

TO: Harper Donahue, Human Resources Director
FROM: Calla Little, Parking Asset/GIS Coordinator
DATE: 19 November 2021
SUBJECT: RE: Parking Asset/GIS Coordinator - Parking Division

I am requesting a review of the recommendation to reclassify the Parking Asset/GIS Coordinator into CG18, Range 12. It is my opinion that this study has not applied a consistent approach to performing comparisons between the related class specifications. The memo has focused on only a portion of the duties required of the Parking Asset/GIS Coordinator, omitting any discussion of the similarities of duties to that of a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator or the differences of duties to that of IT Specialist or Asset Manager 2. Had these comparisons occurred, there would be greater consideration given to placing the Parking Asset/GIS Coordinator in the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator specification.

Before expanding upon the reasons for my request, I would like to mention two sections of the personnel rules that are the basis of my objections. It is written in section 4(B)(3)(c)(ii) that to determine the appropriate classification of a position “the duties and responsibilities of the position under review will be compared to the positions currently included in the same classification and salary range as well as other positions in proposed or related classifications and salary ranges. Considerations include but are not limited to:

- (a) Technical knowledge;
- (b) Specialized knowledge;
- (c) Specialized training related to the position;
- (d) Supervisory responsibility;
- (e) Managerial responsibility;
- (f) Budgetary authority;
- (g) Programmatic authority;
- (h) Decisional impact;
- (i) Policy development;
- (j) Policy interpretation;
- (k) Autonomy;
- (l) Required level of education;
- (m) Required licenses/certifications;
- (n) Required years of experience;
- (o) Physical and mental demands of the position;
- (p) Physical environment in which the position functions, including any hazardous conditions present;
- (q) Compensation level of the position as compared to the relevant labor market.”

According to the above, studies should compare, at a minimum, each of these categories across each related classification and salary range. The second section of the personnel rules I will reference is 4(B)(3)(c)(iv), where it is stated that “Once the classification study is complete, the position is placed within the classification and salary range that best reflects the *majority* of the duties performed by the position [emphasis added]”. Therefore, a position does not need to fit perfectly within a specification, but rather should be placed in a specification where the majority of its duties align.

Based on the way comparisons are presented in the memo, it does not seem that these rules have been applied consistently to this position study. The memo presents two arguments that align me to IT Specialist 4 and Asset Manager 2. The first is that because I am performing leadership level work on complex systems and programs, my position is consistent and aligns with IT Specialist 4 and Asset Manager 2. This is not inaccurate; however, it is also true that a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator performs leadership level work on complex systems and programs. If the comparison were made consistently across all three related specifications, the same logic could be used to say my position is consistent, comparable, and closely aligns to Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator. While I agree with the assessment that my duties have increased in leadership and complexity, I do not agree with its presentation as an argument to align me to 18/12 rather than 18/13.

The second argument presented is related to my supervisory responsibilities. The supervisory responsibilities of the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator are compared to mine, and since I do not supervise more than one technical position, it is concluded that I should be placed one range lower. It is true that the current Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinators supervise larger teams than I do, but presenting supervisory responsibly as “in contrast” to my position duties is false. Additionally, the fact that I am supervising a larger team than an Asset Manager 2 or IT Specialist 4, who don’t supervise any positions, is omitted. This does not feel like a fair comparison of position duties. If a consistent approach were used, it would be clear that my supervisory duties do not align with an Asset Manager 2 or IT Specialist 4 either. Therefore, I would not fall into either category and supervisory responsibility alone couldn’t be used as the basis for excluding me from the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator specification.

In summary, since the information presented to align me to IT Specialist 4 and Asset Manager 2 could also be used to align me to Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator and the information presented to exclude me from Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator could also be used to exclude me from IT Specialist 4 or Asset Manager 2, I argue that the recommendation to place me in 18/12 is not supported by the information provided in the memo. Based on my own review of items a through q in section 4(B)(3)(c)(ii), there are more differences between these three specifications than are described in the memo.

I believe the memo misses some of these differences due to the emphasis given to Cityworks and the failure to discuss other position duties. CMMS is only listed as 20% of my position description, yet nearly every paragraph includes the word construction, maintenance, or Cityworks, even in paragraphs where these aren’t related to the rest of the paragraph’s content. In some cases, the inclusion of the word has the effect of minimizing the impact of my work

beyond CMMS. This is a trend throughout the document, occurrences of which I can highlight if desired.

Additionally, within the presentation of CMMS duties, there is no discussion of how these duties align or differ from the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinators, two of which are responsible for overseeing and managing the CMMS of their divisions. The failure to discuss these differences is reflective of the overall failure to discuss the differences between the items listed in section 4(B)(3)(c)(ii) for the Asset Manager 2, IT Specialist 4, and Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator specifications.

From my own review, differences in required knowledge, programmatic authority, policy development, autonomy level, and supervisory responsibility exist. First, the knowledge required of a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator is different from an Asset Manager 2, as a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator requires a higher degree of GIS, mapping, database, and programming skills. The Asset Manager 2 requires less of these skills and more financial and statistical skills. My position's technical and specialized knowledge are exactly those required of a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator.

Second, there is a difference in programmatic authority. The Asset Manager 2 and IT Specialist 4 are not charged with setting goals and objectives for their programs, but rather report to a higher level manager who sets them. I do not have the goals and objectives of my programs defined for me, but rather have to define them myself based on input from all levels of division staff, as well as consider the direction of the City as a whole. This is in line with the work of a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator.

Third, there is a similar distinction if policy development is investigated. I am responsible for establishing program policies and guidelines. This is what is required of a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator, not an Asset Manager 2 or IT Specialist 4, who is tasked with implementing or recommending policy.

Fourth, while all three positions are highly independent, the autonomy of my position is more like that of a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator. The Asset Manager 2 and IT Specialist 4 work under a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator or Principal IT Specialist. The Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator and Principal IT Specialist have been identified as comparable positions. I do not work under either of these positions, but work under the limited supervision of the Parking Division Manager, which is more in line with the autonomy of a Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator or Principal IT Specialist.

Finally, as mentioned earlier, though the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinators supervise more positions, I do still have supervisory responsibility and have to carry out all of the associated duties, such as hiring, discipline, and work prioritization. Performing these functions adds additional administrative tasks to my position and requires a special set of skills and supervisory knowledge. Neither the Asset Manager 2 nor the IT Specialist 4 is required to fulfill these duties. Though it is obvious current Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinators are required to spend more time doing these tasks, it should not be a deciding factor since section 3(c) of the personnel rules

states that the “quantity of work performed is not a factor unless the quantity is such that it affects complexity or responsibility level of the position”.

These differences make my position comparable to the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator specification and should warrant a discussion of whether the majority of my duties do in fact align with the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator specification. Throughout this reclassification process, it has been requested that HR qualify, in writing, the differences between my position and the Computer Mapping/GIS Coordinator specification. This does not seem an unreasonable request considering in 4(a) of the personnel rules the City recognizes the importance of a well maintained and defined classification system for employee recruitment and retention. Had a comparison been provided, it would be much easier to either A) accept the results of the study as valid or B) respond more pointedly to items I may disagree with. Not doing so has left myself and others unable to understand what the required criteria are, and therefore, unable to respond meaningfully to the study or understand when future reclassification requests might be appropriate.