DEPARTMENT: Administration    BY: Janet Hogan    PHONE: 209/966-3222

RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION: (Policy Item: Yes ( ) No(X)

Adopt this resolution taking action on the 1997 Reclassification Requests pursuant to recommendations set forth in the attached report.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS: The Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with SEIU and AFSCME specify that employees or department heads may request reclassification of existing County classifications once annually during the month of October, and the Administrative Officer is required to review the requests and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. Two requests were received, and the attached report provides recommended actions.

The Board of Supervisors is required by the MOUs to act upon the requests within 20 days of receipt of the recommendation by the Administrative Officer. Three regularly scheduled meetings fall within this time period, namely, February 17th, 24th, and March 3rd.

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The Board may act upon each individual reclassification recommendation. If the Board fails to take action with respect to any of these reclassification requests, the County will be out of compliance with the terms of the MOUs.

COSTS: ( ) Not Applicable
A. Budgeted current FY $0
B. Total anticipated costs $1,247
C. Required additional funding $
D. Internal transfers $

SOURCE: ( ) 4/5ths Vote Required
A. Unanticipated revenues $
B. Reserve for contingencies $
C. Source description: Program Revenue
Balance in Reserve for Contingencies, if approved: $

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:
List the attachments and number the pages consecutively:

_________________________
_________________________
_________________________
_________________________
_________________________

CLERK'S USE ONLY:
Res. No.: 98-54
Vote - Ayes: 5
Noes: 0
Absent: 0
( ) Approved
( ) Denied
( ) Minute Order Attached
( ) No Action Necessary

ATTEST: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
County of Mariposa, State of California
By:_________________________

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:
This item on agenda as:

☑️ Recommended
☐ Not Recommended
☐ For Policy Determination
☐ Submitted with Comment
☐ Returned for Further Action

Comment:_________________________

A.O. Initials:_________________________
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MARIPOSA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

MINUTE ORDER

__________________________________________________________

TO: JANET HOGAN, County Administrative Officer
FROM: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
SUBJECT: 1997 Reclassification requests; Res. 98-54

__________________________________________________________

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

ADOPTED THIS Order on February 17, 1998

ACTION AND VOTE:

Janet Hogan, County Administrative Officer;
Resolution Taking Action on the 1997 Reclassification Requests Pursuant to
Recommendations

BOARD ACTION: Discussion was held. Lisa Edelheit, SEIU, provided input relative
to their request and recommendation. (M)Balmain, (S)Parker, Res. 98-54 adopted
denying the reclassification requests for the fraud investigator position in Human Services
Department and the account clerk position in Public Works Department/Ayes:
Unanimous.

cc: Mike Edwards, Public Works Director
   Tom Archer, Human Services Director
   Ken Hawkins, Auditor
   Jeff Green, County Counsel
   Nancy Kyle, Personnel
   Lisa Edelheit, SEIU
   File
February 17, 1998

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Janet Hogan, County Administrative Officer

RE: 1997 Reclassification Requests

BACKGROUND

Our Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with SEIU and AFSCME specify that employees or department heads may request the reclassification of existing County classifications once annually during the month of October. The process requires that the Administrative Officer review all reclassification requests received and recommend one of three actions to the Board of Supervisors:

- The Board may approve the request for reclassification,
- The Board may deny the request and direct the department head to assign only those duties to the employee that are within the employee’s current job description, or
- The Board may find that the duties performed are reasonably consistent with the job description and deny the request for reclassification.

The Administrative Officer’s recommendation must be transmitted to the affected Union ten working days prior to being docketed for Board action, and the Board must act on the recommendations within twenty days of receiving them. The Union may appeal the decision of the Board to arbitration. The arbitrator cannot direct that a reclassification be approved; however, if the arbitrator finds that the employee has been working out of class, the County must pay the employee back-pay for the time spent working out of class and either reclassify the employee, or remove the higher level duties. Any reclassifications approved by the Board become effective retroactively to December 1, 1997.

To ensure consistency in comparisons, all costs are shown for a 12-month period, fifth step of existing class to fifth step of new class. Benefits are included at a rate of 35 percent.
PROCESS

The analysis of reclassification requests consists of five steps:

1. A review of the job analysis questionnaire completed by employees for the reclassification request, and the extent of change in duties.

2. A review of job specifications for both the current and requested classification to ensure that tasks being performed conform to the job description.

3. A review and comparison to other positions in the County having similar duties and levels of responsibilities to ensure internal equity.

4. A comparison of job specifications from comparable counties, as required.

5. A desk audit or discussion with the employee and/or department head regarding the changes in duties and responsibilities which justify the requested reclassification.

CRITERIA

Reclassification is appropriate for a position when duties and responsibilities have changed significantly from the current job description or for positions that have been structurally affected by organizational changes.

Reclassification is inappropriate in the following situations:

- **Overwork** - If an employee cannot complete the assigned work in the time available because of sheer volume, extra help is needed, not a new job description.

- **Performance** - Superior performance is rewarded by promotion, not a reclassification upward, since such a practice over even a few years will quickly skew a department’s classification hierarchy. Likewise, if poor performance is indicative that an employee has been promoted beyond his or her competence, then demotion rather than reclassification downward is the solution. While it is natural for better employees to grow and mature into taking on greater responsibilities, managers are urged not to do an injustice to their best employees by allowing them to work beyond their classifications to the extent that they are inadequately compensated for the level of responsibility exercised.

- **Topping Out** - Employees at the top of their pay ranges in their respective classifications are not reclassified to a higher pay level; they should seek a promotion to a position classified at the higher level.
Minor Changes in Duties - The addition of duties to a position does not mandate a reclassification. Provided that the duties are within the level and scope of the job classification, no change to the position is warranted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Human Services (1 position)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Fraud Investigator</th>
<th>Cost: $4,536 (10%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested:</td>
<td>Senior Welfare Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation: Not recommended. The employee's duties are all within the present classification.

Discussion:

*The classification of Senior Welfare Investigator does not exist within approved classifications in Mariposa County. The above cost was calculated based on an assumed 10% differential between the current and requested classifications.

The employee's request states that she believes that the work being performed is beyond the scope of her present classification. However, a review of the current as well as proposed class specifications indicate that this employee is properly classified within the Merit System Services (MSS) class specifications. This employee is currently designated as a "Fraud Investigator" by Mariposa County which is identical to the MSS classification of Welfare Investigator II. (MSS has been working on revisions to many of their class specifications, and the Welfare Investigator series is included among those. These new specifications are currently being reviewed by the Human Services Department and will be presented to the Board for their adoption in the first quarter of 1998.)

The new MSS specifications provide for a Welfare Investigator I as a trainee level class, and the Welfare Investigator II as the experienced journey level class in their series. The requested Senior Welfare Investigator is not deemed to be appropriate for use by Mariposa County in that it is primarily designed to be responsible for functional oversight/evaluation of a large unit of employees. This level is used in organizations where MSS has determined that the structure and the duties warrant this Senior level to serve as a day-to-day supervisor. In fact, as a distinguishing characteristic of this class, MSS states that most agencies will use the Welfare Investigator II level to perform leadwork duties when there are a small number of staff assigned to the investigative function. Currently, Mariposa County utilizes only one extra-help Fraud Investigator for the work of its investigative unit.
It is not appropriate to reclassify a position where the overwhelming majority of assigned tasks and duties are accurately defined by the existing level. If occasional special work is required that clearly is the function of a higher level in the series, the County could review other means of compensation for that temporary work such as out-of-class pay.

2. Department of Public Works (1 position)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Account Clerk III</th>
<th>Cost: Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested:</td>
<td>None indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** Establish a new classification of Cost and Billing Clerk I/II at a proposed salary range of 90 ($1,480-1,799 per month)/110 ($1,635-1,987 per month), reclassify the employee at level II of this proposed new classification, and direct the Personnel Office to prepare new class specifications for Board approval. Cost, if approved as recommended, would be $1,247

**Discussion:** The employee's request for reclassification was primarily based on the change in Special Districts' billings from a mostly annual to a monthly basis and her belief that additional accounting work was now required. It should be noted here that not the quantity but rather the kind of work is relevant to reclassification. A review of the overall framework of Mariposa County classifications indicates that this employee is properly classified at the advanced journey level of the Account Clerk series, and movement to the Accounting Technician series is not justified for the kinds of duties being performed.

However, a desk audit of this position indicated not only required special knowledge and a high level of complexity and detail in the required bookkeeping but also a very significant responsibility for the billing requirements for the County's Special Districts (over 300 individual accounts). In addition, there is follow-up required involving work with a collection agency and year-end tax roll additions. These latter functions are, in fact, additions to original assigned work and are unique to this position.

One test of the validity of a class specification is to determine whether or not it would be possible to successfully recruit should a vacancy occur, and this is not believed to be possible under the current Account Clerk III classification wherein a new employee could be expected to function at the full journey level required. Therefore, it is recommended that the Board request the Personnel Office to create a I/II flex series at this time should the department find it necessary in the future to recruit at closer to a trainee level. An increase of four percent is recommended in the salary range to reflect the unique knowledges, skills and abilities associated with this position beyond that of the Account Clerk III.

97Reclass (a)
February 9, 1998

Board of Supervisors
Mariposa County
P.O. Box 784
Mariposa, CA 95338

RE: Reclassification Requests

Dear Board Member:

In early January I received a copy of Janet Hogan's recommendations regarding the requests for reclassification submitted in October. Two reclassification requests were submitted, one from Public Works and the other from Human Services. After reviewing Ms. Hogan's recommendations I had some concerns and requested to meet with her and the affected employees.

The first request is to reclassify an Account Clerk III in the Public Works Department to an Accounting Technician I. Ms. Hogan's initial response to this request was to partially approve it by creating a new job classification reflecting the change in duties and increasing the pay by 2%. Both the Union and the affected employee disagreed with this recommendation. During our meeting with Ms. Hogan we raised several points as to why we disagreed with the recommendation with the largest issue being one of internal equity. We believe the work performed by this employee is comparable to the work performed by Accounting Technician I's and therefore should have comparable pay. The Union believes the duties of this position fits into the job description of an Accounting Technician I and should be reclassified as such. After much discussion, Ms. Hogan still felt a separate classification was appropriate but would place the salary of this new classification at the same salary range of the Accounting Technician I. The Union feels reclassifying this position to an Accounting Technician I is appropriate and preferable over creating a new singular classification, (especially for promotional opportunities), and is asking you to consider this request before making your final decision. However, we believe our concerns regarding internal equity and working-out-of-class will be resolved if the Board elects to create a new classification as long as the salary range of the new classification is the same as that of the Accounting Technician I.

The second request is to reclassify the Welfare Fraud Investigator to a Senior Fraud Investigator. We disagree with Ms. Hogan's recommendation to deny this request and feel reclassification is appropriate. Currently, the County employs only one Fraud Investigator. The Fraud Investigator works independently with minimal supervision and is responsible for all aspects of welfare fraud. We reviewed all the current job descriptions within the Fraud Investigator series and found that several duties being performed fall within the job descriptions of Chief Welfare Investigator, Supervising Welfare Investigator and Senior Welfare Investigator. While the job description does
state that most agencies will use the Welfare Investigator II (equivalent position to Mariposa County's Fraud Investigator) to perform leadworker duties, we believe the incumbent of this position goes beyond leadworker duties. The Fraud Investigator reports directly to the Department Head and since there isn't anyone else in the department trained to handle fraud it would be difficult to remove the duties that are beyond the current classification and reassign them.

In reviewing this request we also checked with other small counties for comparability purposes. We found that Mariposa County is the only small county with a one person fraud unit that has only the Welfare Investigator II classification. Mono County for example has one person working in the fraud unit but that person is classified as a Chief Investigator with a significantly higher salary. Tuolumne County has several Welfare Fraud Investigator I and II's with the salary of the Investigator I higher than our Investigator II. The Investigator II in Tuolumne County does not have all the responsibilities that our Investigator has. Calaveras County has a Welfare Investigator I assigned to the Welfare Department with a higher salary than Mariposa's Investigator and Investigator II's are assigned to the District Attorney with a substantially higher salary than Mariposa. Trinity County has Investigator I and II's also at a significantly higher salary.

Additionally, we contacted the representative from Merit Systems to discuss this matter and explained all the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Fraud Investigator. After hearing this the representative indicated a reclassification may be appropriate and that Mariposa County has a unique situation with only one person assigned to the fraud unit. Though it is true that the Senior Welfare Investigator classification is generally only used in larger agencies, that doesn't mean that it cannot be used in smaller agencies where deemed appropriate. In fact, Merit Systems has made exceptions in the past for other classifications in the Human Services Department to deal with our unique situation of a small county with few employees wearing many hats. Upon the County's request, Merit Systems is willing to conduct an audit to determine if the Fraud Investigator is working out of class and if the classification of Senior Welfare Investigator is appropriate for Mariposa County. Since both Merit Systems and the Board must approve reclassifications in the Human Services Department, we are requesting that you authorize Merit Systems to review this request before making your final decision.

In summary, we believe both requests for reclassification are appropriate and ask that you support them. Thank you for taking our comments into consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Lisa B. Edelheit
Field Representative
RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION:  
Policy Item: Yes [X] No [ ]
Recommend that the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors approve and authorize the Board Chairman to sign the attached contract with Bill Charney. The contractor is a respected trainer in corporate sponsorship and festival development. The proposed training featuring Mr. Charney is a co-sponsored activity recommended by the Visitors Bureau as part of its goal to promote and develop new events and festivals. The training will also help to strengthen existing events and may assist existing and new events to be successful and self-sustaining. There will be a $10 fee for the event that will be used to offset Visitor Bureau costs.

Participation in this training may be considered when recommending promotion of events to the Board of Supervisors. Every effort will be made to personally invite representatives of event promoters and County clubs and organizations.

The qualifications of Mr. Charney follow in the attached materials.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS: There has been no previous action by the Board.

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:
If there was negative action the Visitors Bureau would request direction from the Board.

COSTS:  
☐ Not Applicable
A. Budgeted current FY $900.00
B. Total anticipated costs $900.00
C. Required additional funding $0.00
D. Internal transfers $0.00

SOURCE:  
☐ 4/5ths Vote Required
A. Unanticipated revenues $
B. Reserve for contingencies $
C. Source description:  
Balance in Reserve for Contingencies, if approved:

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:  
List the attachments and number the pages consecutively:

Bill Charney Information

CLERK’S USE ONLY:  
RES. NO.: 53  
Ord. No.  
A. Absent:  
☐ Approved  
☐ Minute Order Attached  
☐ No action necessary

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.

Date:  
ATTEST: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board of Mariposa, State of California
By: Deputy

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:  
This item is on agenda as:  
☐ Recommended  
☐ Not Recommended  
☐ For Policy Determination  
☐ Submitted with Comment

Comment:  
A.O. Initials:  
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