



# HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

## City of Burlington

179 South Winooski Avenue, Suite 100, Burlington, VT 05401

Voice (802) 865-7145

Fax (802) 864-1777

Vermont Relay: 7-1-1 or 800-253-0191

### **Institutions and Human Resources Policy Committee Minutes May 28, 2013**

**Present Councilors:** Sharon Bushor (S.B.), Max Tracy (M. T.), Kevin Worden (K. W.)(via phone 5:38pm – 5:45pm)

**Staff Present:** Susan Leonard (S.L.), Stephanie Reid (S.R.)

**Others Present:** Mayor Weinberger (M.W.)

**Meeting Called to order: 5:38pm Mayor's Office, City Hall, 149 Church Street**

#### **1. Approve Agenda**

MT would like to add the scheduling of future meetings to be determined either at today's meeting or via email.

Agenda accepted with revision.

#### **2. Mayor's Office Reorganization**

MW proposed a reorganization to his office. MW stated that the reorganization would result in a trivial amount of savings to the FY14 budget but that it meets the overall budget goal set by his office to all departments to be level funded for FY14. MW further stated that based on his 1st year plus of experience and understanding of what the Mayor's office needs to run his office efficiently, a formalization of the management role that Mike Kanarick (MK) has been playing and finalizing it even more by having him facilitate Department Head, councilors, and other constituents for decisions and actions needed of the Mayor's office, including a change in the direct reports of the Mayor's office slightly with a couple reporting to MK.

MT questioned if this was verified with the City Attorney's office in regards to the City Charter.

MW stated that Eileen (Blackwood) is aware and has not raised any concerns, nor had SB. Not taking away any charter responsibilities but allow him (MW) to get more done.

MT responded with ok.

SB stated that she had asked SL to check with the copy of the charter if there were any questions. SB had seen a draft (of the job description) before with challenging language. SB stated that she supports making this office work for you (MW) and for future structures, want to ensure it works for everybody. SB stated that she still saw some problems with the job description. For instance, looking at the current skills for the position and would you be able to have the current person?

MT stated as you don't want to set the bar too high.

SB stated for the project coordinator was straight forward, seemed ok. Need to use a critical eye to be generic enough but get the right skill set.

KW agreed, stated that he works on a lot of job descriptions, offer letters. Need to be general enough so that not just 1 person fits the role, but with an expectation of growth, think that one is ok.

SB questioned the Chief of Staff job description as it is difficult to understand the role of the CAO and the Chief of Staff.

MW stated that is a fair question. Thinks it's in the language now. CAO is a big job, responsible for the financials of the City. Should have operational oversight as we move father away from commissions, CAO job had grown into the financial and operational performance. MW further stated that day-to-day, he sits with the CAO and council to review performance objectives of each department. The Chief of Staff is not planned to take the place of things that require mayoral decisions, communications to the public and media but to give time to MW to make a decision that will significantly impact the public. MK is the first contact to get a response when it's dire. Pull MW out of a meeting, etc.

SB requested a copy of the annual report to view an organizational chart. Annual report organizational chart is more generic, not a "who" reports to "who". In viewing the job description, SB gave examples of where the job description needed further word-smithing. SB reiterated that there is to be one message, control, what goes out (to the public) while all the facts have been reviewed.

KW questioned the physical and mental requirements of the Office Assistant job description were missing, were these just not printed out?

SL confirmed that these were not there simply due to printing; they would be included in the final version.

KW questioned diversity, stating that this was a main role of Carina's (position). Will this be in the new position?

MW stated that was Carina's position, the responsibility should stay in the focus of this office. Not as an ongoing basis but the Mayor's office ensuring that the important values are recognized by the Department Heads and through them, the whole organization. Stated "the buck stops with us", that it is important, it's in the job description and SL will come to MW and MK when the hire, who may be an EEOC, isn't given the proper attention and need to call the Department Head out.

KW stated that these are important initiatives.

MW stated the Mayor's office values diversity, pushing to add it to union contracts and the goal is to lead by example.

SB questioned language re: oversee policies of diversity? What role will this new position have with regards to policies?

MW stated when there is a problem.

SL stated to maintain accountability on this. The CAO, Chief of Staff will need to evaluate the departments and Department Heads to ensure that these goals are a part of the process.

KW questioned if this would be folded into performance reviews.

SL stated that this goes above the philosophical, must provide general guidance that goes beyond the value of diversity.

MT stated that not dealing with just the problems day-to-day but applying the lens of diversity with the whole process.

SB stated to exemplify awareness and be a role model in addition to mentor.

SL stated ideally we are all one, keep it at its core, continued oversight.

KW stated that Mike is working hard under the old job description, in this first year there was much to do. Is this [new] position achievable?

MW stated look at this as a whole. The project coordinator role takes on a share of the responsibility of staffing events that would have the Mayor's office more involved at the Department Head level. Mike should be freed up to do these new functions, less of the 230 am emails.

SL stated would it have been helpful to see what has been added?

MW stated to look over the project coordinator job description, assists Mayor's etc. It's a reorientation of Carina's responsibilities.

KW stated that he liked the structure, likes the idea of clear reports and responsibility.

SB moved to recommend approval to the Board of Finance. MT seconded. Motion passed 3:0.

MW left the meeting 6:05pm.

### **3. Scheduling of future meetings**

MT requested a somewhat regular schedule meetings, if they don't need it happen then they could be cancelled but there are people that are awaiting a response.

KW questioned the biannual policy review.

SB would also like to look at the process that has been changed regarding HR and reorganizations/recommendations to the Board of Finance. Board of Finance is about the money and could care less about organizational charts. The Board of Finance assumes its fine, is the work getting done, does the HR committee need to be inserted occasionally?

KW questioned the "Institutions" side of the committee, not listed on the mission statement.

SB stated it's not logical.

KW stated that agenda's and minutes are not posted to the IHRPC webpage since 2009.

SL left the meeting 6:10pm

Discussion took place regarding other meetings and conflicts. KW to work with Susan for future meetings.

SB questioned what was left over from last year?

KW replied last year was the step-placement review/process.

### **5. Adjournment**

MT made a motion to adjourn at 6:23pm, seconded by KW. Motion passed 3:0.