

COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: Personnel Review Committee
CHAIRPERSON: LaDon Trost
DATE/TIME: April 20, 2023 @ 9:00 a.m.

PRESENT:

☒ Tina Brandel	☒ Nicole Hermsen	☒ Craig Ketelsen
☐ Steve Endress	☒ Melisa Hammer	☒ Angie Kaiser
☒ John Lang	☒ Steve Keeffer	☒ Kathy Phillips
☒ LaDon Trost	☐ Vacant	☒ Laura Edmonds
☒ Scott Toot	☒ Joe Kratcha	☐ Vacant

Others: Kristina Tranel, Jamie Watson and Mary Althof

LaDon Trost called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Roll call, a quorum was present.

1. Approval of Minutes –

- a) Minutes of the March 15, 2023 Personnel Review Committee meeting – **Angie Kaiser made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 15, 2023 Personnel Review Committee meeting. Seconded by John Lang and motion carried following a voice vote resulting in 11 ayes; Hammer abstained because she didn't have a chance to read the minutes.**

At this time the committee moved to New Business.

Craig Ketelsen asked to set a time limit on the meeting. John Lang was in agreement. It was the consensus of the committee to adjourn at noon.

2. Citizens' Comments – None.

3. Unfinished Business

- a) Discussion and possible action on reevaluating position descriptions
- Administration
 - Assessor
 - Circuit Clerk
 - County Clerk and Recorder
 - Emergency Management
 - GIS/IT
 - Highway
 - Planning & Development
 - Probation
 - Sheriff
 - States Attorney
 - Transit
 - Treasurer

The committee reviewed each of the position descriptions with the exception of Office Manager position descriptions. Everyone that has an Office Manager will have to bring that position description back with their own duties and responsibilities dropped in to the template. Steve Keeffer commented that we developed that template for Office Managers; should it be the same for Chief Deputy's? Angie Kaiser responded that the prevailing

sentiment with the elected officials would be the Chief Deputy is required by statute and they have completely different duties depending on the elected official. The sentiment would be that they wouldn't be able to be standardized. Keeffer asked then why did we need to standardize the Office Managers? Kaiser added that they are tapping their Chief Deputy to step into their spot if something happens to you and she doesn't know that you can standardize that. Keeffer doesn't want the Office Managers to be graded lower if they don't have the associate or bachelor degree listed in their minimum qualifications. We should have some consistency in these position descriptions when we get to the grading phase of this process. Hammer felt that the Office Manager should have the associate degree as a minimum requirement. High school diploma would be a minimum requirement for the administrative assistant. Kaiser will remove the bachelor's degree requirement from the minimum qualifications on her chief deputy position description if that is what everyone would like; she doesn't want to but she will remove it. Phillips felt there were actually two different issues here and we got off track on this. Keeffer would like for everyone to standardize the chief deputy position descriptions like we did for the office managers. Kaiser questioned why if you didn't come out of that meeting with the education the way you wanted it why are we talking about it here now? Toot commented that it came out of our main meeting to take the associate degree requirement out of the minimum qualifications for the office managers. Kaiser stated that we shouldn't be looking to bring things down. We should be elevating some of this stuff. There was considerable discussion on the Assessor's Chief Deputy position as well. Keeffer added that it is a compensation issue. He feels that his office manager has been compensated lower than they should have been throughout the years. He was never able to get any traction or get anything done and now is the time and he feels we are going down that same path again. Ketelsen would like to see a degree on every position description. He likes to hire from within because they have the experience that he feels can be more valuable than a bachelor's degree, however, if he has to hire from the outside a bachelor's degree may be a great place to start. Hammer doesn't feel we should be comparing the office manager positions and the chief deputy positions. There is a difference. These chief deputy positions are only guaranteed a job every four years. Every time there is an election the new elected official can come in and get rid of those employees and hire whoever they want. There are two different standards here. John Lang commented that college enrollment is going down so there will be less people with degrees. Kathy Phillips commented that she will, to move this on, agree to standardize the chief deputies and she will change her qualifications as long as it has the minimum and go down with that, and she will just change it so that all of the chief deputies have the same. That way we are all the same. If people feel better removing the bachelor's degree, that is fine with Hammer. The associate's degree should be added to the administrative assistant position descriptions as well. **Steve Keeffer made a motion to add a Bachelor's Degree in a related field, or an Associate's Degree with an emphasis in accounting, business or a related field, or at least three years increasingly responsible experience or any equivalent combination of related education and experience. Seconded by John Lang. Motion carried following a voice vote resulting in all ayes.**

Nicole Hermesen reviewed the Office Manager position description. She changed the name of it from Office Manager to Accounts Payable/Receivable Clerk. Took out the comments regarding first aid and CPR and a few other verbiage changes. Melisa Hammer had concerns with the new job title. There are positions that are held by the County Clerk and County Treasurer offices. The County Clerk does accounts payable and the County

Treasurer does accounts receivable. They should be the only ones in the County to perform those duties. Hermesen agreed to change the title to something else.

The Sheriff's office changed their Records Clerk title to an Administrative Assistant.

Angie Kaiser made a motion to accept the revised position descriptions for Administration, Assessor, Circuit Clerk, County Clerk and Recorder, Emergency Management, GIS/IT, Highway, Planning & Development, Probation, Sheriff, States Attorney, Transit and Treasurer with the exception of Office Manager positions to be brought forward at the next meeting. Seconded by Scott Toot and motion carried following a roll call vote resulting in all ayes.

b) Discussion and possible action on grading of position descriptions

- Administration
- Assessor
- Circuit Clerk
- County Clerk and Recorder
- Emergency Management
- GIS/IT
- Highway
- Planning & Development
- Probation
- Sheriff
- States Attorney
- Transit
- Treasurer

The committee discussed the grading process. Angie Kaiser asked if we want to look at what we have now and try to talk about what the problems are with what we have now and then add into it what changes we need to. Melisa Hammer asked if there would still be two separate schedules – an exempt and non-exempt. John Lang commented that no position that we reclassify that anybody should get a reduction in salary. Legally speaking, Kaiser feels that you can't do that. Even if the grade changes, what they're currently making, that can't change. You can't take money away from them because you are not demoting them you are basically regrading them. Craig Ketelsen commented that there needs to be some criteria, some matrix. We already have a starting point with the scales that has already been set. Are we worried about changing their grade or can we just go in and change the amount of salary per grade? Scott Toot responded that what was decided by the County Board and Executive Committee was that we would do the placement on the scale, but then an independent party would make the determination about the actual pay for each position on this scale that we come up with. Kaiser added we are only talking about the grades right now. The independent entity that is going to do the market analysis that will be based on the job titles. Hammer asked why can't we just have the salaries looked at. The grades are causing problems with interior people. Joe Kratcha commented that he tried to educate himself on this because he does not feel that we are qualified to grade these positions. He looked at what Archer and Carlson-Dettmann had proposed for the scope of work. Kratcha reviewed this. He feels we are getting the cart before the horse here. He thinks we need to come up with what evaluation system we are going to do for internal equity. If you are going to hire out the wage and salary part of it that's fine. He does not feel comfortable grading other

people's positions. Kratcha is going to abstain from anything we do internally because he doesn't think we should do it. He thinks we should get an independent third party to look at it. We are too close to this. We care about our employees and the people in those positions and that is going to make us bias. Hammer agreed with Kratcha 100%. The grading should be done by a third party because it is too personal. Hermesen echoed Kratcha and Hammer and feels it would be wise to have all of the information before we do anything in regards to making decisions. Hammer added that the grading should not be done before the market analysis. Kaiser commented that the general consensus of this committee was that we could handle this in house and hire just the market analysis to try to save the County some money. Now all of a sudden we have people saying that all of our work to this point has been all for nothing. Lang commented it has not been all for nothing. We have updated position descriptions and a few more things to do. You have to have someone outside that has a perspective of the market to give you some idea. Lang likes the ranges in salary. The problem was Carlson-Dettmann was never updated right, the County never did it right and it has put us in this position. Toot's recollection at the time is that it was felt by everybody that we could do everything except for the compensation analysis. That is what was presented to the County Board. The decision has been made by the Executive Committee and the County Board that going forward we would do the job descriptions and do the placement on the scale and then the compensation portion would be done by an outside firm. Once the County Board has made the decision that is the mandate that we have to follow. If that changes it is up to the Executive Committee and the County Board. Kaiser commented that we have a scale here that has money attached to it. Basically we look at the grades and are they appropriate, make changes if we don't think they are, new positions added in and maybe we do need some help with the new positions and then we hand it off. We've got the scale that is already in place that's got money that's not appropriate. We have our people in there where we think they should be and then we hand it off to a third party. We felt we knew how this County worked better than an outside entity and we saw that with Archer and Carlson-Dettmann. Kratcha would like some guidelines on how we are going to do this. Kaiser added that we continue to use this scale that was originally prepared by Carlson-Dettmann with modifications that have been made over the past few years to slide the scale. **Melisa Hammer made a motion that the County Board come up with a matrix or a possible procedure to follow to do a grading on position descriptions. Seconded by Joe Kratcha. Motion failed following a roll call vote that resulted in 3 ayes: Brandel, Hammer, Kratcha and 9 nays: Lang, Trost, Toot, Hermesen, Keeffer, Ketelsen, Kaiser, Phillips, Edmonds.** Trost suggested coming up with a subcommittee from this group to figure this out and bring it to the next meeting. Trost added if we can bring this before the Executive Committee, and it is going to take some time, and bring some kind of a fresh idea to this committee. He would like five volunteers from this committee as a subcommittee to bring forward a sample grouping from the entire Personnel Committee. Tina Brandel, Kathy Phillips, Scott Toot, Steve Keeffer and Angie Kaiser will serve on this subcommittee. They will put together a sample grouping to bring to the Personnel Committee. They will figure out when they want to meet, get this completed and then we will have another Personnel Review Committee meeting.

4. New Business -

- a) Discussion and possible action to approve the Office Manager Position Description template – Scott Toot explained that this is the template for the Office Manager position that came out of the meeting that all those department heads that have office

managers attended. Angie Kaiser commented that this is almost exactly what she was thinking about when she mentioned this. So under duties and responsibilities that will be filtered in by each department. Your Administrative Office Manager will have different duties and responsibilities than Probation or Sheriff. It will be standard except for duties and responsibilities. **Tina Brandel made a motion to approve the Office Manager Position Description template as presented. Seconded by Kathy Phillips and motion carried following a voice vote resulting in all ayes.**

- b) Discussion and possible action regarding Financial Administrative Manager position – Scott Toot explained that this will be a Financial Administrative Manager position working out of the County Administrator’s office. This has been under discussion for quite some time with input from board members too. Melisa Hammer asked if this would be an additional position in the County Administrator’s office. Toot verified that there will be an Office Manager, Administrative Assistant and a Financial Administrative Manager in his office. Kaiser commented that this new position still has quite a bit of secretarial duties in it and asked if this is a position that will evolve over time because it looks like it has admin assistant duties but it also has some financial responsibilities as well. Toot verified that this will constantly evolve as time goes on. Theoretically, this could eventually evolve into a CFO position. Toot is looking for the committee to approve this position description as it sits today. He knows what he would like it to go towards. This is what we came up with for now. This will fill the bill with particular talents that exists currently in his office. This position will work under the supervision of the County Administrator. Joe Kratcha asked if this position is filled would Toot be looking to fill the Administrative Assistant position as well, which Toot would. **John Lang made a motion to approve the Financial Administrative Manager position as presented. Seconded by Angie Kaiser. Angie Kaiser amended the motion to approve the Financial Administrative Manager new position and job description as presented. Seconded by John Lang. Motion carried following a voice vote resulting in all ayes.**

5. **Committee Member Comments/Concerns** – None.
6. **Establish future meeting date** – TBD
7. **Citizens’ Comments** – None.
8. **Adjournment** - Melisa Hammer made a motion to adjourn at 11:53 a.m., seconded by Kathy Phillips; voice vote motion passed 12 ayes, 0 nays.