

Supreme Court of Vermont
Office of State Court Administrator

PATRICIA GABEL, ESQ., State Court Administrator

patricia.gabel@vermont.gov

Mailing Address:

Office of Court Administrator

109 State Street

Montpelier, VT 05609-0701

Telephone: (802) 828-3278

FAX: (802) 828-3457

MATT RIVEN, Chief of Finance & Administration

matt.riven@vermont.gov

JEFFERY LOEWER, Chief Information Officer

jeffery.loewer@vermont.gov

LINDA RICHARD, Chief of Planning & Court Services

linda.richard@vermont.gov

TARI SCOTT, Chief of Trial Court Operations

theresa.scott@vermont.gov

www.vermontjudiciary.org

TO: House Government Operations Committee
House Appropriations Committee

FROM: Patricia Gabel, Esq., State Court Administrator

RE: Vermont Judiciary and Vermont State Employees Association
Independent Segal Water's Consulting 2017 Job Review Report

DATE: March 13, 2017

The Judiciary requests that the Legislature provide funding to implement the classification decisions contained in the attached independent consultant's study of three Judiciary positions, as provided in the most-recently concluded collective bargaining agreement with the VSEA. The fiscal impact of these reclassifications are estimated to be \$584,235 in total annually as applied prospectively beginning in FY 2018, and an additional \$323,828 if applied retroactively to the December 15, 2016 agreement date as provided in the agreement.

The Judiciary is available at your convenience to appear before your committees to discuss the process and results of the study, and the associated funding need.

The Judiciary is proud of all its employees and believes that it is critical that their pay grades accurately and fairly reflect their work demands, as reflected in the Willis classification system. The Judiciary and the VSEA worked constructively together to engage a nationally-known human resources firm to conduct an independent and thorough study of these three positions. We note that the Governor included funding for several Executive Branch class action reclassifications. We request that the Judiciary's collectively bargained needs be appropriately funded.

attachment

cc: Theresa Utton, Committee Assistant, House Appropriations
Denise Diehl, Committee Assistant, House Government Operations
Senate Government Operations, Cheryl Ewen, Committee Assistant
Senate Appropriations Committee, Becky Buck, Committee Assistant
Andy Pallito, Commissioner of Finance
Stephanie Barrett, Associate Fiscal Officer
Maria Belliveau, Associate Fiscal Officer



Vermont Judiciary and Vermont State Employees Association

2017 JOB EVALUATION REVIEW

March 10, 2017

Table of Contents

2017 Job Evaluation Review

March 10, 2017

Methodology.....	1
Background.....	1
Findings/Recommendations	2
Docket Clerk B	3
Job Components and Ratings	3
Court Officer B	5
Job Components and Ratings	5
Courtroom Operator	7
Job Components and Ratings	7

Methodology

Background

The Vermont Judiciary and Vermont State Employees Association (Classification Project Team “CPT”) engaged Segal Waters Consulting to evaluate three job classifications, using the State’s Willis Job Evaluation System. The job classifications covered by this study are:

- Docket Clerk B
- Court Officer B
- Courtroom Operator

The Willis Job Evaluation System is a tool that uses components to value a classification and determine appropriateness of pay grade. The components are four large groups with additional subgroups that add dimension to the overall job component. They are as follows:

- Knowledge and Skills
 - Job Knowledge
 - Managerial Skills
 - Interpersonal Skills
- Mental Demands
 - Independent Judgment
 - Problem Solving
- Accountability
 - Freedom to Take Action
 - Size of Impact
 - Nature of Impact
- Working Conditions
 - Physical Effort
 - Hazards
 - Discomfort

To gather the necessary information for this analysis, Segal Waters, in consultation with the CPT, developed a customized Job Description Questionnaire (JDQ) that was distributed to all employees in the three job classifications. Additionally, Segal Waters provided a PowerPoint presentation to assist the CPT in describing the process to the employees completely the JDQs.

The JDQs were used to analyze the job duties and certain job content factors in order for Segal Waters to apply to the Willis Job Evaluation components and dimensions. Once analysis was completed on the JDQs, we also conducted three days of employee interviews in order to better clarify elements of job duties and content.

Findings/Recommendations

The following is an overview of the findings by job classification. A more detailed narrative is provided for each classification in the following sections of this report:

Title	Current Grade	Knowledge & Skills Rating	Knowledge & Skills Points	Mental Demands Rating	Mental Demands Points	Accountability Rating	Accountability Points	Working Conditions Rating	Working Conditions Points	Willis Points	Associated Grade
Docket Clerk B	15	D1N	122	D4K	53	C2S	53	M1C	11	239	17
Court Officer B	15	D1N	122	D3I	40	C2S	53	M1C	13	228	17
Courtroom Operator	16	D1N	140	D4K	61	C2S	53	M1C	11	265	18

- Docket Clerk B: move from pay grade 15 to 17
- Court Officer B: move from pay grade 15 to 17
- Courtroom Operator: move from pay grade 16 to 18

Docket Clerk B

Job Components and Ratings

- Knowledge and Skills
 - **Rating received: D1N**
 - Job Knowledge - D: this level was chosen based on the para-professional definition
 - Managerial Skills - 1: this classification does not have any supervisory responsibilities
 - Interpersonal Skills – N: this level reflects the requirement of frequent personal contact with the public
 - Points – 122: this was the lower level of the points spread and is appropriate for the position’s responsibility staying organized and up to date on legislative orders
- Mental Demands
 - **Rating received: D4K**
 - Independent Judgement – D: this position follows complex procedures and methods, but is limited in decision making
 - Problem Solving – 4: this level describes the classification’s need to resolve complex problems by using, at times, multiple non-corresponding resources
 - Level K: this is the corresponding level in the matrix when looking at D and 4, this is the higher level and is appropriate for the level of discretion
 - Points – 53: this point value corresponds to a matrix using K&S points and the level K
- Accountability
 - **Rating received: C2S**
 - Freedom to Take Action – C: while the level of discretion on resolving problems is higher, the freedom to deviate from procedures and methods is lower
 - Size of Impact – 2: the size of impact is moderate, in that the actions taken can impact the public at large, but the accountability of actions would not rest solely with this position

- Nature of Impact – S: this classification shares in the accountability of the impact of the actions taken
- Points – 53: the points are the mid-level in the matrix
- Working Conditions
 - **Rating received: MIC**
 - Physical Effort – M: the nature of the work being performed can be strenuous without much break from continuous work
 - Hazards – 1: there is a chance, although small, that injury or illness can happen for this position in dealing with the public at large
 - Discomfort – C: moderately disagreeable describes the need to perform work based on a docket and courtroom pace without regular breaks
 - Points – 11: these points are the lower level of the matrix
- Total Points and Grade
 - 239
 - 17

Court Officer B

Job Components and Ratings

- Knowledge and Skills
 - **Rating received: D1N**
 - Job Knowledge - D: this level was chosen based on the para-professional definition
 - Managerial Skills - 1: this classification does not have any supervisory responsibilities
 - Interpersonal Skills – N: this level reflects the requirement of frequent personal contact with the public
 - Points – 122: this is the lower level of the points spread and is appropriate for the position’s responsibility in monitoring the courtroom while in session
- Mental Demands
 - **Rating received: D3I**
 - Independent Judgement – D: this position follows complex procedures and methods, but is limited in decision making
 - Problem Solving – 3: this level describes the classification’s need to resolve complex problems, but that those problems are recurring on a regular basis
 - Level I: this is the corresponding level in the matrix when looking at D and 3, this is the higher level and is appropriate for the level of discretion
 - Points – 40: this point value corresponds to a matrix using K&S points and the level I
- Accountability
 - **Rating received: C2S**
 - Freedom to Take Action – C: while the level of discretion on resolving problems is higher, the freedom to deviate from procedures and methods is lower
 - Size of Impact – 2: the size of impact is moderate, in that the actions taken can impact the public at large, but the accountability of actions would not rest solely with this position

- Nature of Impact – S: this classification shares in the accountability of the impact of the actions taken
- Points – 53: the points are the mid-level in the matrix
- Working Conditions
 - **Rating received: MIC**
 - Physical Effort – M: the nature of the work being performed can be strenuous without much break from continuous work
 - Hazards – 1: there is a chance, although small, that injury or illness can happen for this position in dealing with the public at large
 - Discomfort – C: moderately disagreeable describes the need to perform work based on a docket and courtroom pace without regular breaks
 - Points – 13: these points are the mid-level level of the matrix
- Total Points and Grade
 - 228
 - 17

Courtroom Operator

Job Components and Ratings

- Knowledge and Skills
 - **Rating received: C1N**
 - Job Knowledge - C: this level was chosen based on the para-professional definition
 - Managerial Skills - 1: this classification does not have any supervisory responsibilities
 - Interpersonal Skills – N: this level reflects the requirement of frequent personal contact with the public
 - Points – 140: this was the mid-level end of the points spread and is appropriate for the position’s responsibility in using the recording equipment during fast paced criminal court cases
- Mental Demands
 - **Rating received: D4K**
 - Independent Judgement – D: this position follows complex procedures and methods, but is limited in decision making
 - Problem Solving – 4: this level describes the classification’s need to resolve complex problems by using, at times, multiple non-corresponding resources
 - Level K: this is the corresponding level in the matrix when looking at D and 4, this is the higher level and is appropriate for the level of discretion
 - Points – 61: this point value corresponds to a matrix using K&S points and the level K
- Accountability
 - **Rating received: C2S**
 - Freedom to Take Action – C: while the level of discretion on resolving problems is higher, the freedom to deviate from procedures and methods is lower
 - Size of Impact – 2: the size of impact is moderate, in that the actions taken can impact the public at large, but the accountability of actions would not rest solely with this position

- Nature of Impact – S: this classification shares in the accountability of the impact of the actions taken
- Points – 53: the points are the mid-level in the matrix
- Working Conditions
 - **Rating received: MIC**
 - Physical Effort – M: the nature of the work being performed can be strenuous without much break from continuous work
 - Hazards – 1: there is a chance, although small, that injury or illness can happen for this position in dealing with the public at large
 - Discomfort – C: moderately disagreeable describes the need to perform work based on a docket and courtroom pace without regular breaks
 - Points – 11: these points are the lower level of the matrix
- Total Points and Grade
 - 265
 - 18

8509847v3/14416.001