnolia Room, Largo
January 28, 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. | Justice Center (CJC), 14250 49th Street North, Room 2330, Clearwater
January 30, 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. | South Cross Bayou, 7401 54th Avenue North, St. Petersburg

Common Themes Overview

Career Ladders | Timeline | Process | Evergreen | Engagement & Communication

Listening Tour Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointing Authority</th>
<th>Number of Staff Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Court</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Appraiser’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.pinellascounty.org/hr/study
Careers Ladders

Range compression and rank compression
Phase II will address internal equity (range compression and rank compression). Rank compression looks at pay variation between supervisor and direct reports. Range compression looks at internal equity and how employees are paid within the same classification in the department.

Career ladder process
Personnel Rule 2, Filling Positions, outlines three steps for career ladder promotions. Classified positions are required to be filled through a competitive process; however, career ladders provide an exception whereby employees can be directly appointed to a higher level classification.

1. The Personnel Board has to identify classifications that would be part of a career ladder. There were five career ladders that lost rungs with the consolidation of classifications.
2. Departments identify the criteria for employees to be eligible for career ladder promotions.
3. There has to be a business need for the higher classified position to be filled, as determined by the department.

Proposed Career Step Increase Policy
We recognize the importance of employees receiving recognition for demonstrating valuable skills and competencies. Human Resources and the Appointing Authorities are discussing a proposed policy that would allow Appointing Authorities to award in-range pay adjustments that increase an employee’s base pay rate within the employee’s current salary range and job classification. The purpose of the policy, if adopted, is to recognize significant employee competency enhancements as documented by departmental criteria and development plans. The proposal also encourages the use of working titles to recognize levels of achievement.

Classification Consolidation
Classifications that have been consolidated will be evaluated first as any new career step policies are implemented. As we consolidated positions, one career ladder was eliminated and five lost rungs.

Next steps: Human Resources (HR) is working with Appointing Authorities to identify methods to provide opportunities for advancement within the new classification structure. We recognize that career ladders are very important to employees. That process is moving forward as we engage stakeholders and those impacted to make sure that we get it right.

Timeline

Why was it rushed in the beginning?
It was important to implement the new classification structure and pay plans before the end of FY18 so the general increase would be applied to the new pay grades. As a result, 82% of classified employees benefited from the general increase being higher because the implementation occurred before October 1st. Next steps: As we move forward, we are focusing more on quality and a thorough process over speed.

When will Phase II occur?
Phase II will be throughout FY19. It is important that we involve the right people and give them sufficient opportunity to review what is being proposed instead of meeting a deadline.
Process

What was the intent of the study?
The intent was to review all jobs across the Unified Personnel System to make sure Pinellas County’s pay rates and policies are in line with peer organizations, and to keep the County a competitive employer in the market. This study was not intended to review individual employees’ performance or longevity.

What was the process?
Employees completed their JATs in June of 2017 (90 percent of employees completed JATs). Supervisors had an opportunity to provide comments (90 percent of supervisors provided input). Evergreen took that information and looked at organization charts, current class specifications and other data. The combined number of classified and exempt classifications was over 650. Evergreen took a few months to gather all the information and in May of 2018, they presented recommendations. They recommended 3 options for the classification and compensation structure:

- **Option 1:** Broad branded structure would have been an extensive change and would reduce from 650 to 49 classifications.
- **Option 2:** Minor modification would reduce classification from 650 to 630.
- **Option 3:** Moderate consolidation would reduce classifications from 650 to 560 and would consolidate a number of classifications into the new structure.

Human Resources engaged Appointing Authorities in the development of the process and timeline. Appointing Authorities were provided a file with all of the positions in their area and the impact of the three options. The Appointing Authorities felt it was the best choice to proceed with Option 3, moderate consolidation. Human Resources conducted meetings with each Appointing Authority to address questions and concerns prior to presenting recommendations to the Personnel Board.

Secondary Review Results
At the time of the Listening Tour sessions, secondary review results were still being finalized and had not been shared with impacted employees.

Did all employees have an opportunity for a secondary review request?
Yes, all classified employees had an opportunity to submit a secondary review request. Those employees who had a downward reclassification/reallocation have additional appeal opportunities.

Why not release secondary reviews that have been finalized?
Leadership felt that it was fair and equitable for all impacted employees to receive the results at the same time and have the same window of opportunity to submit appeals following the results, if applicable.

Who will have rights to appeal?
Employees that had a downward reclassification will have the opportunity for further appeal beyond the secondary review process. The first step is to appeal to Human Resources and the second step is to appeal to the Unified Personnel Board. A downward reclassification is defined as a decrease to the maximum of the employee’s pay grade; it is not associated with a change in title or pay rate.

Errors
Calculation errors
As pay adjustments were calculated, an error was made by Human Resources which affected 117 employees. We had to bring that to the attention of impacted Appointing Authorities because the approved methodology was being applied incorrectly.
Human Resources staff are required to follow rules and procedures that were put in place by the Unified Personnel Board and had to follow the methodology that had been approved.

**Process improvement:** Human Resources is establishing quality assurance procedures for future pay rate calculations; we are also committed to communicating this type of negative news in a more personal and caring manner.

**Will adjustments be retroactive?**
Guidance received from the County Attorney’s Office indicates that retroactive pay increases are not in compliance with state law.

**HR should’ve called a face-to-face meeting to explain the process you went through when issues arose.**
While HR was in communication with Appointing Authorities, we understand that face-to-face meetings regarding these issues would have been beneficial to employees as well. This is why HR arranged 5 general listening sessions with employees throughout the County to gather feedback and explain the process as we move forward. Human Resources is working with all Appointing Authorities to identify the best ways to communicate with employees about the process.

---

**Evergreen**

**Did Evergreen read all the employees’ JATs?**
Yes. Evergreen read every the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) that was submitted, and supervisors had an opportunity to add additional information. We engaged regularly in the review process with Evergreen and it was clear to us that they have reviewed all the JATs. Evergreen reached out to supervisors if there was conflicting information.

**Why didn’t Evergreen Solutions come to talk to people about what they do?**
Studies of this type and magnitude do not typically involve in-person interviews. The process was designed to ensure that the JAT would capture the essential functions associated with each position. Supervisors were given an opportunity to review and add comments to their employees’ JATs. With that information, Evergreen came back with preliminary recommendations.

**Employees expressed concerns over the selection of Evergreen Solutions.**
It is typical for any company that does this type of work to have negative feedback. Normal purchasing procedures were followed, and references were checked. The selection committee consisted of:

- Lisa Arispe, EAC Representative, BCC, Public Works
- Greg Carro, BTS
- Mary Flockerzi, Human Resources
- Jack Loring, Human Resources
- Canaan McCaslin, BCC, County Administration
- Ashley Skubal, EAC Representative, Clerk’s Office

Evergreen was identified as the top-ranked firm due to their experience conducting similar studies for other Florida counties.

**How long is the contract with Evergreen?**
The contract is scheduled to expire at the end of March 2019 but we still have exempt positions to address and secondary review results to finalize. We will extend their contract as long as it takes for them to complete the work they were hired to do.

**How many people from Evergreen worked on the Study?**
A core team of four people were fully dedicated but others were involved as needed.

www.pinellascounty.org/hr/study
What was the time frame?
JATs were submitted around end of June 2017 and analysis concluded by May 2018.

Engagement and Communication

Engaging managers
Throughout this process, we heard from employees that involving managers and preparing them to share information with employees is an important step in transparency and moving forward. Process improvement: Supervisors stated that ahead of Phase II, managers needed to receive and identify information before employees so the right results are implemented with the best outcome. Human Resources is working with Appointing Authorities to ensure enhanced internal communication.

Communication timing
We have heard from employees that sharing information on a Friday afternoon is not well received – even if information becomes available then. We are making adjustments to address those concerns – especially for departments that have employees that may not work on Fridays.

Next Steps

Phase I: Secondary review and further appeal process: As soon as we finalize secondary review results, the information will be shared with employees:

- Employees will be informed if they are eligible for further appeal (those who received downward reclassification).
- For those who do not have further appeal rights, Human Resources will help supervisors have conversations with employees.

Phase II

Phase II includes plans to implement recommended classification and compensation changes for exempt employees. Human Resources will follow the same process as Phase I by asking Appointing Authorities to give us feedback on the recommendations they feel that they’d like Evergreen to further evaluate. There will be a secondary review process for exempt employees. Human Resources will communicate the proposed timeline for Phase II. Once we finish that process, addressing internal equity (range compression and rank compression) is planned in 2019.

Three primary components:

1. Exempt classifications and pay plans (working with Appointing Authorities on what they’d like to see for pay plans)
2. Looking at different ways to provide career ladders and career steps – HR will seek feedback and suggestions from Appointing Authorities and employees
3. Addressing internal equity (compensation) – rank compression (distance from supervisor pay to those they supervise) and range compression (how employees are situated within same pay range)

The Board of County Commissioners has dedicated $2 million in the FY19 budget (for positions funded by the General Fund) to addressing the three primary components of Phase II. Funding will first be focused on addressing pay adjustments for Exempt positions, then addressing internal equity as budget allows.
Employees’ Advisory Council – Representative Meeting Minutes
County Office Annex, Room 429, Clearwater, FL
Wednesday, December 19, 2018, 2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Call to Order
The EAC Representative meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Chair, Charles Toney

Introductions
Assistant to the County Administrator – Canaan McCaslin
Senior Assistant County Attorney – Carole Sanzeri
Kevin Connelly - replacing Alicia Parinello representing – Other Appointing Authorities

Approval of Minutes
• The 11-14-18 EAC Representative meeting minutes were approved with a motion by Linda Cahill, seconded by Clare McGrane.
• The 11-14-18 EAC Merit Pay Committee meeting minutes were approved with motion by Lisa Arispe and seconded by Leena Deli Paoli at the 12-19-18 Merit Pay Committee meeting.
• The 11-15-18 EAC Delegate meeting minutes were approved with motion by Donna Beim, seconded by Jackie Warr.

Comments from Holly Schoenherr, Director of Human Resources

• Evergreen Class & Comp Study Update – the response to requests for a second review will be coming soon, some questions on the effects to departments were addressed by Jack Loring.
• The new HR liaison to work with the EAC will be Carol Strickland. The EAC thanked the outgoing liaison Camille Evans for her help to the EAC over the past several years.
• Holly spoke about the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) formation and the BCC Resolution 18-90 and her concerns that the Sunshine Law may have been violated. Charles indicated that he has already had conversations with the HR Director and the County Attorney’s Office and has expressed he does not believe violations of the Sunshine Law occurred because there was not a meeting or conversation between EAC Reps concerning the topic in question. Assistant to the County Administrator – Canaan McCaslin indicated that the BAC had been discussed previously, as far back as May of 2017, and it was presented to the BCC by the County Administrators Office and not the EAC. Senior Assistant County Attorney – Carole Sanzeri explained that all information concerning EAC member communication on the BAC will be reviewed for possible violation of the Sunshine Law. If it is determined that the Sunshine Law was violated, a remedy is to provide a “cure” which she explained is a process to bring up the context of the sunshine law violation at the next meeting (in the sunshine). Charles also emphasized that the information request is very specific to correspondence between two or more EAC Representatives concerning the BAC and only this specific information, if there is any, should be provided.
• HR Director Performance evaluation input due to the Personnel Board prior to the March Personnel Board meeting.
Charles gave an update on the Personnel Board Meeting held December 6, 2018.

There are two new Personnel Board Members – Jeffery Kronschnabl and Kenneth Peluso both appointed by the Board of County Commissioners.

The EAC Representative elections went well and there has been no negative feedback on the use of e-mail for campaigning.

Charles commented on several statements in the Evergreen Pay Plan that was provided to the board members at the November meeting.

Merit Pay Committee – The EAC believes that merit pay will help reduce employee turnover and retain new employees. The general cost involved in replacing and training an employee is about 6-9 months of salary for that position. The EAC is working to have a recommendation to present to the AA’s in the spring of 2019 so funds can be considered for merit increases for the 2019/20 budget. Currently the major reasons for employees leaving a position is: retirement, money, and management issues. Management issues continues to be a concern for the organization.

Charles commented on the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) – this item was brought up at the October 15th joint EAC / AA meeting. The initial thought was to provide input on potential changes to the health benefits. The process of forming the BAC has moved rapidly and Charles shared his opinion that he doesn’t think all parties were in agreement on the purpose and establishment of the committee. He believed all parties involved agree the BAC would provide beneficial input from stakeholders and the EAC wants to make sure time is provided for the proper formation of the committee. The BAC is scheduled later on the Personnel Board (PB) Agenda for discussion and the EAC respectfully requests to be able to further comment if needed when this item is discussed. The PB discussed the BAC and deferred decision on this item to the March PB meeting.

Committee Reports

- **Advocates** – no updates
- **Awards Committee** - no updates.
- **Leave Accrual Committee** - This request to add 2 Floating Holidays will be forwarded to the Appointing Authorities with supporting information for consideration for approval.
- **Merit Pay Committee** – A representative from the Office of Management and Budget will be invited to the next meeting to provide input on the costs involved with implementing the merit pay plan. The recommendation for merit pay is that it will be in addition to a general increase not replacing it. Employees should be able to reach the mid-point of their pay range in about 5-years. The merit pay plan is to include funding for Clerk of the Court employees.

Old Business

- The EAC Representative elections have been completed. There is only one change with Kevin Connelly replacing Alicia Parinello representing – Other Appointing Authorities.
- The Council voted Henry Gomez as Representative for BCC Group 1 to replace Mario Rugghia who was not able to continue due to work commitments.

New Business

- Health Benefits Advisory Committee – two EAC appointees selected. Lisa Arispe, Henry Gomez.
• First Responder status and pay – will be brought up for discussion with the County Administrator.
• Paid Family Leave – Family Addition - new born / adoption, Caregiver - elderly family care, critical illness care. The County could lead the way with including caregiver time in a paid family leave policy.
• Election of EAC Officers for 2019 – Charles informed the Council that he would not be seeking EAC office for the 2019 year due to work commitments. The following officers were voted in by the council.
  Chair - Lisa Arispe  
  Vice Chair - Marion Nuraj  
  Secretary - Leena Delli Paoli
• At Large Representative – selection deferred to future meeting.
• The next EAC Delegate Meeting will be held at Heritage Village.

| Lisa Arispe* | Donna Beim* | Linda Cahill* | Richard Carvale | Leena Delli Paoli* |
| Henry Gomez* | Bill Gorman | Clare McGrane* | Doris McHugh* | Marion Nuraj* |
| Alicia Parinello* | Randy Rose* | Charles Toney* | Jackie Warr* |

*EAC Representatives in attendance at this meeting.
Employees’ Advisory Council Merit Pay Committee Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, December 19, 2018, 1:15 p.m. - 2:15 p.m. – Approved by the EAC  
County Office Annex, Room 429, Clearwater, Florida

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions  
   - Committee open to all EAC Representatives – Present: Randy Rose, Lisa Arispe, Leena Delli Paoli, Charles Toney  
   - Human Resources Representative – not in attendance

3. Approval of Minutes  
   11-14-18 EAC Merit Pay Committee minutes – motion to approve: Lisa Arispe, 2nd: Leena Delli Paoli. Minutes approved.

4. Objective  
   Develop a merit based pay system to forward to Human Resources, Appointing Authorities including the County Administrator, and Personnel Board for consideration. Have a draft available and distributed prior to the April EAC / AA joint meeting.

5. Discussion  
   We have been discussing several of the same key points at the last couple of meetings.  
   o The Rating Factor Definitions were reviewed.  
     • Safety - may need to be revised to include OSHA  
     • Initiative - will be an important consideration for determining work that is performed beyond what is expected  
   o At this point we want to get an idea on the costs of implementing the merit pay plan, including funding for the Clerk of the Court employees. The Office of Management and Budget will be contacted and requested to provide a representative to attend the next committee meeting to help answer questions and provide input.

6. Previous Items noted  
   • The recommendation for merit pay is that it will be in addition to a general increase not replacing it. The general across the board increases should be tied to a general index, something that is already established.
• The committee discussed the previously used merit pay system and will look at examples of the way it was used in the past and suggested changes for current situation use.

• Review previously used points / weighted merit based pay system. Examples of old form with impact and performance rating numbers – in process.

• Review previously used points / weighted merit based pay system. Reviewed the 400 point System - < 100 needs attention no merit, 100-200 Good 0-1% merit, 200-300 Very Good 1-2% merit, 300-400 Excellent 2-3% merit. The 100 point spread in each category could be divided by four and merit awarded at 0.25% increments.

• Out of the box suggestion - Employee self-funding merit pay – retain an ongoing % of suggestion awards continued cost savings, capture a % of non-tax county income (fertilizer, real estate, energy, etc.)

• What is the cost of NOT having a merit pay system? – increased turnover, repetitive hiring, increased time for training …

• What is the cost of replacing an employee? This is the value added worth to keep an employee that is performing the job duties in a satisfactory manner. Meagan provided information on this question. Studies on the cost of turnover are all over the board depending on the position, difficulty of filling the position, location of position etc. but typical estimators are around 6-9 months of salary. It might be a high estimate but it is hard to take into consideration all of the impacts of turnover including your basic effort and time involved in recruiting, interview and onboarding, training of new employee, and the cost to the department in terms of loss of productivity and impact on morale.

• Employees should be able to achieve or be close to mid-point (market pay for satisfactorily performing the job) of their pay grade within five years.

• Currently with the County the top three reasons for employees leaving are (from electronic exit interviews): retirement, money, and management issues. Management issues continue to be a concern – 360° input on management reviews may help with accountability and reduce turnover, grievances, and absenteeism.

7. Other Items to Consider
   Reminder – Clerk of the Court budgeting – all / any recommendations are to include Clerk of the Court personnel and a method for funding.

Lisa Arispe*  Richard Carvale  Linda Cahill  Henry Gomez  Bill Gorman
Donna Beim  Clare McGrane  Doris McHugh  Marion Nuraj  Alicia Parinello
Randy Rose*  Mario Ruggia  Leena Delli Paoli*  Charles Toney*  Jackie War

*EAC Representatives in attendance at this meeting.
Employees’ Advisory Council Merit Pay Committee Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, January 16, 2019, 1:15 p.m. - 2:15 p.m. – Approved by the EAC  
County Office Annex, Room 429, Clearwater, Florida

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions
   - Committee open to all EAC Representatives – Present: Randy Rose, Lisa Arispe, Leena Delli Paoli, Charles Toney, Bill Gorman, Marion Nuraj, Richard Carvale  
   - Human Resources Representative – Meagan Decker  
   - Office of Management and Budget (OMB) – Bill Berger  
   - EAC Appointee to the Personnel Board – Bill Schultz

3. Approval of Minutes
   12-16-18 EAC Merit Pay Committee minutes – not available at time of meeting

4. Objective
   Develop a merit based pay system to forward to Human Resources, Appointing Authorities including the County Administrator, and Personnel Board for consideration. Have a draft available and distributed prior to the April EAC / AA joint meeting.

5. Discussion Current Pinellas County Budget – approximately $2.4 billion.
   - A proposed 3% merit pay is estimated to actually cost about 1.5% which equates to about $2.25 million. Calculating factors – numbers utilized do not include the constitutional officers (Sherriff, etc.), 1% of employees’ salaries equals about $1.5 million, merit increases would be calculated at 0.25% increments, merit increases would range from 0.25% – 3.0%, estimated that approximately 85% of work force would receive a merit increase. This should also cover the cost to include merit increases for approximately 310 state funded employees with the Clerk of the Court – additional calculations will be checked and submitted to the OMB for review.
   - Reestablishing the merit pay should reduce turnover of employees. Questions – what is the average age of incoming employees, what is the average age of employees leaving the County for reasons other than retirement, what is the number of employees leaving the County for retirement?
   - Should the merit pay be awarded once per year on a given date for everyone or awarded throughout the year based on the employee’s anniversary date? Check Personnel Rules.

6. Previous Items noted
   - The recommendation for merit pay is that it will be in addition to a general increase not replacing it. The general across the board increases should be tied to a general index, something that is already established.
• The committee discussed the previously used merit pay system and will look at examples of the way it was used in the past and suggested changes for current situation use.

• Review previously used points / weighted merit based pay system. Examples of old form with impact and performance rating numbers – in process.

• Review previously used points / weighted merit based pay system. Reviewed the 400 point System - < 100 needs attention no merit, 100-200 Good 0-1% merit, 200-300 Very Good 1-2% merit, 300-400 Excellent 2-3% merit. The 100 point spread in each category could be divided by four and merit awarded at 0.25% increments.

• Out of the box suggestion - Employee self-funding merit pay – retain an ongoing % of suggestion awards continued cost savings, capture a % of non-tax county income (fertilizer, real estate, energy, etc.)

• What is the cost of NOT having a merit pay system? – increased turnover, repetitive hiring, increased time for training …

• What is the cost of replacing an employee? This is the value added worth to keep an employee that is performing the job duties in a satisfactory manner. Meagan provided information on this question. Studies on the cost of turnover are all over the board depending on the position, difficulty of filling the position, location of position etc. but typical estimators are around 6-9 months of salary. It might be a high estimate but it is hard to take into consideration all of the impacts of turnover including your basic effort and time involved in recruiting, interview and onboarding, training of new employee, and the cost to the department in terms of loss of productivity and impact on morale.

• Employees should be able to achieve or be close to mid-point (market pay for satisfactorily performing the job) of their pay grade within five years.

• Currently with the County the top three reasons for employees leaving are (from electronic exit interviews): retirement, money, and management issues. Management issues continue to be a concern – 360o input on management reviews may help with accountability and reduce turnover, grievances, and absenteeism.

• The Rating Factor Definitions were reviewed.
  - Safety - may need to be revised to include OSHA
  - Initiative - will be an important consideration for determining work that is performed beyond what is expected

7. Other Items to Consider
   Reminder – Clerk of the Court budgeting – all / any recommendations are to include Clerk of the Court personnel and a method for funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lisa Arispe*</th>
<th>Donna Beim*</th>
<th>Linda Cahill</th>
<th>Richard Carvale*</th>
<th>Kevin Connelly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leena Delli Paoli*</td>
<td>Bill Gorman*</td>
<td>Henry Gomez</td>
<td>Clare McGrane*</td>
<td>Doris McHugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Nuraj*</td>
<td>Randy Rose*</td>
<td>Charles Toney*</td>
<td>Jackie Warr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EAC Representatives in attendance at this meeting.
Call to Order
The EAC Representative meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Chair Lisa Arispe.

Approval of Minutes
- The December 19, 2018 Representative meeting minutes will be approved at the February 20, 2019 meeting.
- The December 19, 2018 Merit Pay Committee minutes were approved prior at that meeting.

Comments from Holly Schoenherr, Director of Human Resources
- Taleo upgrades have been implemented – working on adding the location and possibly the hours to the job listings – no set length of time that jobs are posted it is management discretion
- Classification and Compensation Study Secondary Reviews are still underway – focusing on quality over speed – All 523 secondary reviews will go out at the same time in a similar manner as the original determination
- Listening tours are currently underway – HR is will be listening to positive and negative feedback to improve future processes – the plan is to come back at the end and let employees know what was said and how they are moving forward
- Appointing Authorities Advance Retreat – the Appointing Authorities and Holly Schoenherr will be attending two retreat sessions, on February 1st and 15th, and have invited one member from the EAC to attend

Personnel Board 01/03/19 Comments
- The January 03, 2019 meeting of the Personnel Board was cancelled – The next meeting is scheduled for February 07, 2019

Committee Reports
- Advocates – A new member joined the advocate committee.
- Legislative – Local Council meets twice per year – the next meeting date has not been set – once the date is set, the Committee members will try to attend
- Other - Merit Pay Committee – Going to move forward with plans to recommend a program similar to the previous Merit Pay Program – Committee making sure that the end result is as successful as possible – Bill Berger attended the Merit Pay Committee meeting and stated that the Office of Management and Budget would be willing to verify our numbers.

Old Business
- Review of possible Sunshine Law violation investigation by the HR Director is still underway – no timeline for completion
- Ashley Skubal was elected to fill the At Large Representative vacancy with motion by Randy Rose, seconded by Richard Carvale
• Charles Toney to email out the list of Delegate Concerns, from the November 15, 2018 meeting, so that we can begin looking into some of the concerns

New Business
• Special meeting will be held on February 20, 2019 at 1:15pm to discuss the EAC’s input on the review of HR Director Holly Schoenherr
• Lisa Arispe will be speaking at the January 24, 2019 EAC Delegate Meeting and has suggested that the EAC Representatives take turns speaking at the future Delegate Meetings
• Jackie Warr has been promoted and will be unable to continue as the EAC Representative for the Property Appraiser. She will ask any interested employees and advise her replacement to fill out the required approval form.

Adjourned
Marion Nuraj made a motion to adjourn at 4:30 p.m., seconded by Charles Toney.

*EAC Representatives in attendance at this meeting.
The Emperor Has No Clothes … Just Sayin’

We are taught from very young to “go along to get along.” As Maslow demonstrated in the often-shared Hierarchy of Needs, after food, shelter and clothing, a sense of social belonging is the next foundational level of human need. What does this mean in any group, and how does this play out in the workplace?

Learning from real situations makes it easier to see how the Hans Christian Anderson story of an emperor with no clothes plays out in work situations. You may have seen this concept of Anderson’s tale in other leadership literature.

Take a look:

- An employee is hired into a front line position. The work culture of the group they are hired into has been one of getting the job done, yet there is room for improvement. So, the hiring manager makes sure to assess the job applicants for more than just the task level skills. The new person has innovative approaches to the same tasks. They are good ideas, yet the direct supervisor and others immediately react negatively to this new employee, justifying the reasons things should stay the same. They paint the picture that this person is speaking up too much as a new employee. The new employee begins to feel they are not a good fit.

Did the hiring manager say anything to the direct supervisor about the areas of needed improvement in the workgroup before the new hire came on board? Was the workgroup previously enabled to gate back performance without being addressed? Did anyone say to themselves, “It’s been this way for years, and it is not up to me to straighten it out. After all, I inherited this situation”? If we pretend the “emperor has clothes on,” we don’t say anything and we go along with status quo so as not to rock the boat. We get rewarded for this behavior because we will be included by others, and we can all vent about how bad it is without owning our own responsibility.

- If we are willing to say, the “emperor has no clothes,” we risk social alienation. Even if we deliver things assertively, yet tactfully, we have challenged the status quo. Yet we were hired to make a difference and the higher we move in an organization, the more responsibility we have in courageously confronting situations which are holding us back. We may not always be popular, yet it is authentic and most respectful to do what is right to earn trust.

- We hear a group of peers talking negatively about a person and/or a department. It becomes apparent that the information being provided is from a limited perspective that cannot be validated, yet it is presented as the total truth. Facts that demonstrate other facets of the situation are provided, yet these facts seem to be ignored to justify the growing sentiment of the number “blaming” the challenging situation on a certain segment of the organization. It feels much easier to point the finger elsewhere than for us to own our part in the challenge.

- If we go along with the voiced opinion of blame, we are echoing that the “emperor has clothes on.” We find social acceptance with joining arms against a common enemy, though it is a part of our own organization.

- If we are willing to follow through in a way that demonstrates that the “emperor has no clothes,” we risk being treated as an outsider. Leadership takes courage to confront in a constructive way that may be hard for people to hear … yet necessary to become the healthiest, most effective and efficient service provider, which is our espoused vision and mission.

“Between stimulus and response, there is a space. In that space is our power to choose our response. In our response lies our growth and our freedom.”

Viktor Frankl
New Year Resolutions in Leadership

Many people work in service organizations because they “want to make a difference.” There are sectors where people make more money, have more resources, and more achieve notoriety. Yet the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of employees, residents and all stakeholders is prime in local government. The real question for each of us is: do we keep this vision as a primary focus when the going gets tough?

Leadership character is built during times of scarcity, times of uncertainty, times of stress and times of transition. Here are a few actual scenarios in government organizations:

- An employee is resistant to change. They have demonstrated they are not responding to coaching or development. This individual is influencing others in a negative way. As a leader, do you make a decision that may be difficult, yet will help the workgroup and the department as a whole? Do you have the tough conversations? Do you treat everyone consistently across your span of control? Or do you build in “work arounds” and put the responsibility on someone else?

- One of your supervisors is very strong technically. If you examine any of their individual outputs, they are exemplary in their attention to detail, quality and thoroughness. From a task perspective, this supervisor is 100% on most everything. However, this same person does not hold employees that report to them accountable. They do not have tough conversations. What is the trickle effect for the whole workgroup, department and organization? People management is just as important as individual performance. What does a leader do to address this?

- Quite a bit has been accomplished under your leadership over the last few months. Examine how you have responded to the following results:
  - A project went very well. There was broad recognition as a result of the impact and positive results. Did you share the rewards by recognizing all the others that were responsible for the outcome since it was very positive?
  - Some things fell through the cracks; after all, there was so much going on and you were loaded down. There were real reasons that you could not make the entire meeting. There were things you were juggling that no one knew about. Did you own the responsibility and admit areas you plan to work on by modeling humility? Or did you tend toward explaining why others or obstacles contributed to the errors?

It is human nature—and so much easier—to see things in others that need to change, and coach from the sidelines. Self-awareness and creating personal responsibility results from authentic leaders who model vulnerability and fallibility while asking for different perspectives on how to improve. The leaders who take on the challenge of “looking in the mirror” will gain true followership of people who respect the character of the humble role model, and others will go the extra mile to give back.