

WEST TISBURY PERSONNEL BOARD  
MINUTES  
January 13, 2020

**Present:** Leon Brathwaite, Dianne Powers, Ben Retmier, and Rachel Rooney

**Absent:** Norm Perry

**Also present for all or part of the meeting:** Kathy Logue, Bea Phear, and Pam Thors

The meeting was called to order at 5:02PM.

The minutes of the December 2 meeting were approved as revised.

The minutes of the December 9 meeting were approved as revised. Rachel abstained.

**Performance Evaluations:** None

**New Business**

**2019 Annual Report:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the 2019 Annual Report as revised. All in favor.

**Old Business:**

**Classification and Compensation Study**

**Administrative Assistant to the CPC:** This position was reclassified from Administrative Assistant on Grade 3 to an Administrative Assistant II on Grade 4 on the classification plan recommended by the Consultant. At their meeting on December 9, the Board heard an appeal from the Affordable Housing Committee that resulted in the reclassification of this position from Administrative Assistant II as recommended by the Consultant, to Grade 6 with the title to be determined. Because of this change, the Board invited the CPC to come in to discuss their staff position.

Bea Phear, Chair of the CPC committee was present to discuss the classification of the staff position for the CPC to be sure that internal equity was being maintained.

Bea said her position has been that the CPC position is slightly less challenging, difficult, and complex than the Board Administrator positions. However, if it is the Board's view that the Affordable Housing position should go up to grade 6 then the CPC position should do the same. In both cases they deal with legal issues have responsibility for their budgets and in all the various ways the positions operate they are comparable. Originally she did not feel that the CPC position should move to Grade 6.

Dianne said there were several factors that were reviewed that resulted in the Grade increase for the Affordable Housing position including, the rating for experience and confidentiality.

The board reviewed the original revisions to the CPC position that were approved by the Department. There were no changes to the position that would have changed the grade.

Bea told the Board she is satisfied with the job description and that said she is familiar with both the Affordable Housing and CPC positions and they are comparable, but do not rise to the level of the board administrator position.

If the experience is shifted to be consistent with the Affordable Housing position it would move the CPC to Grade 5.

In an effort to correct internal inequity, a motion was made and seconded to move the rating for Experience from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> degree which will place the position at Grade 5. All in favor.

**Assistant Treasurer/Collector:** Kathy was present at the request of the Board of Selectmen who objected to the reclassification of this position from Grade 5 to Grade 8,

The board reviewed the revisions to the descriptions submitted by the Treasurer/Collector.

Kathy said she was ambiguous about the level of education. She is fine keeping the original requirement of a high school diploma with a bachelor's degree preferred.

The following factor ratings were adjusted based on the Board's review of the revised job description on appeal and interpretation of the rating manual.

Knowledge, Training & Education: Returned the rating factor to the 2<sup>nd</sup> degree.  
Supervision Given: Returned to original rating of 1<sup>st</sup> degree.

These reductions will reduce the total points to 303 and place the position on Grade 7. A motion was made and seconded to revise their decision of December 9 and place this position at Grade 7. All in favor.

**Board Administrators:** Members reviewed the December 9 email from the Consultant regarding her classification of the Board Administrator position. In part, the email states that "board administrators should fall on one grade and not be spread amongst different grades otherwise it would cause inequity among the group of positions." She did not need see a need to create a Board Administer II position. In conversation with the board, the Consultant said the wage study showed that these positions are underpaid in relation to the market.

### **Parks & Recreation**

Knowledge, Training and Education: Was a 2<sup>nd</sup> degree in 2015. Changed to 4<sup>th</sup> degree in 2019 by the Consultant. The board placed it at 3<sup>rd</sup> degree.

Problem Solving Skills & Effort: In 2015 it was at the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree. Consultant moved it to the 4<sup>th</sup> degree. There were no changes to the job description that warranted this increase so it was changed back to the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree.

Experience: The degree was increased from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 4<sup>th</sup> degree. This would increase the total from 278 in 2015 to 293. No action was taken.

### **Planning Board**

Experience: In 2015 the rating was 4<sup>th</sup> degree. The consultant reduced it to the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree and the board left it there. Supervision Given was reduced from was reduced from 2<sup>nd</sup> to 1<sup>st</sup> degree. This reduced the total points from 293 in 2015 to 281.

Maria questioned how this would be lower than park and rec for total points. She pointed out there is no mention in of the work the planning board staff does with respect to the zoning bylaw in the job description.

The complexity was 4<sup>th</sup> degree in 2015 reduced by the consultant to the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree. Maria suggested the board's keep this factor at 3<sup>rd</sup> degree. This discussion led to a review of the planning board questionnaire to determine how the responsibilities related to the Zoning Bylaw were overlooked. The Planning Board will be asked to look at the job description again to see if changes are need define this responsibility. No action was taken.

### **Zoning Board of Appeals**

Pam said she thinks the education and experience requirements should be reviewed again by her board. She also asked why the board is not taking the market data into consideration in making their determination. She was told that the job descriptions are placed on the classification plan based on the total point score.

The board ran through the factor ratings. It was noted that complexity was again reduced from the 4<sup>th</sup> degree in 2015 to the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree in 2019. Experience and complexity is lower than 2015 but there were no changes to the descriptions. The 2019 total points 281. In 2015 the total was 293.

Leon suggested that we may need to meet with the board administrators to be sure that the job descriptions are consistent. There appears to be several inconsistencies. No action was taken.

### **Conservation Commission**

Physical environment – reduced by consultant from 2<sup>nd</sup> to 1<sup>st</sup> degree and maintained by the Board.

After review, the rating for problem solving went up and supervision went down. Total points in 2015 were 298 and reduced to 296. No action taken.

## **Personnel Board**

Confidentiality should be the same as any other positions that rates higher for confidentiality. In 2015 confidentiality was rated at the 4th degree. The consultant reduced it to the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree. Maria requested that it but back to the 2015 rating which would make the total points 301 or grade 7. No action was taken.

A decision on the grading of these positions was tabled to the January 28 meeting.

Ben and Maria will work on a memo to the Board Administrator staff asking them to review their descriptions again, submit a written appeal if warranted and to attend the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup>.

Maria asked the board if they were going to look at the positions that were reclassified from Grade 7 to Grade 8. Maria told the board she had reviewed those positions and there were minimal wording changes to the job descriptions yet the grades went up and the board has not questioned that, yet they have questioned the consultant's determination on the Board Administrators.

Ben said he was very frustrated with the work of the consultant's final work product and felt as though the board had no choice but to redo the grading of these positions.

### **The following documents noted for the record**

Vacation Carry Over/Gately/Library

Vacation Carry Over/ Gebo/ Police

Approvals of Use of Sick Bank by Sick Bank Committee under Section 12-11 of the Bylaw

Letter from the Martha's Vineyard Builders Association dated December 10, 2019 recognizing the work of the Building Inspector and Local Inspector

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maria McFarland  
Board Administrator  
APPROVED  
January 27, 2020