

**PROCEEDINGS OF**  
**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WEST BLOOMFIELD**  
**4550 WALNUT LAKE ROAD**  
**EMPLOYEE LOUNGE**

**Thursday, May 28, 2009 --- 6:45 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Brown at 6:56 p.m.

Members Present:           Trustee Larry Brown  
                                  Trustee Steve Kaplan  
                                  Trustee Howard Rosenberg

Members Absent:           None

Staff Present:             Kent Herbert, Human Resources Director  
                                  Catherine Shaughnessy, Township Clerk  
                                  Joseph Chapin, Deputy Police Chief  
                                  Curt Lawson, Police Lieutenant

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Agenda approved as presented.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Postponed until the next Personnel Committee Meeting.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**General Employee Hiring Policy**

Mr. Herbert stated that the following revisions were made to the policy:

(1) Section 5c: *“Each job description shall contain a table of required and desirable training skills and experience formulated by each department head and approved by the Personnel Committee. Department heads with vacancies may assist in the assembly of this table.”*

**General Employee Hiring Policy** (Continued)

Ms. Shaughnessy stated she did not have any objections to applications, testing and following a policy. However, there should be some room for a department head to make a decision with respect to interviewing candidates. She indicated that the department head should be the hiring authority and not the Personnel Director. Mr. Herbert stated the policy does not indicate that the Personnel Director is the hiring authority. Ms. Shaughnessy indicates he misspoke and stated that it was the Oral Board.

Mr. Herbert stated that there are instances in which 400 applications need to be reviewed and he was not aware of any department head that had the time to screen those applications. He suggested that the department head assist in the screening process for any vacancies within the department according to the established criteria.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the job description exists and can be utilized to determine whether a candidate is qualified for the position. Mr. Herbert stated although that was true, she had asked that additional criteria be utilized in addition to the job description.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated that she had an issue with the testing of candidates. She indicated that candidates who met criteria for another department were tested for a position in her department. She felt that the job description should be utilized in determining eligibility for a position; however, the department head should be involved in the screening as well as interviewing of candidates.

Mr. Brown stated the policy included language to address that. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that was not reflected in Section 2-76. Mr. Rosenberg asked to review her copy of the ordinance and indicated that it was different from what the Committee was given. Mr. Herbert stated that the language within that section is identical in both copies.

Mr. Rosenberg referred to Section 6a of his copy of the ordinance which he provided to Ms. Shaughnessy. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that the language within Section 6a was quite different from that in Section 2-76. She questioned which document the Committee was working from. Ms. Shaughnessy indicated that there was language in Section 6a that was not approved by the Township Board; yet, it has been included in the revised document.

Mr. Herbert stated the Township Board approved the ordinance and policy. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that was not correct. Mr. Rosenberg recalled that the ordinance was approved at the board meeting.

**General Employee Hiring Policy** (Continued)

Mr. Herbert stated the policy was approved by the Township Board with a 4-3 vote. The policy was rescinded, but not the ordinance and therefore, it still stands. The Board directed the Committee to revise the policy and bring it back before the Board for review. Therefore, the Committee currently has the revised policy before them for review.

Mr. Brown stated the purpose of this meeting is to review the proposed policy which will replace the existing ordinance. Therefore, the Committee was directed by the Township Board to review the policy and make any necessary changes. If this policy is approved by the Board, it will be the hiring policy for the general office positions.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated the Township Board has not been privy to any of this information. Mr. Brown stated the Board will not be privy until the Personnel Committee comes back before the Board with the proposed policy.

Mr. Rosenberg suggested that the Committee allow Ms. Shaughnessy an opportunity to discuss the issues she has with the current ordinance and determine whether the documents address those issues. Ms. Shaughnessy stated she did not have an opportunity to review the proposed policy. Mr. Brown asked whether the policy was sent to Ms. Shaughnessy. Mr. Herbert indicated that he did send it to her.

Mr. Kaplan asked when the policy would be placed before the Township Board for consideration. Mr. Herbert replied, "June 15, 2009."

Ms. Shaughnessy referred to the following language, "*The Oral Board shall be two individuals selected by the Personnel Officer*" and expressed objection because she did not feel the Personnel Director should select the members of the Oral Board. Mr. Brown asked why. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that the individuals should be selected by the department head. Mr. Herbert referred to the remaining language within that section, "*...which may include the Personnel Officer and the Department Head seeking to fill the vacancy.*" Mr. Kaplan stated that it was appropriate to have both the Personnel Specialist and Department Head to conduct interviews. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that language was not reflected in the ordinance. Mr. Brown stated that language would be included in the policy. Mr. Kaplan stated she should be pleased with the change since it would be beneficial to her.

Mr. Herbert indicated that there is a proposal to remove the computer testing unless it is for a certain type of position. Mr. Brown questioned the removal of the computer test since computers are used on a daily basis in a lot of jobs.

**General Employee Hiring Policy** (Continued)

Mr. Herbert stated that some positions do not require a certain typing speed. Ms. Shaughnessy indicated that she objected to the typing test since she was not interested in speed to perform the tasks in her department.

Mr. Rosenberg stated although that may be true for Ms. Shaughnessy's department, there may be areas in which speed and accuracy are important. Mr. Kaplan suggested that language be added to indicate that if computer skills are an important aspect of a position, it shall comprise a certain percentage of the interview. He asked where that language would fit under Section 6b since it has been deleted. Mr. Brown suggested that an additional line be added in one of the sections.

Mr. Kaplan suggested that the scores be weighted as 50, 30, and 20. However, if the typing skills are not an aspect, it is disregarded and the scores be weighted at 75 and 25.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated that some individuals do not do well on written tests, but that may not necessarily mean they will not do well in a particular position. Therefore, she questioned the necessity for a test. Mr. Kaplan stated it is an objective and indicated that it is 75% of the weighted average and not the score. Mr. Brown suggested that the language be added to Section 6b. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the test should be conducted if word processing skills are required in a position.

Ms. Shaughnessy asked about the oral exam and test score. Mr. Brown stated that those items are each weighted at 50% of an applicant's overall testing score. Ms. Shaughnessy stated she wanted the Department Head to review the results of the scoring with the Personnel Director. Mr. Kaplan stated that is an administrative function. Ms. Shaughnessy replied, "Yes" and indicated that she wanted it to be included in the policy so that there is no question as to who conducts the review.

Mr. Brown referred to the language in Section 7a which indicates. "...*except for department head positions, the Personnel Officer will present up to four applicants. Up to 12 top applicants for an open position will be presented to the Personnel Officer or higher authority.*" He indicated that the next paragraph refers to 8 applicants and in Section 6b it reflects 16 highest scores. He asked why the change from 8 to 12 applicants. There was a consensus to leave it at 8 applicants for a maximum of 16 applicants.

Ms. Shaughnessy referred to the language in Section 7a which indicates, "*if such applicants are deemed unacceptable in writing by the hiring authority...*"

**General Employee Hiring Policy** (Continued)

Mr. Herbert stated the Personnel Director does not do the hiring; rather it is done by department head that has the vacancy. The Personnel Director simply provides a pool of applicants for the department head to choose from. If a department head does not choose from the 8 candidates on the list provided, the department would be required to submit that in writing. Ms. Shaughnessy expressed objection to that provision and asked the reason for requiring that. Mr. Rosenberg stated it is good public policy and being a municipality, the administration must ensure that it is not accused of favoritism.

Ms. Shaughnessy stated that requiring department heads to put in writing the reason for not selecting a candidate from the provided list sets them up for unfavorable circumstances. Mr. Kaplan stated that a department head would verbally indicate reasons for not hiring an individual. Mr. Brown stated the department head is involved in the entire process and therefore, he or she is aware of each candidate's qualifications. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that it was not good public policy to require a department head to put their reasons in writing.

Mr. Brown expressed concern with candidates being selected due to favoritism or the individual knowing someone in house and therefore, selection could be the 16<sup>th</sup> person or an individual further down the list. Mr. Kaplan asked how that could be prevented from occurring. Mr. Brown stated that an explanation would be required as to why the other candidates were not selected.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that if the first 8 candidates are not acceptable by the hiring authority, how do the department heads inform the Personnel Officer informed. Mr. Herbert stated that it could be done verbally. There was a consensus to remove the language pertaining to the submittal of a written reason. Mr. Kaplan suggested the following language: *"If the applicants are deemed unacceptable, the next eight applicants shall be presented to the hiring authority by the Personnel Officer."*

Mr. Kaplan referred to line 2 in Section 7 and suggested the language be changed as follows: *"except for department heads, the Personnel Officer shall present four applicants to the Township Board."*

Ms. Shaughnessy asked about the temporary employees. Mr. Herbert stated those individuals are not covered in the policy. Ms. Shaughnessy referred to the following language in Section 8a: *"An officer or department head with budgetary authority for a temporary employee shall notify the Personnel Officer that they want to recruit for that position. Upon receipt of such notice, the Personnel Officer shall provide the public notice and applicant notifications as described in Section 4. Eligibility lists, written tests, and job qualifications described in Section 25 are not required for temporary positions."*

**General Employee Hiring Policy** (Continued)

Ms. Shaughnessy stated this is a process that would apply to election workers. Mr. Rosenberg asked how it was currently handled. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that notifications are sent to individuals who worked in previous elections and is done on an as-needed basis. Mr. Kaplan stated an exception could be made to election workers and suggested the following language: "*Temporary election workers serving for less than 20 weeks are not covered by the requirements in this section.*"

Mr. Kaplan suggested the following language in Section 7: "*...present three or four applicants.*" This removes the words "up to."

Mr. Brown suggested that "hiring authority" be replaced with "department head" throughout the policy.

Mr. Brown referred to Section 2 regarding long-term part-time positions and asked that if an individual worked more than 20 weeks, they would be considered a union employee. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes" and indicated that is reflected in the union contract as well. Mr. Brown asked that the language in the union contract be provided to the Committee. Ms. Shaughnessy asked how that would affect the policy. Mr. Brown stated that it was important to know whether an individual who works 20 weeks or more and averages 30 hours or less is either union or non-union after a certain period of time. In addition, the individual could become full-time and that is something that must be determined as well.

Ms. Shaughnessy expressed concern with respect to inconsistent language in Section 5 regarding the computer testing, which she thought had been removed previously. In an effort to address inconsistencies in the policy, there was consensus to add the following language: "*Written tests, and computer tests, if applicable to the employment position, should be given to the applicant.*"

Ms. Shaughnessy asked how long the eligibility list was valid for. Mr. Herbert replied, "Six months and can be extended for an additional six months." Ms. Shaughnessy asked if that was at the discretion of the Personnel Officer. Mr. Herbert replied, "Yes." Mr. Kaplan asked if six months was standard. Mr. Herbert stated that one year is standard.

Mr. Kaplan referred to the last line in Section 8 and indicated that applicants is singular and therefore, should read as such "*applicant's.*" He referred to Section 9 and suggested the following language: "*Amendments to this policy must be presented.*"

**General Employee Hiring Policy** (Continued)

**Motion by Mr. Kaplan and supported by Mr. Brown to recommend approval of the revisions to the General Employee Hiring Policy to the Township Board.**

**Ayes: Brown, Kaplan, Rosenberg**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: None**

**Motion carried**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Review and Revision of Police and Cadet Hiring Policies**

Mr. Brown stated the change was proposed in Section 3b. Mr. Kaplan referred to Section 1f. and suggested the following language: "*Consideration will be given to any and all traffic and criminal violations.*"

Lt. Lawson asked why the policy would be different for the cadets vs. police officers. Mr. Rosenberg stated there was a suggestion to give preference to a cadet that might have the proper skills and background, which would give the department latitude to give personal consideration. Mr. Brown stated the scores will be changed from 70 to 80.

Mr. Brown referred to Section 4 and suggested that the eligibility list be valid for a period of six months with the option to extend it for an additional six months.

Mr. Kaplan suggested that the Oral Board consist of Deputy Police Chief and either the Administrative Lieutenant or Administrative Sergeant, to be determined by the Police Chief.

Mr. Rosenberg suggested the following language: "*The Oral Board shall consist of the Deputy Police Chief, either the Administrative Lieutenant or the Sergeant in charge of cadets, to be chosen by the Chief of Police.*"

Mr. Rosenberg asked if it was necessary to maintain Section 5(3). Deputy Police Chief Chapin stated that it should remain.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if all cadets were new hires. Deputy Police Chief Chapin replied, "Yes."

### **Review and Revision of Police and Cadet Hiring Policies** (Continued)

Deputy Police Chief stated that in the event of layoffs of police officers, those individuals should be allowed the option of serving in the capacity of a cadet. Ms. Shaughnessy agreed that all employees should be given the opportunity to apply for these positions.

Mr. Rosenberg referred to Section 4(1) and asked for a definition of "new hire." Mr. Kaplan suggested the following definition: "*An individual not currently employed by the township.*" Mr. Rosenberg stated that there should be language relative to the preference given to a person employed by the township. Mr. Brown stated that could be addressed in another paragraph.

Mr. Kaplan stated that if a police officer is laid off, he or she should automatically be offered the position of a cadet if they want to serve in that position. Ms. Shaughnessy stated that it should not be automatic, but rather, those individuals should be the first ones eligible for those positions.

Ms. Shaughnessy suggested that the policy be written for two types of people: (1) new hires not currently employed by the township and (2) applicants currently employed by the township. There could be one sentence indicating that police officers and dispatchers are exempt from the cadet exam. Mr. Kaplan suggested that any former police officer should be exempt from the cadet exam and indicated that this could include experienced officers from other communities. Deputy Police Chief Chapin and Ms. Shaughnessy disagreed and indicated that the focus should be to protect the township's officers.

Mr. Rosenberg stated the intent on the new hire language is that unless a former police employee is being hired, the individual would be required to go through the entire process. Therefore, the language in Section 4(1) and Section 5(1) should indicate, "*The Police Chief shall make a contingent offer of employment subject to...*"

### **Review of Proposed Changes to Employee Manual**

Mr. Brown asked what was being changed. Mr. Herbert stated the Committee requested benefit reductions for department heads and those are the primary changes.

Mr. Brown stated that all the changes to the benefit packages need to be reflected in the Employee Manual.

**Review of Proposed Changes to Employee Manual** (Continued)

Mr. Rosenberg stated the changes discussed in the Township Board closed session were changes that were going to be proposed to the two General Office Employee unions and are not in effect. The township could potentially impose those changes on the TPOAM, but that has not been done yet.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that Mr. Herbert has gone one step ahead and made changes to the Employee Manual. Mr. Herbert stated that has not been done yet, because the Committee has to adopt them first. Mr. Rosenberg stated he was not prepared to adopt nor discuss those changes at this meeting. Mr. Brown stated that it could change between now and the negotiations with the two groups.

Mr. Herbert asked if the Committee was indicating that they did not want to make any changes until the union contracts were approved. Mr. Rosenberg stated that was correct and reiterated that he did not wish to consider any of those changes.

Mr. Herbert stated the Committee could cover the items that do not involve wages and benefits. He referred to page 2.1 and indicated that the definition of a full-time employee is currently reflected as 37.5 hours and suggested that it be changed to 32.5 hours.

Mr. Brown asked why. Mr. Herbert stated the township could go with a shortened work week. Mr. Brown stated the township has not done that yet. Mr. Rosenberg agreed and indicated that he did not want to consider that issue at this meeting either.

Mr. Brown suggested that Mr. Herbert put those issues aside for the new Human Resources Director.

Mr. Herbert referred to Section 5b regarding the presentation of a grievance. He stated that department heads should not be submitting grievances to the Personnel Director, but rather, they should be submitted directly to the Township Supervisor. He stated that step 1 would eliminate the Personnel Director from the process, which is what should be done.

Mr. Rosenberg asked why. Mr. Herbert stated that department heads should not be submitting grievances to another department head.

Mr. Herbert referred to Article 11 regarding inclement weather. Mr. Rosenberg asked if this was changed by the Supervisor and whether she had the authority to do so. Mr. Kaplan replied, "Yes, if the Board does not take action."

**Review of Proposed Changes to Employee Manual** (Continued)

Mr. Brown stated that schools will close on a very cold day and town hall was closed on a day in which other surrounding communities were opened. He disagreed with the language in the manual and indicated that the policy should be reviewed by the Township Board. Mr. Herbert stated the Employee Manual is adopted by the full board. Mr. Brown stated he did not recall adopting the manual and questioned how town hall was closed one day during the winter. Mr. Kaplan stated the Supervisor made the decision to close town hall and unless there is a policy prohibiting that, she is able to do so. Mr. Brown stated this issue needs to be discussed at the Township Board.

Mr. Kaplan asked about the current rule. Mr. Brown indicated that *“work for non-emergency, non-vital workers will be cancelled only in the case that the Governor, Michigan State Police or the West Bloomfield Police Department officially declares an emergency that bars all non-essential vehicles from the road.”*

Mr. Herbert indicated there were proposed changes to Section S11.1 relative to travel expenses.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Marya Duncan*

Marya Duncan  
HR Specialist