SALARY AND BENEFITS COMPENSATION COMPARISON COMMITTEE

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

A G E N D A

October 13, 2011 - 6:00 P.M. - City Hall Conference Room - City Hall - City of Dover

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

1. Self Introductions of Membership

2. Welcome by Dr. McGlumphy and Review of the Committee's Purpose

3. Adoption of *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* - Parliamentary Authority for Conducting Meetings

4. Distribution of Materials

5. Discussion - Meeting Dates and Times, Meeting Format, Etc.

6. Adjournment

/js
S:\AGENDAS & MINUTES\Misc-Agendas\SALARY AND BENEFITS COMPENSATION COMPARISON COMMITTEE\10-13-2011.wpd

THE AGENDA ITEMS AS LISTED MAY NOT BE CONSIDERED IN SEQUENCE. THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE TO INCLUDE THE ADDITION OR THE DELETION OF ITEMS, INCLUDING EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.

Excerpts from the Minutes of the City Council Meeting of August 22, 2011:

Formation of Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee

Mr. Hare proposed the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee to compare salary and benefit information from approximately ten (10) municipalities in the State of Delaware: New Castle, Sussex, and Kent Counties and the cities/towns of Wilmington, Newark, Middletown, Smyrna, Lewes, Seaford, Milford, and Dover. He stated that, to his knowledge, such research has never been conducted and he felt that such information would be useful, particularly with union contract negotiations scheduled for the near future. Mr. Hare suggested that this Committee consist of five (5) members from varied backgrounds and advised members that individuals have already been selected to serve on the Committee and have agreed to participate.

Responding to Mr. Shevock, Dr. McGlumphy stated that a Health Benefits Committee has been formed and a meeting is scheduled for the week of August 15, 2011. Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, explained that the Health Benefits Committee was formed specifically to review medical insurance options due to new accounting standards affecting Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability. Mr. Shevock questioned if these committees should be combined. Responding, Dr. McGlumphy stated that the committees would have separate responsibilities, explaining that the Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee would be established to review salary and benefit information similar to that provided previously through the MAG Pay-For-Performance Study; however, rather than utilizing corresponding municipalities in other states, the desire is to determine how the City compares with local municipalities. He reminded members that this recommendation was made during the recent Budget Hearings.

Mr. Anderson inquired if the Committee would be temporary in nature, how members would be selected, and to whom the Committee would report. Responding, Mr. Hare felt that the Committee would be temporary; however, if there is a need for such research in the future, another committee could be established. He stated that the Committee's findings would be reported to the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee and that the individuals proposed for membership have varied backgrounds in human resources, business, law, and accounting.

Mr. Anderson indicated his support for obtaining such information outside of the constraints of a timeline associated with the budget development process. However, it was his feeling that the goal for reviewing this information should not be to compete in a "race to the bottom" in establishing salary levels and that the City's pay scale should remain competitive.

Mr. Lester Blakeman (former City Electric Director) advised members that, in the past, no such comparison has been performed for Electric Department employees. He explained that no other municipality in Delaware has a utility the size of the City's; therefore, there is no comparable electrical function on the Delmarva Peninsula. Responding, Mr. Bonar stated that there are a few utility organizations in the State of Delaware with comparable positions and suggested obtaining information from Delmarva Power and the Delaware Electric Cooperative.

Responding to Mrs. Kim Hawkins, Human Resources Director, Mr. Hare stated that the research would be conducted on all levels within the City (to include both bargaining and non-bargaining

employees). Dr. McGlumphy stated that five (5) individuals have agreed to serve on the proposed Committee; however, members would not be appointed until Council authorizes the formation of the Committee. Mrs. Hawkins questioned how the membership selection process occurred. Responding, Dr. McGlumphy stated that two (2) of the proposed members are presently serving on the City's Compensation Commission and the other three (3) members are from the community.

Mr. Scott Koenig, Interim City Manager, informed members of a website (Sperling's Best Places at www.bestplaces.net/col) that compares cost of living and salaries. He requested that this website be used as a tool to compare "apples to apples" when the Committee is reviewing the data obtained.

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, noted that the City of Newark is the only municipality in Delaware that compares to the City of Dover in terms of population. In addition, she noted that the City of Milford outsources their engineering work and, although they have a Planner, some of their planning functions are also outsourced. Mrs. Townshend noted that the City of Harrington outsources all planning and has a consultant who performs all planning activities. She expressed her concern that positions in smaller towns perform very different functions from those within the City of Dover. She questioned if the size of the population served would be considered when assessing each position's level of responsibility. Responding, Mr. Hare stated that the Committee members would be provided a charge and felt confident that they would take such issues into consideration.

Mr. Anderson requested that the salaries and benefits of State of Delaware employees also be considered when conducting the comparison.

Dr. Jones suggested that if the proposed Committee is formed, their charge will be stated and all discussions, considerations, and concerns could be addressed at that time.

Mr. Anderson requested that the minutes of this meeting be forwarded to members of the proposed Committee for their review and consideration. Dr. McGlumphy requested that staff compile minutes of all meetings of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee during the past year which included discussion of salaries and benefits and provide them to members of the proposed Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee. In addition, he requested that the Human Resources Director provide members of the proposed Committee with any additional information that would be beneficial in their consideration of this matter.

The Committee recommended approval of the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee.

Dr. McGlumphy noted that appointment of the individuals recommended to serve on this committee was scheduled to take place during the latter part of the meeting. He advised members that those recommended for appointment have various backgrounds in human resources, business, law, and accounting.

Dr. McGlumphy moved to recommend approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mrs. Williams.

Mr. Lynn concurred with the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee; however, expressed concerns regarding the individuals recommended to serve as members; therefore, he stated that he would express his objections during the consideration of Item #7 on the agenda. He indicated that he would like assurance that the proposed Committee would provide recommendations that are intellectually honest, fair, and even-handed.

The motion to approve the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee, as recommended by the Committee, was unanimously carried.

APPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY THE LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE CHAIR - SALARY AND BENEFITS COMPENSATION COMPARISON COMMITTEE

Dr. McGlumphy, Chairman of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee, submitted recommendations for appointments to the Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee, as follows: 1) Richard Cook, 2) Tim Horne, 3) Mike Karia, 4) Alan Machtinger, and 5) Adam Perza.

Dr. McGlumphy noted that a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee was created earlier in the meeting, as recommended by the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee and approved by City Council.

Dr. McGlumphy moved for approval of the appointments to serve on the Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee as submitted, seconded by Mrs. Williams.

Mr. Lynn relayed concerns regarding the proposed appointees to the Committee. Due to the importance of the information to be collected by the Committee, he indicated a desire for an assurance that such information would be collected in a fair and even-handed manner. Noting that Mr. Horne's resume was not provided, Mr. Lynn stated that the remaining resumes appeared to represent a very homogenous group of individuals. He indicated that no women nor African Americans were included and that all prospective members were ideologically aligned, with the exception of Mr. Machtinger. It was his feeling that these individuals were selected predicated on the belief that City workers make too much money, and that these five (5) individuals would present this same finding after reviewing the matter.

Mr. Lynn suggested that this matter be delayed for two (2) weeks to allow members of Council to submit the names of additional potential appointees. He felt that this would ensure that the information collected and the findings of the Committee would be fair and balanced and would allow for Council to make impartial decisions. Otherwise, he felt that the membership of the Committee would be hand picked by certain individuals to mirror their own ideology.

Mr. Lynn moved to table the matter for two (2) weeks and open up the appointment process to allow all Council members the opportunity to submit the names of prospective appointees. The motion failed by a roll call vote of four (4) no, four (4) yes (Mrs. Russell, Mr. Lynn, Mr. Bonar, and Mr. Leary), and one (1) absent (Mr. Hare).

Mr. Anderson noted that the work of the Committee would be to conduct research rather than to create policy. Although he understood the concerns relayed by Mr. Lynn, based on the resumes provided, he felt that the members were qualified to serve.

Mr. Anderson moved to amend the motion for approval of the appointments to serve on the Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee as submitted to include two (2) additional members to be appointed by the Council President, for a total of seven (7) members. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bonar.

Dr. McGlumphy expressed his disappointment with the comments regarding the possible partiality of the Committee. He explained that salary and compensation information was requested of staff in May and, due to the unprecedented work load, it was difficult for them to obtain the information in a timely manner. He explained that the Committee would be requested to provide specific information, without bias. It was his feeling that there was bias in the Management Advisory Group (MAG) and PAS Reports.

On a call for the question by Mr. Hutchison, the motion to amend the motion for approval of the appointments to serve on the Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee as submitted by adding two (2) additional members to be appointed by the Council President was unanimously carried.

The motion for approval of the appointments of Mr. Richard Cook, Mr. Tim Horne, Mr. Mike Karia, Mr. Alan Machtinger, and Mr. Adam Perza to serve on the Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee and for two (2) additional members to be appointed by the Council President was unanimously carried.

Robert's Rules

The City of Dover has adopted Robert's Rules of Order as the parliamentary authority used to conduct all City Council, committee, commission, and board meetings. The purpose of adopting a parliamentary procedure is to provide for meetings to be conducted in an orderly fashion, ensure that all involved parties are given a voice, and facilitate decision making without confusion.

Attached is a brief summary of some of the basic provisions of Robert's Rules. The complete Robert's Rules of Order is available online at the following link:

http://www.rulesonline.com/

Introduction to Robert's Rules of Order

What Is Parliamentary Procedure?

It is a set of rules for conduct at meetings, that allows everyone to be heard and to make decisions without confusion.

Why is Parliamentary Procedure Important?

Because it's a time tested method of conducting business at meetings and public gatherings. It can be adapted to fit the needs of any organization. Today, Robert's Rules of Order is the basic handbook of operation for most clubs, organizations and other groups. So it's important that everyone know these basic rules!

How Does Parliamentary Procedure Work?

Organizations using parliamentary procedure usually follow a fixed order of business. Below is a typical example:

Call to order.
Roll call of members present.
Reading of minutes of last meeting.
Officers reports.
Committee reports.
Special orders --- Important business previously designated for consideration at this meeting.
Unfinished business.
New business.
Announcements.
Adjournment.

How is Action Taken?

The method used by members to express themselves is in the form of moving motions. A motion is a proposal that the entire membership take action or a stand on an issue. Individual members can:

Call to order.
Second motions.
Debate motions.
Vote on motions.

There are four basic types of motions:

Main Motions: The purpose of a main motion is to introduce items to the membership for their consideration. They cannot be made when any other motion is on the floor, and yield to privileged, subsidiary, and incidental motions.

Subsidiary Motions: Their purpose is to change or affect how a main motion is handled, and is voted on before a main motion.

Privileged Motions: Their purpose is to bring up items that are urgent about special or important matters unrelated to pending business.

Incidental Motions: Their purpose is to provide a means of questioning procedure concerning other motions and must be considered before the other motion.

How are Motions Presented?

Obtaining the floor:

Wait until the last speaker has finished.

Address the Chairman by saying, "Mr. Chairman, or Mr. President."

Wait until the Chairman recognizes you.

Make your motion.

Speak in a clear and concise manner.

Always state a motion affirmatively. Say, "I move that we ..." rather than, "I move that we do not ...".

Avoid personalities and stay on your subject.

Wait for someone to second your motion.

Another member will second your motion or the Chairman will call for a second.

If there is no second to your motion it is lost.

The Chairman states your motion:

The Chairman will say, "it has been moved and seconded that we ..." Thus placing your motion before the membership for consideration and action.

The membership then either debates your motion, or may move directly to a vote.

Once your motion is presented to the membership by the chairman it becomes "assembly property", and cannot be changed by you without the consent of the members.

Expanding on Your Motion

The time for you to speak in favor of your motion is at this point in time, rather than at the time you present it.

The mover is always allowed to speak first.

All comments and debate must be directed to the chairman.

Keep to the time limit for speaking that has been established.

The mover may speak again only after other speakers are finished, unless called upon by the Chairman.

Putting the Question to the Membership

The Chairman asks, "Are you ready to vote on the question?"

If there is no more discussion, a vote is taken.

On a motion to move the previous question may be adapted.

Voting on a Motion:

The method of vote on any motion depends on the situation and the by-laws of policy of your organization. There are five methods used to vote by most organizations, they are:

By Voice -- The Chairman asks those in favor to say, "aye", those opposed to say "no". Any member may move for a exact count.

By Roll Call -- Each member answers "yes" or "no" as his name is called. This method is used when a record of each person's vote is required.

By General Consent -- When a motion is not likely to be opposed, the Chairman says, "if there is no objection ..." The membership shows agreement by their silence, however if one member says, "I object," the item must be put to a vote.

By Division -- This is a slight verification of a voice vote. It does not require a count unless the chairman so desires. Members raise their hands or stand.

By Ballot -- Members write their vote on a slip of paper, this method is used when secrecy is desired.

There are two other motions that are commonly used that relate to voting.

Motion to Table -- This motion is often used in the attempt to "kill" a motion. The option is always present, however, to "take from the table", for reconsideration by the membership.

Motion to Postpone Indefinitely -- This is often used as a means of parliamentary strategy and allows opponents of motion to test their strength without an actual vote being taken. Also, debate is once again open on the main motion.

Parliamentary Procedure is the best way to get things done at your meetings. But, it will only work if you use it properly.

Allow motions that are in order.

Have members obtain the floor properly.

Speak clearly and concisely.

Obey the rules of debate.

Most importantly, BE COURTEOUS.