

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency & Minnesota Government Engineers Council  
Meet & Confer  
February 20, 2008

MGEC: Dana Wheeler, Gene Soderbeck, Dan Card, Mike Lynn, others  
MPCA: John Holck, Myrna, others

DW asked if everyone saw the minutes from the last meeting.  
John H. were now working on the MPCA workforce planning and that will be reviewed again this spring. DOER has provided some guidance as to what the next plan will look like to address retention. It's a management committee now but can be shared with employees sometime later.

John H. the panel for reallocation has met twice. They are looking at three issues  
Vacancy Gene has in PE class – the panel feels a Pr. Eng is still needed.  
Two reallocations

John thinks that there are times a supervisor may not submit a reallocation request because of concern about the employee's performance.

Dana suggested allowing the employee to submit for a job audit might push the conversation about job performance to happen sooner rather than go unsaid and the employee left with concern with the notion the employer will submit a reallocation.

Dana answered questions about the audit process with other agencies. DOH bases heavily on the PD. MnDOT treats movement to Pr. Eng. more along promotional opportunities. A difference is that they have more project oriented positions than other agencies have where work remains the same year after year but there are lead works or experts in those given areas.

John – they still want to revise the 2002 document. They've met two or three times.

Will they include the AEP?

John doesn't know. The agency has never used that classification; instead they go to the management series.

Will MPCA respond to the process MGEC proposed?

John, yes, but he can't say when.

MPCA has had the memo for six to eight years. We'd like a time frame for moving on the information. We believe in a transparent process. Reaching an agreed to process can happen faster than discussing the substantive issues of each individual case.

Myrna - All reallocations go across a "division review." Documents submitted did not match the verbal conversations. The substance is as important as the process. The process needs to ensure the substance, as contributed by various parties, is heard.

Dan – the process we are envisioning would allow an employee to submit a request directly to a panel, not through the various levels up to division directors.

Jim – it was not the intent of the panel to be a deciding group on classification. The intent was to determine how many principal engineers are needed. Then as now, reallocations come up through the leadership of the agency. It was about new jobs or an evaluation of a principal engineer vacancy to see if it should be maintained at that level. The panel was meant to have knowledge of what a principal engineer should be. They did not have authority to tell HR what to decide. The panel can clear up questions for HR.

Questions: How will the panel operate?

What decision will the panel make?

What happens before it gets to the panel?

Are there intermediate steps between the supervisor and the review panel?

Myrna – timeliness is important. What can we add to clarity when it is a staff wanting a job audit rather than a supervisor submitting a reallocation?

It's a busy time. New hiring freeze from Governor is taking time. We will get it done by the next meeting. It is a priority for us. We acutely understand the we are having trouble competing with the market.

Dana will check in with John for a date.