

LABOR RELATIONS & EMPLOYEE SERVICES (LRES) COMMITTEE MINUTES
1st Floor Conference Room, Oneida County Courthouse
February 19, 2020, 9:00 a.m.

LRES COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Ted Cushing/Chairman, Billy Fried/Vice-Chairman, Dave Hintz, Scott Holewinski and Sonny Paszak

ALSO PRESENT: Lisa Charbarneau, Jenni Lueneburg (LRES); Darcy Smith (Finance); Joel Gottsacker (ADRC); Mary Rideout (Social Services); Kyle Franson (Register of Deeds); Tracy Hartman (County Clerk); Kris Ostermann (Treasurer); Brenda Behrle (Clerk of Courts); Steven Schreier (County Board)

CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Cushing called the LRES Committee to order at 9:00 a.m. in the 1st Floor Conference Room of the Oneida County Courthouse. The meeting has been properly posted in accordance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law and complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Fried to approve agenda. Second by Hintz. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

APPROVE MINUTES

Motion by Fried to approve the minutes of February 6, 2020 as presented. Second by Holewinski. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

VOUCHERS, REPORTS AND BILLS

Charbarneau presented vouchers and bills in the amount of \$3,067.00, noting that all expenses are usual and within budget. Motion by Holewinski to approve the vouchers and bills as presented. Second by Hintz. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

FULLTIME SOCIAL WORKER POSITION TO 40% SOCIAL WORKER AND 60% CHILDREN SERVICES SUPPORT POSITION

Charbarneau and Rideout discussed the multiple Social Worker openings and recruitment process currently under way. Rideout reports that of the five current openings, there are two accepted contingent job offers in place. Rideout notes that all the of the applications received did not have the Social Worker certification or training certificate in place and discussed the process taken when a Social Worker is hired without the licensing. Rideout notes that additional job advertising will be done, and difficulties recruiting Social Workers in rural areas is common. Discussion held on the additional college courses needed, with Holewinski suggesting that the county cover these courses once a signed agreement is in place for the Social Worker to stay for a specified time period. Rideout states a Pre-Employment Agreement is already signed by Social Workers due to extensive ongoing training costs incurred, even after a Social Worker is licensed. Rideout has had discussions with Technical Colleges regarding their two-year Human Services degree, suggesting internships in order to encourage students to obtain their Bachelors in Social Work or a related field. While the recruitment process continues, Rideout notes that several retired Social Workers have been rehired temporarily, plus Rideout is working with vendors to outsource some duties. Rideout is also reviewing duties that could be moved to support staff, and possibly hiring an additional Children's Services Support position in place of a Social Worker. Fried inquired if they could increase caseloads and eliminate one Social Worker position. Rideout says that even when fully staffed, her Social Workers have above average caseloads. Cushing inquired and Rideout confirmed that agency caseloads continue to increase each year. Holewinski suggests sending job postings to Town Chairman and Clerks; Lueneburg confirmed this would be done. Charbarneau would like to take a resolution to March County Board, stating that for one of the vacant Social Worker positions, at most a Social Worker would be hired but at the least, a combination part-time Children's Services Support Worker and part-time Social Worker would be hired. Motion by Hintz to proceed (with the proposed resolution). Second by Paszak. Brief discussion held. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

UPDATE: REVIEW OF RESTRUCTURE OF ACRC AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Charbarneau discussed the draft proposal provided to Committee members, for a restructure of the ADRC and Social Services Departments. This proposal is based on weekly meetings previously held between Charbarneau, Rideout and Gottsacker to come up with a structure that provides the same or better services, yet finds efficiencies and cost savings. The proposal includes a list of counties that have done the same or similar restructuring, with Charbarneau noting that none of the counties indicated a negative result from the restructuring but many positive results were found. Charbarneau reviewed the various options listed in the proposal, along with an example of an organizational chart from Pierce County's restructure. Charbarneau discussed the potential of 1-2 positions that could be eliminated, due to the combining of duties and the reduced needs now that Family Care implementation is completed. Charbarneau notes that originally they were looking to take this draft restructure proposal to the March County Board but due to changes in Committees with the upcoming elections, Charbarneau would like to have the final estimated cost savings calculated and for the proposal and fiscals to go through the new Committees of Jurisdiction for review before moving forward to the County Board. Charbarneau would like to have the final proposal and numbers come before the LRES Committee at their March 25th meeting and review if a public hearing is needed, before proceeding to the April County Board. Hintz notes that there is a lot going on at the April County Board meeting and it may be best to have this final proposal at the May County Board; Cushing agrees. Fried discussed the importance of maintaining services but always feels that one of the primary goals is finding cost savings when possible. Charbarneau reiterates that this proposal will keep the same level of services and still finds cost savings in the process. Holewinski suggests a date change to the March LRES meeting in order to get this proposal approved sooner in order to get the resolution to the March County Board Meeting. Rideout notes that even if the proposal is approved at the March County Board Meeting, the implementation will not happen overnight; Cushing agrees and feels that more thought and work needs to be done before this proposal can go to the County Board. Cushing reiterates that any changes being proposed are all behind the scenes in Administration and the public may not even notice the changes. Further discussion held with Hintz, Cushing and Fried voicing agreement that more work needs to be done, and aiming for May County Board may be the most appropriate. Gottsacker wants to make sure that time is allowed for a public hearing before any final decisions are made. Rideout discussed the cross training opportunities that could take place between Social Workers and ADRC Specialists in order to have better coverage and to help find additional efficiencies in staff. Discussion held regarding the Human Service Center potential restructure; Cushing confirms that meetings are being held. Holewinski asked about public hearing requirements; Rideout says she has no public hearing requirements based on there being no changes in services. Gottsacker says the changes are significant enough that a public hearing is needed on his end as part of his three-year plan. Schreier asked Gottsacker about public hearing requirements; Gottsacker states changes to his Committee and Advisory Board structure necessitate a Public Hearing. Further discussion held on what has worked in other counties. Charbarneau, Rideout and Gottsacker agree to continue working on the restructure and will report back to the Committee on March 25th. No motions made.

WAGES FOR COUNTY CLERK, REGISTER OF DEEDS AND TREASURER FOR 2021-2024

Charbarneau states that during the process of determining wages for the upcoming new terms for the County Clerk, Register of Deeds and Treasurer, she has reviewed comparable wages from other counties, and determined that the numbers vary greatly. In-depth discussion held on why these three positions are grouped together and often have the same wage. Charbarneau says that prior to the 2014 wage study, these positions were often compared to the wage set for the Land Information Director; Charbarneau is not sure how or why that got changed after the wage study. Charbarneau states that Franson, Ostermann and Hartman are requesting increases of 9% for 2021, and 1.5% increases each year for 2022, 2023 and 2024. A fiscal impact statement was provided along with the Exempt wage schedule noting the previously used Grade M for comparison. Hartman notes that their positions do not receive PTO or Holidays and therefore are not eligible for any PTO payouts. Ostermann notes that based on the amount of hours she works, she never would have used the PTO normally provided and therefore misses out on significant payouts. Ostermann realizes elected officials can work whatever hours they wish but based on all three elected officials having smaller offices, it is hard to take time off since there is staff coverage and duties that need to be done. Charbarneau notes the importance of keeping the elected official wages competitive in order to encourage

WAGES FOR COUNTY CLERK, REGISTER OF DEEDS AND TREASURER FOR 2021-2024 (continued)

well qualified people to run for these positions and take them seriously. Franson notes that they based their request on the results of the recent Carlson Dettmann market study and cost of living adjustments, and feels these adjustments will catch their position salaries up to the other comparable position's salaries in the county. Smith notes that some of the comparables provided work 2080 annual hours, which make the wages larger in comparison to their wages based on 1950 annual hours. Hartman notes that Department Heads had an 8% increase during the market study and their request is only fair; Smith disagreed stating the full 6% market study was not implemented due to the inability for the county to afford the full implementation. Hartman feels the Committee should consider their lack of PTO when determining their increase; Hintz notes most employers do not allow PTO payouts/carryover and these positions do have the ability to take any amount of time off needed. Fried notes if they are unhappy with no PTO for their position, they should not run for office. Franson provided further comment on the comparables and feels the higher comparables are appropriate for use. Ostermann and Franson discussed the knowledge needed for each of their positions and the passion they have for their departments. Ostermann also notes that they are not eligible for the cash-in-lieu payment if they waive the health coverage. Fried agrees that Franson, Ostermann and Hartman are excellent employees but salaries still need to be set appropriately and suggests more information be gathered before a decision is made. Ostermann notes that wages need to be set so the resolution can go to March County Board since running papers come out in April and the wage needs to be established by that time. Discussion held with the Committee agreeing an increase should be given but the amount unknown. Charbarneau says that the increases should ideally follow cost of living increases, which are unknown for future years, plus the wages should be set for the position, not the person currently in the position since elections can change this. Holewinski feels that these are three core positions in the county and need to be treated that way. Fried suggests the increases being set to follow future year COLA rather than a set amount; Charbarneau clarifies that this can't be done and flat amounts are required to be set. Further discussion held. Cushing recommends a 3% increase for each of the four years. Holewinski asked Hartman, Franson and Ostermann if they were agreeable to this proposal; all agreed. Motion by Holewinski to set the wage increases for the Register of Deeds, Treasurer and County Clerk at 3% per year for the next four years and forward a resolution onto the County Board for approval. Second by Cushing. Further discussion held. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

- **DEPARTMENT HEAD PARTICIPATION:** Charbarneau states that based on a discussion at the last Administration Committee meeting, this topic was requested to be placed on this Committee's agenda. Charbarneau states that currently, the Human Resources Director, County Board Chair and COJ (Committee of Jurisdiction) Chair participate at Department Head performance evaluations. Fried feels that the entire COJ needs to be a bigger part of the process and include input for the final evaluation. Holewinski voiced concerns about the COJ Chairman bringing information to the final evaluation that wasn't discussed with the COJ first, having an effect on the final outcome of the performance evaluation. Holewinski recommends additional changes brought up at the final evaluation should be returned to the COJ before the evaluation is completed. Charbarneau says this may add a lot of extra time to evaluations. Smith recommends having the County Board Chair and Human Resources Director conduct the evaluation at the COJ meeting. Fried feels this can't always be coordinated and could be intimidating for Department Heads. Holewinski agrees that two different levels are good. Cushing feels the main concern he's heard is that communication needs to improve in the process. Discussion held with Committee agreeing that the COJ Chairman should bring a report back to the COJ after the final evaluation on any concerns that were brought up at the final evaluation and not previously discussed at the COJ level.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM (continued)

- **JOB DESCRIPTION ALIGNMENT WITH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:** Charbarneau discussed County Board Supervisor Rob Jensen’s concerns about performance evaluations not aligning with the performance evaluation topics. Charbarneau notes that when the current system was designed and established, the Committee felt that the categories set would apply to each position within the county. Discussion held with Committee agreeing there may be too many different topics and the process could be simplified. Charbarneau notes that even though some of the categories seem similar, it was determined they were needed. For example, there is a category for how an employee works with their coworkers and another category for how the employee works with the public since their performance may be good in one but not in the other. Cushing feels getting input from Department Heads on the current process and potential improvements may be beneficial. Holewinski recommends that for Department Head reviews, the process should start with the COJ, than the COJ Chairman should bring the COJ’s recommendations to the final evaluation. Once the performance evaluation is complete, the COJ Chairman will bring the results of the evaluation and additional items discussed back to the COJ at a future meeting; Committee agrees.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

March 11, 2020 9:00 a.m.
March 25, 2020 9:00 a.m.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Paid Time Off, Compensatory Time and Overtime

Paszak recommends adding County Board per diem’s as a future topic; Smith confirms that this topic can’t be addressed outside budget time and should be brought up next budget season.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Schreier strongly agrees with Holewinski’s concerns with the performance evaluation process and has felt very “out of the loop” on the process within his own Committees in the past. Schreier strongly agrees with the decision made by this Committee today regarding Department Head performance evaluations.

ADJOURNMENT

Cushing announced the adjournment of the LRES Committee meeting at 10:55 a.m.

/s/Ted Cushing
Ted Cushing, Chairman

03-11-2020
Date

/s/Jenni Lueneburg
Jenni Lueneburg, Committee Secretary

03-11-2020
Date