

Memo

To: Members of the Personnel Committee
From: Barbara Smyth, Chairwoman
Date: June 14, 2019
Re: Personnel Committee Meeting – Wednesday, June 19, 2019

There will be a meeting of the Personnel Committee on **Wednesday, June 19, 2019 at 7:00 pm** in **Conference Room 123 (first floor)**, 125 East Avenue, Norwalk, Connecticut.

AGENDA

1. Call to order / roll call
2. Public comments
3. Approval of minutes from meeting held on March 20, 2019
4. Discussion of Performance Evaluation forms for Ordinance employees
5. Discussion and Vote on Revised Ordinance Pay Plan Schedule
6. Adjourn

The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 17, 2019.

cc: Mayor Harry W. Rilling
Donna King, City Clerk
Irene Dixon, Assistant City Clerk
Mario Coppola, Corp Counsel

**CITY OF NORWALK
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING**

MARCH 20, 2019

ATTENDANCE: Barbara Smyth, Chair; Gregory Burnett, Colin Hosten, Beth Siegelbaum

STAFF: Ray Burney, Director of Personnel and Labor Relations

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Smyth called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m. A quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no actions on this item.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 20, 2019

On page 6, in Adjournment, add adjournment time: 8:15pm

**** MR. BURNETT MOVED TO ACCEPT THE FEBRUARY 20, 2019 MINUTES AS CORRECTED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED TO ACCEPT THE FEBRUARY 20, 2019 MINUTES AS CORRECTED WITH THREE (3) IN FAVOR (BURNETT, SMYTH AND SIEGELBAUM) AND ONE (1) ABSTENTION. (HOSTEN)**

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF JOB DESCRIPTIONS FOR HUMAN SERVICES DIRECTOR AND CHIEF OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

Ms. Smyth suggested reviewing the Chief of Community Services job first.

Mr. Burnett asked about funding. He said with this proposal to create a department, will it start with funding or would that be a TBD? He noted it was a new department with a lot of outreach and touchpoints to people in the community, saying he was in favor of it, but wondered if it had any teeth.

Mr. Burney said there was nothing on the table for additional funding, but it was conceivable that funds would be necessary for initiatives. He said that the direction that they'd receive from the mayor would be see what you can do with available funds. He noted that all departments have some discretionary funding, and they'd be expected to pursue grants and come before the committee to justify a need for money.

He said part of the initiative is to give the chief and director latitude to come in and come up with better ways to spend resources.

Ms. Smith said that there is a line in the description that says sustains and augments budget including initiating grant applications. She said it seems that they're going to rely on that to beef up programs.

Mr. Hosten asked if they should call out grant writing skills in qualifications.

Mr. Burney said it could be explored. He said that the communication manager coordinates grant applications, and various departments have people who explore and develop grant applications. He said that he would foresee a similar role here, and that he wouldn't want to lose a great candidate if they had everything but grant writing.

Ms. Smyth noted that in the 'Director' description it says knowledge of funding sources.

Mr. Burney agreed to add language that said something like knowledge of grant writing/external funding sources.

Mr. Burnett asked if it was consistent with other Chiefs' job descriptions, because they all pursue grants, he noted that Community Service is the real focus of this job.

Mr. Burney said they could add it as a skill and said he anticipated the candidate coming from the public sector, and having a lot of experience, which is why it is okay to add.

Ms. Siegelbaum said that education and experience for both positions were similar.

Mr. Burney said they'd debated on the master's degree language for the Chief—whether it was required or preferred. The thinking was if they went with preferred, they'd open the pool a little more.

Mr. Burnett noted that the Fair Housing Officer would remain separate and independent.

Mr. Burney said that the last time the committee had met, they'd planned to incorporate the Fair Housing Officer under one umbrella, but that the city had dropped that part of the initiative. He said that upon further discussion it was discovered that there was virtually no overlap in function between the Fair Housing Officer and the Fair Rent Commission. He said also that the Fair Housing Officer had been created by consent decree, and reports to the Housing Commission. It was determined that it should stay as it is.

Mr. Burnett asked if the NAACP was aware.

Mr. Burney said that the officer and the Reverend Ingraham had been advised via email that it would stay as it was.

Mr. Burney also stated that he planned to add a line about the Director participating in any disaster relief or recovery efforts the city has to undertake. He said that would mean that while the Fire Department ran the response, the Directory would be the liaison to the city and the city staff.

Mr. Burnett clarified that they were creating two new positions and asked if there was a dollar amount for them.

Mr. Burnett said that if you looked at Bob Barron's May 21st analysis from last year, it is there. He thought the Human Services Director salary was \$85 or \$90,000 and that the community services job was being funded by not filling the job formerly held by Adam Bovilsky. He said it would cost net, about \$100,000.

Mr. Burnett asked if it were too soon to say that the reorganization would lead to any cost savings?

Mr. Burney said he didn't anticipate cost reduction. He said the purpose here was better service and better efficiencies.

Mr. Burnett clarified that he didn't mean cost reductions, he thought that savings could come through the new efficiencies.

Mr. Burnett noted that there were \$60-\$80,000 in operations savings due to combining the workforces under one umbrella.

Mr. Hosten asked if it would make sense to write in more defined metrics for deliverables, so the candidates understand how they'd be evaluated.

Mr. Burney said that wasn't typical in a position description. It would be more likely found in a business plan or performance evaluation scenario.

He said he owed the committee a revised draft performance appraisal at the meeting next month.

Mr. Burney read a post on "We Are from Norwalk, CT" from a man asking for help with a loan. He said that things like this are the reason for these positions, so someone from the city could answer him and tell him where he might be able to go for help.

Ms. Smyth noted that there are pockets of services and people don't know where to go. She said that there is a high percentage of disenfranchised people who deserve a coordinated effort to find what they need. She said it was shameful that they didn't already have a Community Services Department, she said she supported this.

Mr. Hosten agreed and noted that they could direct people to places like Open Door, TCC, etc.

Mr. Burnett asked if there was language that talked about external and community groups, Mr. Burney referred him to the last sentence in the description. He said it would be the job of this department to help people find resources.

**** MR. BURNETT MOVED TO APPROVE HUMAN SERVICES DIRECTOR
AS A NEW POSITION WITH THE NECESSARY UPDATES AS DISCUSSED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**** MR. BURNETT MOVED TO APPROVE JOB DESCRIPTION OF CHIEF OF COMMUNITY SERVICES AS A NEW POSITION WITH THE NECESSARY UPDATES AS DISCUSSED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

EXECUTIVE SESSION: STATUS OF RECRUITMENT FOR RECREATIONS AND PARK DIRECTOR

**** MR. BURNETT MOVED TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:13 PM**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

ADJOURNMENT

**** MR. BURNETT MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:29p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

L Grassilli
Telesco Secretarial Services



ANNUAL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Employee Name: _____

Job Title: _____ Department: _____

Period of Evaluation: From: _____ To: _____

PART I – INSTRUCTIONS TO RATER

Listed below are five (5) performance factors, seven (7) behavioral traits, and five (5) supervisory factors that are important in the performance of the employee's job. Performance factors and behavioral traits must be utilized for all employees. The supervisor factors should be utilized only for employees with supervisory responsibilities. The rater will then complete the assessment of the specific objectives from the prior year. The overall weights are as follows: 70% for Parts II-IV and 30% for Part V. The Personnel department will meet with each rater prior to the employee meeting to finalize the weighting within each section. NOTE: A rating of Unacceptable (1), Needs Improvement (2) or Superior (5) requires comments.

DISTRIBUTION INSTRUCTIONS	1. Return the original form to the Personnel Department 2. Maintain one copy for your department records 3. Distribute one copy to the employee
MARKING INSTRUCTIONS	1. The supervisor should indicate the employee's performance by using check box next to the appropriate level of performance.

The following rating scale guide is being provided to assist the evaluator in assigning the most appropriate measurement of the employees' performance factors, behavioral traits and supervisory factors.

- 1 = Unacceptable – Consistently fails to meet job requirements; performance clearly below minimum requirements. Immediate improvement required to maintain employment.
- 2 = Needs Improvement – Occasionally fails to meet job requirements; performance must improve to meet expectations of position.
- 3 = Meets Expectations – Able to perform 100% of job duties satisfactorily. Normal guidance and supervision are required.
- 4 = Exceeds Expectations – Frequently exceeds job requirements; all planned objectives were achieved above the established standards and accomplishments were made in unexpected areas as well.
- 5 = Superior – Consistently exceeds job requirements; this is the highest level of performance that can be attained.

PART II – PERFORMANCE FACTORS

1. **Knowledge, Skills, Abilities** – Consider the degree to which the employee exhibits the required level of job knowledge and/or skills to perform the job and this employee's use of established techniques, materials and equipment as they relate to performance.

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

2. **Quality of Work** – Does the employee complete assignments meeting quality standards? Consider accuracy, neatness, thoroughness and adherence to standards and safety rules.

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

3. **Quantity of Work** – Consider the results of this employee's efforts. Does the employee demonstrate the ability to manage several responsibilities simultaneously; perform work in a productive and timely manner; meet work schedules?

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

4. **Work Habits** – To what extent does the employee display a positive, cooperative attitude toward work assignments and requirements? Consider compliance with established work rules and organizational policies.

Unacceptable.....Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

5. **Communication** – Consider job related effectiveness in dealing with others. Does the employee express ideas clearly both orally and in writing, listen well and respond appropriately?

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

PART III – BEHAVIORAL TRAITS

1. **Dependability** – Consider the amount of time spent directing this employee. Does the employee monitor projects and exercise follow-through; adhere to time frames; is on time for meetings and appointments; and responds appropriately to instructions and procedures?

UnacceptableSuperior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

2. **Cooperation** – How well does the employee work with co-workers and supervisors as a contributing team member? Does the employee demonstrate consideration of others; maintain rapport with others; help others willingly?

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

3. **Initiative** – Consider how well the employee seeks and assumes greater responsibility, monitors projects independently, and follows through appropriately.

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

4. **Adaptability** – Consider the ease with which the employee adjusts to any change in duties, procedures, supervisors or work environment. How well does the employee accept new ideas and approaches to work, respond appropriately to constructive criticism and to suggestions for work improvement?

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

5. **Judgment** – Consider how well the employee effectively analyzes problems, determines appropriate action for solutions, and exhibits timely and decisive action; thinks logically.

Unacceptable Superior
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

6. **Attendance** – Consider number of absences, use of annual and sick leave in accordance with City of Norwalk policy.

☐Unacceptable ☐Acceptable

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

7. **Punctuality** – Consider work arrival and departure in accordance with departmental and City of Norwalk policy.

☐Unacceptable ☐Acceptable

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

PART IV – SUPERVISORY FACTORS

1. **Leadership** – Consider how well the employee demonstrates effective supervisory abilities; gains respect and cooperation; inspires and motivates subordinates; directs work group toward common goal.

Unacceptable Superior N/A
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

2. **Delegation** – How well does the employee demonstrate the ability to direct others in accomplishing work; effectively select and motivate staff; define assignments; oversee the work of subordinates?

Unacceptable Superior N/A
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

3. **Planning and Organizing** – Consider how well the employee plans and organizes work; coordinates with others, and establishes appropriate priorities; anticipates future needs; carries out assignments effectively.

Unacceptable Superior N/A
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

4. **Administration** – How well does the employee perform day-to-day administrative tasks; manage time; administer policies and implement procedures; maintain appropriate contact with supervisor and utilize funds, staff or equipment?

Unacceptable Superior N/A
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

5. **Personnel Management** – Consider how well the employee serves as a role model; provides guidance and opportunities to their staff for their development and advancement; resolves work-related employee problems; assist subordinates in accomplishing their work-related objectives. Does the employee communicate well with subordinates in a clear, concise, accurate, and timely manner and make useful suggestions?

Unacceptable Superior N/A
☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5 ☐

Weight: _____

Comments: _____

PART V – SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVES – WEIGHT

The Supervisor will indicate to what extent the objective was achieved.

Objective No.	Objective:
Objective Achieved: Yes ☐ No ☐	
Comments: (Rating Must Be Supported By Narrative)	
None Completed ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5	

Objective No.	Objective:
Objective Achieved: Yes ☐ No ☐	
Comments: (Rating Must Be Supported By Narrative)	
None Completed ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5	

Objective No.	Objective:
Objective Achieved: Yes ☐ No ☐	
Comments: (Rating Must Be Supported By Narrative)	
None Completed ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5	

Objective No.	Objective:
Objective Achieved: Yes ☐ No ☐	
Comments: (Rating Must Be Supported By Narrative)	
None Completed ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5	

Objective No.	Objective:
Objective Achieved: Yes ☐ No ☐	
Comments: (Rating Must Be Supported By Narrative)	
None Completed ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5	

Objective No.	Objective:
Objective Achieved: Yes ☐ No ☐	
Comments: (Rating Must Be Supported By Narrative)	
None Completed ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5	

Additional Supervisor's Comments Concerning Employee Growth and Development:	

Employee's Comments:

SIGNATURES Employee's signature confirms report was discussed with supervisor. It does not indicate Approval of Rating	SIGNED (Employee)	Date:
	SIGNED (Supervisor)	Date:
	SIGNED (Department Head)	Date:



CITY OF NORWALK
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
OBJECTIVE SETTING FORM

Employee		
Title	Signature	Date
Department		
RATING PERIOD:	From:	To:
Supervisor		
Title	Signature	Date

PURPOSE OF THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

- Facilitate joint planning between an employee and a supervisor on what the employee is expected to accomplish.
- Establish clear, achievable, measurable, results-oriented performance objectives, consistent with the department's priorities and mission and considered fair by both the employee and the supervisor.
- Promote ongoing communication between the employee and the supervisor concerning expectations, how well the employee is meeting these expectations, and what steps must be taken to ensure that objectives are met.
- Guide regular evaluations of progress and promotion of the employee's professional development. Identify corrective action needed when an employee has not accomplished a performance objective.
- Improve individual job performance and thereby increase the effectiveness of the agency.

CITY OF NORWALK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OBJECTIVE SETTING FORM

The employee, together with the supervisor, will list the employee's performance objectives for the fiscal year. Each objective should state what the employee plans to accomplish, identify performance measures to determine whether the objectives are accomplished, and specify the target date for completion. (Use additional sheets as needed)

Objective No. 1	Weight	Objective:
Performance Measures		
Objective No. 2	Weight	Objective:
Performance Measures		
Objective No. 3	Weight	Objective:
Performance Measures		
Objective No. 4	Weight	Objective:
Performance Measures		

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL & LABOR RELATIONS

CITY OF NORWALK

PAY PLAN

FOR

**NON-UNION*, APPOINTED AND ELECTED
OFFICIALS**

As approved by the Common Council *

* Non-Union employees shall include all Ordinance positions

Submitted to:
Personnel Committee
City of Norwalk
Adopted: January 23, 2007
Rev: February 13, 2013
April 12, 2016
October 11, 2016

the individual Directors. Effective July 1st each year's salaries shall be adjusted based on the terms and condition outlined herein. In the event, the increase moves the salary above the range, a lump sum payment will be given.

As condition precedent, Personnel Appraisal Forms must be completed and submitted to the Personnel Department by the date established by the Personnel department for the individual to be eligible for a merit increase.

D. Performance Bonus Awards:

In addition to the increases awarded pursuant to the Merit Matrix, employees may be eligible for increases from a discretionary bonus pool. The Director of Personnel shall submit with the "Annual Merit Matrix a request for an amount to fund the discretionary bonus pool. The distribution of the bonus amounts shall be at the Mayor's discretion; however, no employee shall receive an annual bonus of more than five (5%) percent of base pay. Bonuses received by employees whose salary is in the bottom quarter of their salary range shall be added to their base pay.

E. Pay Rates for New Positions: In the event a new Ordinance classification is established, the Personnel Department shall recommend to the Personnel Committee the appropriate pay grade. The Personnel Committee shall vote on the appropriate pay grade.

F. Reallocation of Positions: In the event of significant changes in the job content of a particular Ordinance position, the Personnel Director shall recommend to the Personnel Committee the appropriate pay grade.

Reallocation of a position does not impact the salary of any incumbent unless the incumbent is below the minimum or above the maximum of the new grade. In the event of the former, the incumbent's salary shall be adjusted to the minimum of the grade. In the latter case, the incumbent's salary shall remain fixed until the maximum of the new range reaches the incumbent's salary.

G. Elected Officials: The salary for elected officials and certain appointed officials shall be as follows:

Mayor	Midpoint of Director of Finance
Town Clerk	Minimum of Grants Coordinator
Registrar of Voters	At the 10 th Percentile of the Salary Range for Executive Assistant

As changes in the ranges are made, the above salaries will be adjusted accordingly. Changes in the salaries for elected officials shall be effective December 31st, of the year they are elected or reelected.

H. Position Status: All salary ranges and recommendations are for full time positions. If positions are filled on less than a full time basis, salaries shall be prorated and adjusted accordingly.

I. Maintenance of Salary Plan Objectives: In order to maintain the salary plan objectives, the Personnel Committee shall review the salary ranges. This review shall be as requested by the Personnel Committee and the results of such review shall be reported to the Common Council. If ranges need to be adjusted beyond what beyond what exist, then the new ranges must be approved by the Personnel Committee and the Common Council.

Effective **July 1, 2017** allocation of positions to grade shall be as follows:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
1. <u>Elected Officials</u>			
Mayor	Minimum of Dir. of Finance Effective 12/31/ 2012		
	Midpoint of Director of Finance Effective 12/31/2013		
Town Clerk	Minimum of Grants Coordinator Effective 12/31/2013		
Registrar of Voters	Minimum of Executive Assistant Effective 12/31/2012		
	10 th Percentile of Sal Range for Executive Assistant Eff. 12/31/2016		
2. <u>Department Heads</u>			
Director of Finance	\$125,143	\$147,043	\$168,944
Director of Public Works	\$118,886	\$140,786	\$162,687
Dir. Rec/Parks/Bldg. Mgmt.	\$118,886	\$140,786	\$162,687
Dir. of Health	\$118,886	\$140,786	\$162,687
Dir. of Personnel and Labor Rel.	\$118,886	\$140,786	\$162,687
Dir Combined Dispatch	\$94,277	\$111,953	\$129,629
Corporation Counsel (PT)	\$79,257	\$93,858	\$108,458
3. <u>Supervisors/Administrators</u>			
Deputy Corporation Counsel	\$118,886	\$140,786	\$162,687
Dir. of Mgmt. & Budgets	\$112,629	\$134,531	\$156,431
Assist. To Mayor	\$88,384	\$100,169	\$111,953
Grants Coordinator	\$93,858	\$106,372	\$118,886
Risk Manager	\$93,858	\$106,372	\$118,886
Personnel Administrator	\$81,344	\$93,858	\$106,371
Benefits Manager	\$81,344	\$93,858	\$106,371
Deputy Director of Emergency Preparedness Planning	\$75,086	\$87,601	\$100,116
Associate Corporation Counsel	\$67,987	\$79,772	\$91,557
City Clerk	\$68,830	\$81,344	\$91,124
Assist. Corporation Counsel (PT) 2/3 of the Asst. Corp. Counsel Minimum			
4. <u>Support Staff</u>			
Executive Assistant	\$56,315	\$68,830	\$81,344
Executive Secretary	\$56,315	\$68,830	\$81,344
Assistant City Clerk	\$56,315	\$68,830	\$78,898

- K. **Effective Date of Pay Plan:** January 1st, 2007; however, the initial adjustment to the salary ranges shall occur on January 1st, 2008. **Revised, effective February 13, 2013. Revised pay ranges effective July 1, 2016 and July 1, 2017(Approved Common Council 4/12/2016). Revised pay for Registrar of Voters (Approved Common Council 10/11/2016).**

Burney, Ray

To: Personnel Committee
Subject: Pay Plan Revision

The Pay Plan For Non-Union , Appointed and Elected Officials is revised and updated on a regular basis by the Human Resources (Personnel) Department and submitted to the Personnel Committee, and then the Common Council, for approval. Attached is the most recent version of that Pay Plan.

As you can see , the schedule of salary ranges was adjusted in 2016 and in 2017. However, no changes have been made to the Plan or to the Schedule since then. In both 2017 and 2018, the City requested, and the Common Council approved, salary increases of 2.36%, effective July 1, for all employees covered by this pay Plan. (These annual 2.36% increases to pay were consistent and identical to the wage adjustments received by the 600+ unionized employees of the City during the same fiscal years). A merit pool of \$50,000 was also requested and granted in each of these prior fiscal years for the Mayor to distribute at his discretion, in accordance with the terms of this Pay Plan.

For the Fiscal year 2019-2020 and going forward, the City is proposing a change to the Pay Plan schedules. The current Pay Plan creates inequities amongst City employees in similar positions and does not adequately address issues of compression, the competitive market, attraction and retention of employees, equal pay principles, and the “at will “ status of most of the employees covered by this Plan. Here are a few examples of the problems with the current Pay Plan provisions:

- Executive Secretaries- There are two Executive Secretaries covered by the Pay Plan. These two employees in those positions have work for the City for almost 10 years each. Their current salaries are \$64,369 and \$71,725. These salaries are different only because each of these employees were hired at different starting salaries in 2010. Since then, they have received the annual wage adjustments received by all other employees in this Pay Plan. Their functions, roles and responsibilities are similar. Had both of these employees been hired into a unionized Executive Secretary position, they would both now have an annual salary of \$75,985. This is because the unionized workforce of the City is subject to a wage progression that moves the employee through the wage steps as each year goes by. The NMEA, representing most clerical/administrative positions, has a 5 year wage progression to the top rate. Because these two Executive Secretaries perform “confidential” tasks, they are not permitted to be in a union, but the nature and quantity of the work they perform is certainly comparable to the Unionized Executive Secretary. Their compensation should be the same.
- Manager level positions- There are 5 or 6 Manager level positions that are covered by the Pay Plan. Like the Executive Secretaries, these positions are not in a Union because of the confidential nature of the work they perform for the City. But the contributions and responsibilities of these Managers is equivalent to the Managers that are covered by the Union contracts. However, the compensation paid to these Managers in the Pay Plan is far below the compensation of Managers represented by either the NMEA or NASA. For example, one Manager covered by the Pay Plan has worked for the City for 19 years and currently has an annual salary of \$91,656. Had his position been subject to Union representation and the wage progression, this Manager would have a current salary of \$114,267.
- Senior level positions- The Comptroller position for the City is covered by the NASA agreement and is subject to the 11 year wage progression in that contract. The Director of Management and Budgets is subject to the Pay Plan. Both of these positions are direct reports to the Chief Financial Officer and perform critical functions for the City. They are peers in the City hierarchy and are both responsible for managing significant staffs and initiatives. The Director of Management and Budgets has an annual salary of \$134,531. The Comptroller has an annual salary of \$144,046 and will move up in the wage progression on 7/1/19 to \$150,138. The Comptroller will continue to move through the contractual wage progression steps for the next 9 years. There is no mechanism under the current Pay Plan for the Director of Management and Budgets to receive an increase in salary except for annual wage increases. The inequity between the compensation level of these two positions will continue to grow and will never be resolved.

In order to remedy the multiple problems and inadequacies with the current Pay Plan, the City is proposing that the positions covered by the Pay Plan be subject to wage progression steps similar to the wage progression in the NASA agreement. The NASA agreement is a valid benchmark because there are similar positions covered in that contract, and the Common Council has previously decided that the benefits provisions in the NASA agreement will govern the benefits available to the employees covered by the Pay Plan. (Vacations, personal days, sick leave, H&W benefits, pension and 401a plans for employees covered by the Pay Plan are the same as set forth in the NASA agreement).

In order to establish the 11 step wage progression for employees covered by the Pay Plan (NASA has an 11 step wage progression), the minimum, midpoint and maximum salaries from 1/1/17 were adjusted to reflect the 2.36% wage increase granted on 7/1/18 and the 2.36% increase requested for 7/1/19. After these adjustments, the difference between the recalculated minimum and maximum salaries were divided into 9 equal steps, to create an 11 step wage progression. This spreadsheet is attached.

The City will place each of the employees covered by this Pay Plan into the appropriate step on this new matrix. As with the NASA wage progression, employees covered by this revised Pay Plan will move through these steps on each succeeding July 1 until the employee reaches the final step. Again, as with the Unionized employee wage progressions, this matrix will be adjusted on an annual basis to reflect the authorized wage increases. The City can place the employees in the appropriate step on this matrix and stay within the budgetary amount previously set aside in the budget process for salary adjustments to this group of employees.

The City requests that the Personnel Committee, and then the Common Council, approve this revised wage step matrix for employees subject to this Pay Plan, approve the budgeted 2.36% of wages to fund the placement of employees at the appropriate step on the matrix, and to approve the budgeted \$50,000 merit pool to be distributed at the mayor's discretion. No salary adjustments nor merit payments will be made until performance appraisals are completed on employees subject to the performance appraisal process.

Ray Burney
Director of Personnel and Labor Relations
City of Norwalk
125 East Ave.
Norwalk, CT 06851
Office: (203) 854-7724
Cell: (203) 984-8591



Ray Burney
Director of Personnel and Labor Relations
City of Norwalk
125 East Ave.
Norwalk, CT 06851
Office: (203) 854-7724
Cell: (203) 984-8591

7/1/2019 2.36%	7/1/2019 Ranges		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	Minimum	Midpoint Maximum											
Chief Financial Officer	\$131,119	\$154,066 \$177,012	\$131,119	\$135,708	\$140,298	\$144,887	\$149,476	\$154,066	\$158,655	\$163,244	\$167,834	\$172,423	\$177,012
Chief of Operations & Pub Wrks	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Chief of Economic & Com Dev	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Chief of Staff	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Chief of Community Services	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Chief of Human Resources	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Dir. Of Recreation & Parks	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Dir. of Health	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Dir. Com Dispatch	\$104,898	\$124,564 \$144,230	\$104,898	\$108,831	\$112,764	\$116,698	\$120,631	\$124,564	\$128,497	\$132,430	\$136,364	\$140,297	\$144,230
Corporation Counsel (PT)	\$91,306	\$108,125 \$124,944	\$91,306	\$94,670	\$98,034	\$101,397	\$104,761	\$108,125	\$111,489	\$114,853	\$118,216	\$121,580	\$124,944
Deputy Corporation Counsel	\$124,565	\$147,510 \$170,455	\$124,565	\$129,154	\$133,743	\$138,332	\$142,921	\$147,510	\$152,099	\$156,688	\$161,277	\$165,866	\$170,455
Dir. of Mgmt. & Budgets	\$118,008	\$140,955 \$163,902	\$118,008	\$122,597	\$127,187	\$131,776	\$136,366	\$140,955	\$145,544	\$150,134	\$154,723	\$159,313	\$163,902
Risk Manager	\$98,340	\$111,453 \$124,565	\$98,340	\$100,963	\$103,585	\$106,208	\$108,830	\$111,453	\$114,075	\$116,698	\$119,320	\$121,943	\$124,565
Personnel Administrator	\$85,229	\$98,340 \$111,451	\$85,229	\$87,851	\$90,473	\$93,096	\$95,718	\$98,340	\$100,962	\$103,584	\$106,207	\$108,829	\$111,451
Benefits Manager	\$85,229	\$98,340 \$111,451	\$85,229	\$87,851	\$90,473	\$93,096	\$95,718	\$98,340	\$100,962	\$103,584	\$106,207	\$108,829	\$111,451
Deputy Dir of Emg Plan	\$78,672	\$91,785 \$104,898	\$78,672	\$81,295	\$83,917	\$86,540	\$89,162	\$91,785	\$94,408	\$97,030	\$99,653	\$102,275	\$104,898
Associate Corporation Counsel	\$75,646	\$88,759 \$101,871	\$75,646	\$78,269	\$80,891	\$83,514	\$86,136	\$88,759	\$91,381	\$94,004	\$96,626	\$99,249	\$101,871
City Clerk	\$72,117	\$85,229 \$98,340	\$72,117	\$74,739	\$77,362	\$79,984	\$82,606	\$85,229	\$87,851	\$90,473	\$93,095	\$95,718	\$98,340
Grants Coord/Com Manager	\$59,004	\$72,117 \$85,229	\$59,004	\$61,627	\$64,249	\$66,872	\$69,494	\$72,117	\$74,739	\$77,362	\$79,984	\$82,607	\$85,229
Executive Assistant	\$59,004	\$72,117 \$85,229	\$59,004	\$61,627	\$64,249	\$66,872	\$69,494	\$72,117	\$74,739	\$77,362	\$79,984	\$82,607	\$85,229
Executive Secretary	\$59,004	\$72,117 \$85,229	\$59,004	\$61,627	\$64,249	\$66,872	\$69,494	\$72,117	\$74,739	\$77,362	\$79,984	\$82,607	\$85,229
Assistant City Clerk	\$59,004	\$72,117 \$85,229	\$59,004	\$61,627	\$64,249	\$66,872	\$69,494	\$72,117	\$74,739	\$77,362	\$79,984	\$82,607	\$85,229