

## *X-Change Minutes*

**Date:** November 17, 2008

**Location:** Downtown Library

### **Those in Attendance:**

Jennifer Adkisson, Ann Aliotta, Julie Ballou, Roy Ballou, Kay Bauman, Karen Bays, Barbara Beasley, Rosemary Czarski, Denyveta Davis, LaVetta Dent, Priscilla Doss, Anne Fischer, Kelly Hoffman, Linda Hyams, Chris Kennedy, Lloyd Lovely, Karen Marriott, Candace McDaniel, Dee McDaniel, Donna Morris, Todd Olberding, Michael Owens, Katrina Prince, Ric Rea, Debbie Robertus, Anita Roesler, Stacy Schrank, Kim Terry, Phil Tolbert, Maria Watkins, Randy Wayland, Jimmy Welch, Fariba Williams, Patrick Williams, John Wood

### **Welcome**

Kay Bauman called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. Kay welcomed the supervisors to the Downtown Library and X-Change meeting. Kay introduced the extension specialists and new supervisors. Donna was introduced

### **Salary Survey and Staff Association Response**

Donna passed out the executive summary of the 2008 compensation study and summary of findings and discussed the compensation study tables (attached). She addressed the need for review and revisions to the job descriptions. Donna also addressed the staff association response. Discussion followed and Donna introduced Ric Rea.

### **Leave Policies**

Ric passed out a letter regarding leave without pay(attached). He addressed that leave without pay is not part of the leave policy and spoke about the implications that can come about from using leave without pay. He discussed changes that will be made to the payroll program regarding leave without pay.

### **Rules of Conduct Training**

Stacy and Linda shared observations about feedback from the training sessions they have conducted. There were two areas that needed to be addressed:

1. Empowerment - Management should support that all employees are able to enforce the rules.
2. Modeling - Leaders should embrace and model the rules to employees as well as share their expectations. There are also needs to be a distinction between internal branch rules vs. policies.

### **Adjournment**

After no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

November 17, 2008

To: All Staff

From: Donna Morris, Executive Director

Re: 2008 Compensation Study

I have attached the executive summary of the Compensation study which was conducted by James Associates and completed in April of 2008. Administrative staff met with the consultant to review the findings and then met again to determine our next course of action.

The administration believes the research related to the benchmarks in the report to be less than accurate. This determination is based on a number of factors:

- only 5 of the 28 benchmarked positions appear to have a sufficient number of matches and/or matches that we believe to be valid.(18%)
- The remaining 23 positions either do not have a sufficient number of responses, a sufficient number of matches, or matches that we believe to be accurate(82%).
- Therefore, it appears that the information as presented is not reliable enough to recommend any type of salary adjustments.

I have listed in the attached table the positions identified as benchmarks for the purposes of the study with administrative comments as to why these positions are not matches and/or other comments.

The request for proposal for a salary study was sent out twice and only one consultant bid was received each time. Because we felt that we needed to complete the project last fiscal year, we awarded the contract to James Associates (the only bidder)for an amount well below the budgeted amount. It is clear that for the research that is needed; we will need to completely revise our request for proposal and add significantly to the scope of work in order to obtain more complete results. In addition, we will need to research and recruit nationally a larger firm that will be better equipped to handle our request.

The consultant also recommended that we thoroughly review and update our job descriptions as 29% of the 28 benchmarked job descriptions were 9 years old and 73% are over 2 years old. We agree with that recommendation and have made assignments to senior staff to update job descriptions under their supervision.

In the meantime, we will review the job descriptions for the benchmarked positions and make adjustments as needed. Upon completion those may be sent to Human

Resources to be re-factored using our current system. If adjustments are recommended from the re-factoring; they could be made upon completion.

Below are comments about each of the benchmarked recommendations. Those with an 'x' in the concerns column are ones that we have concerns about the data or recommendation and believe that further review is needed.

Concerns	Benchmark Position	Consultant's recommendation	MLS Comments
	Accounting Manager	3 matches out of 8; no adjustment recommended	
x	Administrative Specialist	6 matches out of 11 Recommendation: a salary adjustment or grade adjustment based on market may be warranted.	several questionable matches; local respondents pay below MLS
x	Benefits Manager	4 responses – 2 matches; no adjustment recommended.	Don't believe these are equal matches; Too few matches.
x	Cataloger	6 responses; all reported as equal matches. No adjustment recommended.	Not equal matches because the reporting libraries outsource their cataloging to varying degrees. Further review needed.
	Cataloging Manager	6 responses; 3 matches; no adjustment recommended	
	Circulation Clerk	8 responses – 7 matches; no adjustment recommended	
x	Computer Operator	5 responses – 1 match; adjustment recommended	Too few matches
	Delivery Driver	7 responses – 5 matches; no adjustment recommended	
x	Deputy Executive Director/Library Operations	7 responses; 2 matches; no adjustment recommended	Questionable matches and too few matches.



Concerns	Benchmark Position	Consultant's recommendation	MLS Comments
x	Director, Facilities Maintenance	10 responses; 5 matches; consultant reported an adjustment may be warranted.	Questionable matches especially with Pioneer which does not perform their own maintenance yet reported the position as one with more responsibilities
x	Director, Information Technology	9 responses, 7 reported matches; Review of scope of position is recommended by consultant.	Questionable matches
x	Employee Development Coordinator	8 responses; 3 reported matches; Recommendation: this position may need to be adjusted.	Questionable matches; Pioneer does not have a similar position.
x	Employment Manager	7 responses; 1 reported match. Consultant recommends further review in terms of scope and salary	Too few matches
x	Graphic Designer	7 responses, 5 reported matches, adjustment recommended because major competitor (Pioneer) has higher salary.	MLS believes this is not a good match because PLS position requires more.
x	IT Technician II	9 responses, 5 matches. No adjustment recommended.	Questionable matches
x	Librarian	11 responses; 9 reported matches. Adjustment recommended based on competitive nature of recruitment in the region.	MLS disagrees that we compete with communities listed as the top 3 in the region; and it is questionable that they are part of our "region". Our position is non-exempt and only 2 of reported matches are also non exempt.

Concerns	Benchmark Position	Consultant's recommendation	MLS Comments
x	Manager, Library Operations II	9 responses, 7 reported matches. Recommendation: if librarian rate is adjusted; consideration needs to be given to avoid compaction of the rates between the two positions	MLS do not believe librarian adjustment needed; consequently no adjustment needed here. Questionable matches; Integris Health is not a match.
	Maintenance Tech II	8 responses, 7 matches; no adjustment recommended.	Agree
x	Marketing and Communications Manager	8 responses, 1 reported match. Recommendation: if adjustment made, would be made only on basis of Pioneer's salary and is a competitive market decision.	The reported match, Pioneer, we do not consider a match.
x	Material Selection Tech	8 responses, 4 reported matches. Recommendation: move to mean rate of \$12.18 which is 9% higher than Pioneer and roughly equivalent to Tulsa.	The scope of duties varies among reported matches. Of the two in state matches; educational requirements suggest that at least one is not an equal match. Further review is needed.
x	Material Selector	8 responses, 6 reported matches; review and adjustment recommended.	The scope of duties varies among the reported matches and three include supervisory responsibilities. Further review needed.
x	Purchasing Officer	7 responses; 2 matches; no adjustment recommended	Too few matches to make recommendation.
x	Receiving Technician	9 responses; 3 matches. Adjustment recommended based on TCCL's position.	MLS needs to clarify if Tulsa's position is indeed a match and to consider the changes that will occur to the MLS position with the



Concerns	Benchmark Position	Consultant's recommendation	MLS Comments
			move to the Service Center
x	Senior Accounting Tech	6 responses; 2 matches; no adjustment recommended.	Too few matches
x	Senior Services Coordinator	2 responses only 1 match; Adjustment recommended.	Not enough data to make recommendation.
	Technical Processor	6 responses; 6 matches. Adjustment recommended.	Reported matches appear valid; will need to consider changes that will occur to MLS position with move to Service Center.
x	Volunteer Coordinator	5 responses; 2 reported matches; no adjustment recommended.	Too few matches
	Webmaster	7 responses, 4 matches, no adjustment needed.	

November 17, 2008

## Leave Without Pay

In the library system's Policies and Procedures, Stewardship of Human Resources, SH 220 Employee Leave Policies, the category of "leave without pay" is not a recognized form of leave and therefore no provisions for the use of that status are made; but the use of leave without pay, or perhaps better known as "absence without leave", is a reality.

The confusion with the term possibly comes from the category of leave in mlsHRPay called "leave without pay." This entry is intended to be nothing more than a way to record the absence of paid time in payroll work week.

More and more often, supervisors are approving "leave without pay" when an employee has exhausted all of their annual vacation leave, floating holidays, and sick leave and still wants additional time off. The granting of additional time off is not the intent of the payroll entry. The intent is for there to be a way to account for missed hours during the workweek.

When a full-time employee experiences as few as one unpaid absence, that person jeopardizes their status as a full-time employee under some of the insurance plans and policies. This places both the employee and the library system at risk. The exceptions to this are instances involving the Family and Medical Leave Act, workers' compensation and a combination of the two. These two circumstances come under certain legal mandates covering some benefits for a specified period of time.

The time associated with an unplanned or unscheduled absence should be charged against any and all available, qualifying paid leave until it is exhausted. As an option or when available leave has been exhausted, the time should be made up within the same work week by adjusting the employee's work schedule.

If an employee does not report to work at a time when she or he is otherwise required (or expected) to be at work, the absence results in a pay reduction (called leave without pay in the payroll program). With rare exceptions which are to be approved in advance by the Director of Human Resources or his/her designee, an absence without leave should be treated as a performance issue and should result in a written warning indicating that a second instance could result in further disciplinary action including possible termination of employment. A copy of this warning should be sent to the Human Resources Office for inclusion in the individual's personnel file