HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
City of Burlington

179 South Winooski Avenue, Suite 100, Burlington, VT 05401 Voice (802) 865-7145
Fax (802) 864-1777
Vermont Relay: 7-1-1 or 800-253-0191

AGENDA:

Institutions and Human Resource Policy Committee

January 2, 2013

Human Resources Conference Room
179 South Winooski Avenue, Suite 100
6:00 pm

1) **Approve Agenda**

2) **Approve Minutes**
   a. **August 19, 2013**

3) **Residency Hardship – Peter Owens**

4) **11/22/13 City Council Referred Communications (2)**
   a. **Agenda Item 7.02, City of Burlington and University of Vermont Memorandum of Agreement Re: 2009 Zoning Amendments**

5) **Policy Manual Review (Pending City Attorney Revisions)**
   a. **Proposed Update of Domestic Violence Policy**
   b. **Proposed Update of Diversity and Inclusion Statement**

6) **Department Head Vacation Time**

7) **Future Meeting Dates**

The City of Burlington does not discriminate on the basis of political or religious affiliation, race, color, national origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, veteran status or disability.
The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities.
For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at 865-7145.

Human Resources Department

City of Burlington

179 So. Winooski Ave., STE 100, Burlington Vermont 05401 **Voice (802) 865-7145**
Fax (802) 864-1777

Institutions and Human Resources Policy Committee
Minutes
January 2, 2014

Present Councilors: Kevin Worden(K.W.), Sharon Bushor(S.B.), Max Tracy(M.T.)

Staff Present: Susan Leonard(S.L.), Stephanie Reid (S.R.), Peter Owens(P.O.), Bruce Pine (B.P.)(arrival at 6:11pm)

Others Present: Joe Speidel, UVM and Lisa Kingsbury, UVM

Meeting Called to order: 6:04pm Human Resources Conference Room, 179 S. Winooski

1. Approve Agenda
KW moved to approve the agenda. SL requested a new agenda item: HR Structure, to be placed in-between items 6 and 7. Request granted. Motion to approve, seconded by MT, motion passed 3:0.

2. Approve Minutes
KW moved to postpone the approval of the minutes. SB stated that she had no reason to postpone. MT agreed. Motion to approve minutes, seconded by SB, motion passed 3:0.

3. Residency Hardship – Peter Owens
KW reviewed draft resolution Authorization to Grant Charter Hardship. SL presented the referred communication from City Council. SL believes the residency hardship is due to children living outside of the Burlington School District. The school that the Owen's children attend is in New Hampshire, though he states it is a Vermont and New Hampshire school, in which children from each state attend. In response to other Department Head's living out of state, there are none in SL's time and none in recent records. There are other Department Heads that have received the Residency Hardship due to children in other Vermont schools. PO provided background information about his intention to live in Burlington at the time of hire. He had rented an apartment and has traveled back and forth to NH. During the course of the last year, one child has demonstrated the need to have more parental presence. MT requested the description of PO's average week. PO works 70-80 hours a week. PO comes to Burlington on Monday, goes home Tuesday night. Returns Wednesday to Burlington, returns to NH Thursday night and works remotely on Friday. PO makes accommodations when things come up, weather, last minute meetings. PO stated that this is a not a question about his ability to do the job, but about where he lives. SB discussed the intent of the hardship. The intent was a hardship for local communities and not for someone to live in another state. SB doesn't believe Burlington to be well-served having someone living 2 to 3 hours away. PO states that he does have an address in Burlington and is a registered voter in Burlington, he wants to be transparent in his residency. Clarification was then asked of what is needed from this committee. SL responded that it was referred from City Council for a recommendation from this committee to be turned back over to

City Council. SB would support a short-term approval, until September 2014 of the current living arrangements. MT does not support it as it currently stands. MT believes that the CEDO department demands both a professional and personal commitment and when PO is not present, those duties fall to others in CEDO that are paid significantly lower than PO. PO states that according to the City Attorney's office, he meets the residency requirement. The conditions to which he accepted the position has changed and he doesn't want to be dishonest. Discussion proceeds re: the letter of the law vs. the spirit of the law. SB states that giving the 1 year deadline will give all time to evaluate the situation, including the Administration. SB proposes an amendment to the resolution. MT does not want to get involved in the special projects with this in place. MT wants to know how this will affect the CEDO staff and perhaps we need to collect anonymous reviews of PO. SL states that in her opinion, that puts PO in an unfair position. KW states that this is moving to a performance basis and this is not the place. SB states that is the role of the Administration. SL states that there is the appointment period and that's when the Administration gains information on performance. KW reiterates that this is not a place for performance discussion. SB recommends language change to the resolution – line #51, legal voter of the City ~~for the time period that the condition described above continues to exist and signs the annual from certifying that condition.~~ until September 2014 when this hardship request will be reconsidered.
KW will have this language submitted to the City Attorney's office. Councilors agree to clean up language via email, decide whether to recommend and forward to the Council. SB states that they also need to know the standing of the school.

6:57 PO exits the meeting.

4. <u>11/22/13 City Council Referred Communications (2)</u>
KW references the 2 items referred to this committee, the June 21 and the October 30 reports. Lisa discusses why there are 2 reports, which is to keep in line with the MOA. Lisa reviews both the June 21 and October 30 reports. Joe further discusses the capturing of student addresses, the alert system, patrols on campus, mapping of incidents, and the hiring of an intern to assist with the mapping and "hot spots" of incidents. Discussion on the impact of the patrols and cost vs budget of these patrols. BP discusses the regular communication between the City and the University, which focuses primarily on the housing issues, as well as the quality of life issues. BP also discusses student housing, current and future sites. SB states that she is glad that student locations are being more accurately captured and she hopes that the report next year will more adequately reflect that information, especially as it pertains to the Wards. She wants Burlington to co-exist with the schools and not be defined by the schools. Also expresses concerns about past involvement in a focus group and lack of follow-up to that focus group. Lisa comments that they have not completed the follow-up conversations with the focus groups and explains the delays. SB would also like UVM to look into the housing project on Grove Street for staff housing. Joe believes those discussions are taking place. SB expresses concern over the Community Coalition and the focus on just the 3 streets. There are issues that are broader than that, that could benefit from the Coalition.
Discussion on admissions/enrollment, as it pertains to housing and the need for both administrations to have further conversations. Lisa explains that the MOA does expire in 2015 and as a result those conversations will take place. KW also expresses concerns about the collection of student addresses with further discussion on how to best collect this data.
KW states that there is general agreement that UVM has met the requirements of the MOA. KW and BP will work together to put together the report that is due to the City Council for February 10 meeting.
Joe distributes a flyer on UVM resources the community can use.
7:50 BP and UVM exit the meeting.

5. Policy Manual Reivew(Pending City Attory Revisions)

a. Proposed Update of Domestic Violence Policy

SL explains that there are 2 documents of the policy, a track-changed document and an accepted-all changes document. The updates to the policy started with the Safe-At-Network request. Original policy was less policy-oriented and more of a training document. Eileen reviewed the policy considering the comments and suggestions from this committee. Biggest difference in the policy is the use of sick-time for those affected by the Domestic Violence, which is supported by SL. SB states at first glance, she likes the re-wording. SL requests that perhaps all could review the policy and work together online (via email).

b. Proposed Update of Diversity and Inclusion Statement

SL states that a draft is in place but not ready for sharing as we are still collecting feedback.

6. Department Head Vacation Time

SL explains that while we continue to discuss combined time-off, 2 union negations are in process and we are not getting any support from those 2 unions for a combined time-off policy. SB questions is that because of the loss of time. SL states yes, as well as the loss of carry-over time. SL believes that in order to get this going, the non-union will need to lead the way. Discussion takes place regarding current maximums. SL requests a recommendation from the Councilors to move forward with drafting a combined time-off policy to move forward with the non-union. SB states that all the little details need to be ironed out – the carry over, etc. SL also looking for feedback regarding increasing the number of vacation hours for new hires. SB states no, based on her time working with HR that she hears about those who cannot take enough time away now, why we would increase those hours. SL expresses the concern of the Mayor regarding those positions that require 5 or 10 years of experience for the position, however when that individual is hired, we start them at the bottom of the vacation accrual. Is there an appetite, like step-placement, to be able to increase? SB states she would be interested in seeing scenarios to build a formula.

7. HR Structure

SL explains that the Retirement Administrator, Marina Collins, resigned at the beginning of December. This presents an opportunity to the department to further create backup in roles. We have already moved in that direction with the creation of the HR Generalist roles, with one-stop HR by department and in creating redundancy. SB questions the staffing of the Retirement Board and how that plays out with Ordinances. SB states that she does want to know the roll of the Retirement Administrator. SL states that she has placed Stephanie Hanker as Interim Retirement Administrator, that SR has been in the Interim HR Generalist role since April, and we need to fill the vacancy at the front desk. SL is looking for support to stabilize the department. SL will prepare the standard documents for a re-organization.

8. Future Meeting Dates

Future Meeting Dates: January 29, 2014 @ 5:30pm, HR conference room
February 20, 2014 @ 6:00pm, HR conference room

9. Adjournment

KW made a motion to adjourn at 8:19pm, seconded by MT, motion passed 3:0.