



## Human Resources Department

Harper Donahue, IV, Human Resources Director

Madison Municipal Building, Suite 200  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
Phone: (608) 266-4615  
Fax: (608) 267-1115  
[hr@cityofmadison.com](mailto:hr@cityofmadison.com)  
[www.cityofmadison.com/hr](http://www.cityofmadison.com/hr)

Date: November 13, 2018

To: Meagan Hatfield, Program Assistant 2

From: Harper Donahue, IV, Human Resources Director

Re: Appeal of Job Study Recommendation

Thank you for meeting with me on November 7, 2018, to discuss your appeal of the position study done on your current position. In accordance with City Personnel Rules, I have completed a thorough review of your appeal, the original study, and the recommendation to recreate your position as an Administrative Assistant (CG17/R14).

After reviewing the duties you perform as a Program Assistant 2, as detailed in the position description that was submitted with the study request, and the information that was provided during the appeal process, I have determined that the study performed by Sarah Olson and Michael Lipski resulted in an accurate recommended placement in CG17/Range 14 as an Administrative Assistant and therefore the decision is upheld.

I appreciate your thoughtful appeal regarding the study of your position as well as the time you took to read our report and express your concerns. While we may not agree on the appropriate classification and salary range for your position, I want to emphasize that this in no way diminishes the quality of work you perform for the City and Parking Division.

The work of an Administrative Assistant is described as:

*...responsible paraprofessional staff support work relative to the development and implementation of divisional and/or departmental administrative programs and functions. Work is characterized by responsibility for a wide variety of administrative services (such as the development and implementation of budgetary documentation and fiscal controls, personnel, purchasing, payroll, and the supervision of office clerical activities); and/or direct responsibility for a comprehensive administrative program requiring the development and integration of diverse and complex operational data inherent to unit operations. This work is performed with a high degree of independence and discretion. Under the general supervision of a department or division head, work is normally assigned in terms of program objectives and directives; and employees are responsible for establishing the necessary administrative procedures, methods and controls. Employees may supervise subordinate administrative and clerical staff.*



Regarding particular points stated in your study, I want to emphasize a critical point Ms. Olson, and Mr. Lipski made in the original memo:

*When a classification exists in the City's compensation plan that fits the level of responsibility, programmatic authority, level of supervision, and other factors, Human Resources will make every attempt to recommend placement into a classification that already exists.*

The original memo from Ms. Olson and Mr. Lipski did an excellent job of explaining why the work of your position description fits within the Administrative Assistant classification. In your appeal, you contend that some of the work identified in the Administrative Assistant class specification is actually performed by people in your agency that you supervise, as justification for placement at a higher level. The work you specifically highlight includes supporting committees and coordinating personnel/payroll transactions. However, not all positions within a classification perform all of the work detailed in the classification. As we are well aware of such variances, position descriptions become critical to ensure work expectations are being properly communicated. Subsequently, the duties you reference are not distinguishing features of an Administrative Assistant. As you correctly point out, there are lower-level classifications in the City that also have responsibility for these functions, including Administrative Clerks and Program Assistants. Again, these are merely examples of work that someone in the Administrative Assistant classification could perform. It should be noted that the position description submitted with your study does indicate that you are the person providing support to the Pedestrian/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission. The work that the original memo emphasized that places you within the Administrative Assistant classification includes the administration of complex programs, such as the residential parking permit program, overseeing the IT needs for the organization and supervising/serving as Office Manager. It is the combination of these activities that make placement as an Administrative Assistant appropriate. Further, regarding your contention that you serve both the Parking Division and Traffic Engineering Division, we are engaged in initial discussions with the new Director of Transportation to better clarify the reporting relationships within the two divisions.

A large portion of your appeal is spent comparing your position to the work of the Police Court Services Supervisor classification. However, as previously noted above, when we have a classification that allows for direct comparison, it isn't appropriate for HR to use other classifications as comparable. The work done in the Police Department is very different from the work of your position, such that making meaningful comparisons between Police Court Services and its function versus the Parking Division and your function is very difficult. I believe this position was referenced in the original study because this position is in CG18/R5, and there was a request from PU to also place your work in CG18/R5. While it is difficult to compare these two positions, I can note that the Police Court Services Supervisor supervises a work area of 13 employees. Also, while you indicate that you serve as records coordinator for the Parking Division, this duty does not appear in the position description you submitted so handling these records do not appear to be a significant focus of your position. However, it is specifically called out in the Police Court Services Supervisor position description as a major function of the position. Similarly, you contend that you draft and recommend resolutions for Council. However, again, this is not spelled out in your position description. This is not to say that you do not perform the work; but instead that it does not appear to be a significant portion of your position whereas it is 15% of the Police Court Services Supervisor position. I bring this up to illustrate the difficulty in comparing positions to others that are not performing similar work. This is why we found the Administrative Assistant classification to be a more appropriate comparable - we could readily identify the work in your position description with the description found in the Administrative Assistant class specification whereas it is much more difficult to make comparisons to the Police Court Services Supervisor.

November 13, 2018

Page 3

Additionally, you questioned the origin of the comparison to the Water Account/Computer Specialist classification. Your supervisor suggested this classification as another position that may potentially be comparable. However, the same problems exist in comparing the Water Utility position as the Police position - their purpose is different from your position so direct comparisons are difficult.

I realize this may seem like I am trying to avoid making comparisons that would be favorable to you, but I assure you that is not the case. We will compare positions that may not be performing precisely the same work when we do not have other, broader classifications to review and compare - this is more common when looking at positions in CG18. However, in this case, because we have determined that your position fits well within the Administrative Assistant classification, further analysis is not required.

In closing, I want to emphasize that this determination is not a measure of your performance or a lack of respect for the important work you perform in your current role. This classification decision, as defined in the Personnel Rules, is based on a comparative analysis of other positions that perform comparable work for the City.

If you disagree with this decision, the Personnel Rules allow you to appear before the Personnel Board. The Board may choose to uphold the decision or send the matter back for further study, with instruction as to what needs to be looked at further. Please let Mike Lipski know if you intend to appear so he can prepare the agenda for the Personnel Board meeting on January 9, 2019.

CC: Thomas Lynch, Director of Transportation  
Sabrina Tolley, Asst. Parking Utility Manager  
Michael Lipski, HR Services Manager