



MINUTES OF THE CITY OF NEW LONDON
PERSONNEL BOARD MEETING
HELD November 30, 2009

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Willoughby at 4:33 p.m. with herself and members Gillis, and McCredie in attendance, as well as Personnel Coordinator Welch. Finance Director Lathrop also was in attendance for a portion of the meeting.

The minutes of the Personnel Board Meeting held October 13, 2009 were reviewed. A motion was made by Ms. Gillis, seconded by Mr. McCredie that the minutes of the Personnel Board meeting of October 13, 2009 be approved as submitted. Vote on the motion: Unanimous.

Citizen Participation: There was no public attendance at the meeting.

Communications:

It was noted that the (Certified) Public Safety Dispatcher position was posted as both full-time and part-time due to a recent separation in that Division. As a result both positions, rather than just the part-time position, will be needed.

Action Agenda:

a) Position Classifications:

The Board received the position classifications, by union or non-union affiliation, listing current wage ranges for each position. Classifications for MEU and Local 1378 positions also included the minimum qualifications recently developed for all positions.

It was noted by the Board that the classification level for the Fire Chief position appeared to be too low in relation to other significant department heads. Understanding that such movement would not alter the present wage of this position, the Board also discussed other movements that would be required to maintain the integrity of the classification system once the Fire Chief position was moved.

A motion was made by Mrs. Gillis, seconded by Mr. McCredie, to increase the classification of the Fire Chief position from a UN-24 to a UN-25 and to move both the Deputy Fire Chief and the Personnel Coordinator positions from a UN-21 to a UN-22. Vote on the motion: Unanimous.

b) Personnel Rules 3, 4 and 5:

A decision was made to postpone the review of Personnel Rules 3, 4 and 5 until the December meeting, in order to accommodate the review of four job descriptions.

c) Approval of Job Descriptions:

Payroll System Administrator: Mr. Lathrop gave a short presentation related to the new work to be undertaken as a result of the new payroll system. While the Board sincerely appreciated his explanation and were conceptually in agreement with the idea, they requested that the Personnel Coordinator and the Finance Director provide them with written documentation of the proposal in accordance with the Personnel Rules, along with the former job description, so that the reclassification might properly be considered at the December Personnel Board meeting.

Master Mechanic: Concerns regarding the job description resulted in the general recommendation that the position description should be drafted in the same manner as all current Public Works Union jobs, and specific recommendations as follows:

(General Statement of Duties, line 1) the term Leadership is inappropriately used; replace with Responsible or similar term.

(Examples of Work)

Paragraph 1, difficult to understand as written. Sentence needs to be broken up.

Paragraph 7, recommended to read: Serves as the expert in accomplishing all phases of repair and maintenance functions and will perform all work assignments of the Division, even under extreme conditions.

The Board expressed concern that no mention of welding was made; i.e. who makes the decision regarding what welding jobs are handled in-house and what is contracted? Also “Knowledge of welding” should be added to the KSA’s

Paragraph ten (Determines the optimum...) is difficult to understand

The Special Qualifications should be revised to be the same as the Solid Waste Crew Leader, which provides the qualification needed to operate all vehicles in the Fleet.

Solid Waste/Fleet Manager: Concerns regarding the job description resulted in the general recommendation that the position description should be drafted in the same manner as all current MEU jobs, and specific recommendations as follows:

(General Statement of Duties, lines 3 and 4) the language after the term “Division’s personnel” needs clarification.

(Examples of Work)

Paragraph 1, the first sentence is too long. Needs to be broken up for clarity.

Paragraph 3 is not understandable.

Paragraph 7; the meaning is unclear, revision needed.

Paragraph 10; the meaning is unclear, revision needed.

Approval of Job Descriptions, Solid Waste/Fleet Manager, cont'd

The final full paragraph (before related duties); for budget issues a position of this nature would assist the department head and/or submit a proposed budget to the department head, but would not be responsible for preparing, implementing and monitoring budgets. Needs clarification. The Board also recommended the following addition: "Reports over-budget situations to Department Head on a monthly basis."

(Required Knowledge, Skills and Abilities)

Paragraph 2, the meaning is unclear, revision needed.

Paragraph 3, remove the word development as it relates to software and hardware.

Paragraph 4, the meaning of the words "write complex writings" is unclear; the concept of "measuring the effectiveness of these communications" is confusing: Is the Division Manager evaluating himself? Should this not be his supervisor's job?

Paragraph 5, substitute personnel for the word staff at the end of the line.

Solid Waste Crew Leader: Concerns regarding the job description resulted in the general recommendation that the position description should be drafted in the same manner as all current Public Works Union jobs, and specific recommendations as follows:

(General Statement of Duties, line 1) the term Leadership is inappropriately used; replace with Responsible or similar term.

(Examples of Work)

Paragraph 2, Work assignments are a manager's job, not the work of a "crew leader".

Paragraph 4, needs revision for clarity.

(Required Knowledge, Skills and Abilities)

Paragraph 6, Working with state and local government representatives is the work of a manager.

(Minimum Qualifications)

Overall the Board felt that the Minimum Qualifications were too high for a crew leader.

A motion was made by Mrs. Gillis and seconded by Mr. McCredie to send all three job descriptions back to the Director of Public Works for revision, incorporating all recommended changes and drafting each one using the same format as current job descriptions. In accordance with the Personnel Rules, these revisions must then be reviewed and discussed with the Personnel Coordinator prior to returning them to the Personnel Board at its next meeting in December. Vote on the motion: Unanimous

It was noted by the Board that they had no problem with the concept of combining two Manager (former Foreman) positions into one, higher level position, or with the proposal for working leaders in each of the two divisions. A discussion ensued, however, about the wages recommended for all three positions. It was strongly felt that the responsibilities for the Master Mechanic and the Solid Waste Crew Leader were equal, therefore these positions should be paid equally.

A motion was made by Mrs. Willoughby, seconded by Mr. McCredie, that after reviewing the position classification system for the Public Works Union (Local 1378) the Personnel Board determined that both the Master Mechanic position and the Solid Waste Crew Leader should be classified equally, as a Grade 17. Vote on the motion: Unanimous

2010 Meeting Schedule:

A decision regarding whether or not to return to Monday meetings was tabled until the December meeting, in order to first determine the needs of a potential new Board member.

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made by Mr. McCredie, seconded by Mrs. Gillis and voted unanimously to adjourn at 6:06 p.m.

The next meeting date for the Personnel Board is Tuesday, December 14th at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette M. Welch
Personnel Coordinator

