

**Compensation Study  
Phase II - Proposed Implementation Policies  
June 12, 2019**

**Background**

In 2014, the budget committee embarked on a compensation study to evaluate the competitiveness of the compensation plan. The compensation consultant recommended revised pay ranges for each of the 11 staff positions. The percentage increases to the pay ranges varied by position. The following chart summarizes the recommended pay adjustments:

	Percent Increase	MIN	MKT	MAX
Chief Clerk III	9.0%	30.50	38.12	45.75
Chief Clerk II	6.0%	26.94	33.68	40.41
Chief Clerk I	9.0%	25.21	31.51	37.81
Staff Attorney	12.0%	28.51	35.64	42.77
Deputy Clerk	13.0%	23.78	29.72	35.67
Clerk	8.0%	20.63	25.79	30.95
Assistant Clerk	15.0%	18.19	22.74	27.29
Court Assistant	5.0%	15.06	18.83	22.59
Security Officer	5.0%	15.06	18.83	22.59
Lead Family Specialist	27.0%	30.17	37.71	45.25
Family Specialist	25.0%	26.11	32.64	39.17

Due to budgetary constraints, the budget committee approved implementation of the compensation study in two equal phases. Phase I increased the compensation rates for each position by 50% of the consultant's recommended adjustment. Phase II will complete the project by adjusting pay ranges to the consultant's recommended amounts.

Before implementing Phase I, the Budget Committee adopted policies to determine how changes to the pay ranges would affect the rates of pay of individual employees. In developing the policies, careful consideration of the findings of the internal pay equity study (which was completed in 2013) was necessary. The internal pay equity study increased the rates of pay of employees who were underpaid in relation to length of

service in the Probate Courts. A key decision was to grandfather employees whose pay rates were higher than the rate as calculated in the equity study. In light of this key decision, the compensation study implementation policies addressed the treatment of grandfathered employees to avoid perpetuating legacy pay disparities among employees.

## **Phase II Implementation**

For most employees, the Phase II compensation study amount is an additional raise equal to the Phase I compensation study amount. The Phase II amounts for employees who were hired since November 2015 and employees who have changed positions within the system will be calculated as follows:

- Employees hired since January 5, 2011 will be adjusted to the new minimum for their position.
- The Phase II adjustment for employees who were promoted since November 2015 will be increased by the same percentage that the employee received at the time of the promotion (in most cases 3.5%).

Employees who did not receive a Phase I compensation adjustment because their pay is already above the compensation study amount will continue to be grandfathered.

A confidential mailing will be sent to each court containing Phase II calculation worksheets for each employee.

## **Merit Pay Policy**

### **June 12, 2019**

#### *Budget and Formula for Merit Increases*

- Implementation planned for first payroll in July
  - Pay date July 18, 2019
  - Pay period Monday, July 1 – Friday, July 12
  
- FY20 budget assumption is 3.0%
  - Each court allocated a merit pool based on compensation of eligible employees (excludes temps, retirees, over max)
  - Calculation of merit pool will be made after Phase II Compensation Study adjustments
  
- Formula considerations
  - 2.5% allocated based on overall rating from performance evaluation
  - 0.5% allocated at discretion of the judge
  - No increase for scores of 1 or 2 (unacceptable or needs improvement)
  - Minimum 2% for a score of 3 (meets expectations)
  - Maximum 6%
  
- Consideration of merit pay for court staff at max
  - Based upon performance evaluation
  - Amount capped at 2%
  - Merit pay is not added to base pay for purposes of calculating COLA's and future merit increases

# STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: June 12, 2019

Probate District: **Hartford**

District No.: **1**

Positions	Current Benchmark	Proposed Benchmark
Chief Clerk III	1.0	1.0
Chief Clerk II		
Chief Clerk I		
Deputy Clerk	1.0	1.0
Clerk	2.0	2.0
Assistant Clerk	4.0	5.0
Court Assistant	1.0	
Court Staff Attorney	1.0	1.0
Temporary Staff		
Probate Court Officer		
Security Officer		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)

# STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: June 12, 2019

Probate District:

East Hartford

District No.:

5

Positions	Current Benchmark	Proposed Benchmark
Chief Clerk III		
Chief Clerk II		
Chief Clerk I	0.9	0.9
Deputy Clerk		
Clerk	0.9	0.9
Assistant Clerk	1.4	1.8
Court Assistant		
Court Staff Attorney		
Temporary Staff		
Probate Court Officer		
Security Officer		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.6</b>

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)

# STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: June 12, 2019

Probate District:

Farmington Regional

District No.:

10

Positions	Current Benchmark	Proposed Benchmark
Chief Clerk III		
Chief Clerk II		
Chief Clerk I	0.9	0.9
Deputy Clerk		
Clerk	0.9	0.9
Assistant Clerk	1.1	1.8
Court Assistant		
Court Staff Attorney		
Temporary Staff		
Probate Court Officer		
Security Officer		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)

# STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: June 12, 2019

Probate District:

Meriden

District No.:

16

Positions	Current Benchmark	Proposed Benchmark
Chief Clerk III		
Chief Clerk II		
Chief Clerk I	1.0	0.9
Deputy Clerk		
Clerk	0.9	0.9
Assistant Clerk		0.9
Court Assistant		
Court Staff Attorney		
Temporary Staff		
Probate Court Officer		
Security Officer		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.7</b>

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)

# STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: June 12, 2019

Probate District:

Region #19 (Bristol Area)

District No.:

19

Positions	Current Benchmark	Transitional Benchmark	Proposed Benchmark
Chief Clerk III			
Chief Clerk II	1.0	1.0	1.0
Chief Clerk I			
Deputy Clerk			
Clerk	2.4	2.4	2.0
Assistant Clerk	2.4	3.0	2.0
Court Assistant	1.0		1.0
Court Staff Attorney			
Temporary Staff			
Probate Court Officer			
Security Officer			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.0</b>

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)



# STAFFING PLAN

Budget Committee Meeting: June 12, 2019

Probate District: **Hartford RCPC**

District No.: **60**

Positions	Current Benchmark	Proposed Benchmark
Chief Clerk III	1.0	1.0
Chief Clerk II		
Chief Clerk I		
Deputy Clerk	1.0	1.0
Clerk	2.0	1.0
Assistant Clerk	2.5	2.5
Court Assistant	1.0	1.0
Court Staff Attorney		
Temporary Staff		
Lead Probate Court Officer	1.0	1.0
Probate Court Officer	3.0	3.0
Security Officer		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>10.5</b>

Full Time Equivalents (FTE) = 40 Hour Work Week (2,080 Annual Hours)



## State of Connecticut

COURT OF PROBATE  
DISTRICT OF HARTFORD

FOYE A. SMITH  
JUDGE

250 CONSTITUTION PLAZA  
THIRD FLOOR  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103-2800  
TELE (860) 757-9150  
FAX (860) 724-1503

June 4, 2019

Hon. Paul J. Knierim, Administrator  
Budget Committee Chair  
Office of the Probate Court Administration  
186 Newington Road  
West Hartford, CT 06110

Dear Budget Committee:

The staffing levels at Hartford Probate Court are as follows: one Chief Clerk, one Deputy Chief Clerk, one Staff Attorney, two Clerks, four Assistant Clerks, and one Court Assistant. Currently, we have an opening for an assistant clerk position and for the court assistant position.

The Court respectfully requests a change in staffing level from Court Assistant to Clerk. Currently, all members of court staff are responsible for scheduling hearings, creating fiduciary certificates, sending out reminder letters. As you are well aware, our Court is among the largest and busiest courts in the state and the court assistant position does not make sense in how we process our files. Presently, Court Assistants do not have the authority to sign documents including certificates and notices. As a result, this presents an unnecessary waste of time for processing files and working as efficiently as possible. The persons who have previously held the role of Court Assistant were essentially performing the duties of Assistant Clerk and should have had the appropriate title and compensation.

We are seeking a change to this position in order to hire one new Assistant Clerk and one new Clerk. Hopefully, this will allow us to offer a more competitive salary and attract applicants with the necessary skills and expertise that are needed to address our difficult and sensitive matters. Ideally, this will also prevent the high level of turnover and transfers to other courts for increased salary and/or decreased workload.

I anticipate that this Committee will consider the logic and benefit to making the change in staffing levels from Court Assistant to Clerk.

Thank you for your time. I am available to address any further concerns or questions.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Foye A. Smith".

Foye A. Smith, Judge