

2010 MAR -8 AM 8: 44

Appeal of job study recommendation regarding Assessment Aides 2 and Aides 1,
March 5th, 2010.

Dear Director of Human Resources for the City of Madison,

Mr. Brad Wirtz:

Please consider this appeal of the job study recommendation for Assessment Aides. We ask that you work with us to improve this recommendation. Although many of our duties sound similar to other jobs, they are not really. We would like you to reconsider the level of responsibility and skills that our job requires.

As you know, Property Code Inspectors 1 are not required to be licensed or certified to practice in the State of Wisconsin, whereas, knowledge and understanding of Wisconsin Statute Chapter 70 General Property Taxes is a requirement to perform our job as Property Assessment Technicians satisfactorily. Property Code Inspectors 1 are required to enforce City ordinances specific to general environmental nuisances on a general knowledge level. The legal requirements of Property Assessing clearly indicate a higher range of 12 similar to city positions for which possession of a state certification or license is a condition of continued employment.

As an Assessment Technician, the application of assessments begins with knowledge of construction design and materials, construction methods, architecture and architectural

drawings. Property Code Inspectors have no similar knowledge requirement.

Interpretation and translation of complex architectural drawings of multi-story construction such that AutoCAD computerized drawing files can be created for analysis is an additional duty completed by the Assessment Technician 1. Property Code Inspectors require no such capabilities.

The knowledge and ability to transform field observations and cost data into interim assessments using methods recommended in Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual, is required for state certification and is used in conjunction with the work performed by Appraiser 1, 2, 3, and 4. Whereas, there isn't a comparable requirement of state statutes knowledge utilized by the Property Code Inspectors

In our job, we need to be able to interpret and translate metes and bounds property descriptions, and other forms of legal descriptions into computerized Deed Plot drawings as a function of Assessment Technicians and is not similar to any job duties performed by Property Code Inspectors.

Assessment Technicians work is directly supportive and substantially contributes to the work of all Commercial and Residential Property Appraisers 1 through 4, and with the Residential and Commercial Supervisors, comparable to Engineering Aide 1/2 and Architectural Aide 1/2, in their support capacity.

There exists a longstanding Career Ladders training agreement in this department. The recommended Range 10 for Assessment Technicians 2 creates two issues for administration of the program. First, a five (5) range jump to Range 15 for promotion to Appraiser 1 seems incongruous with other Career Ladders programs in the City with narrower ranges. Extended work duties performed by Assessment Technicians at the level of Appraiser 1 Range 15 under the Career Ladders training program goes beyond what was explicitly expected in the agreement, and has become the norm in the Assessors' office. Second, the extended Range 15 work performed by Assessment Technicians is a disincentive for management to effectively promote. Appraiser level work may be accomplished by Assessment Technicians indefinitely, at a much lower cost to the departmental budget. We therefore believe the rate should reflect the three range Career Ladders progression from Appraiser 1 to Appraiser 2, that would be similar to a Pay Range 12 for Technician 2, improving program administration and employee expectations, and accounting for the extended higher level of Appraiser work regularly performed on the job, in addition to everyone's own full job responsibilities as a Technician.

The proposed status change to the positions is equivalent to one pay range increase. The most recent job posting for the entry position in 2008 did not deliver a qualified applicant although a new test was developed and approximately 100 persons took the exam yielded a good statistically normal distribution of scores, and the four individuals who had the best scores were interviewed and rejected as unqualified. This proves that the standards

for our position are quite high. The position went unfilled and was eliminated in 2010 because of new budget requirements. The technical work load did not decrease.

Similarly, because no one qualified for hire at the time of the testing, this indicates that no qualified people applied for the position at current pay range. We do not think it likely that any qualified applicants would be found at compensation Range 8 either, since the improvement in salary would be only \$93.02 monthly or \$26.26 weekly. The recruitment and retention standard of the City has been to set compensation levels adequately to retain the highest quality personnel for each position. We believe this data indicates a higher compensation level is needed to achieve adequate recruitment of qualified personnel into these positions.

We acknowledge there are similarities in the job descriptions between the Property Code Inspectors and that of the Assessment Technicians. Walking around a house does have some similarities to it. A closer look is needed. We respectfully ask you to reconcile this appeal with us. The training it takes to develop appropriate skills and experiences in this position, the unique skills and knowledge needed for work in Assessment, the use of lengthy and detailed legislative requirements inherent in performing the Assessment work, hold a greater measure of weight than what is necessary to be a Property Code Inspector. We hope you agree. We place ourselves at your early disposal to discuss improvements of the recommendation to reconcile this matter. We all look forward to meeting with you very soon.

Respectfully yours,

On behalf of

Jerry Bentz

Dan Dixon

Amanda Frankewicz

Ken One Peace

Ken Seifert