

Classification and Compensation Study Analysis for Marion County, FL

REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC

April 28, 2022

Table of Contents

	PAGE
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Study Methodology	1-2
1.2 Report Organization.....	1-3
2.0 ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CONDITIONS.....	2-1
2.1 Analysis of Pay Scale.....	2-1
2.2 Grade Placement Analysis	2-3
2.3 Salary Quartile Analysis.....	2-7
2.4 Summary	2-9
3.0 SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE OUTREACH.....	3-1
3.1 General Feedback	3-1
3.2 Compensation and Classification.....	3-2
3.3 Market Peers	3-2
3.4 Benefits	3-2
3.5 Performance Evaluation.....	3-3
3.6 Summary	3-4
4.0 MARKET SUMMARY.....	4-1
4.1 Salary Survey Results	4-1
4.2 Salary Survey Summary	4-4
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5-1
5.1 Classification System	5-1
5.2 Compensation System	5-3
5.3 System Administration	5-14
5.4 Summary	5-15



Chapter 1 - Introduction

Evergreen Solutions, LLC (Evergreen) conducted a Classification and Compensation Study for Marion County, FL (the County) beginning in August 2021. The purpose of the study was to analyze its classification and compensation system and make recommendations to improve the County's competitive position in the labor market. The study activities involved analyzing the internal and external equity of the County's compensation system, and making recommendations in response to those findings.

Study tasks involved:

- holding a study kick-off meeting;
- analyzing the County's current salary structure (pay plans) to determine the strengths and weaknesses;
- facilitating discussions with the County's project team to develop an understanding of its compensation philosophy;
- collecting classification information through the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) process to analyze the internal equity of the County's classification system;
- developing recommendations for improvements to classification titles if appropriate;
- conducting surveys to assess the external equity (market competitiveness) of the County's current pay and benefits system;
- developing a revised pay structure (plans) and slotting classifications into the pay ranges while ensuring internal and external equity;
- developing the most appropriate methods for transitioning employees' salaries into the new pay structure (plans);
- providing the County with information and strategies regarding compensation and classification administration;
- preparing and submitting a report that summarize the study findings and recommendations; and
- updating job descriptions to reflect recommended classification changes and employee responses to the JAT, and Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) status recommendations.



1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY

Evergreen used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to develop recommendations to improve the County's competitive position for its compensation system. Study activities included:

Kick-off Meeting

The kick-off meeting allowed members of the study team from the County and Evergreen to discuss different aspects of the study. During the meeting, information about the County's compensation (pay plans) and current pay philosophy was shared and the work plan for the study was finalized. The meeting also provided an opportunity for Evergreen to explain the types of data needed to begin the study.

Assessment of Current Conditions

This analysis provided an overall assessment of the County's current pay structure (plans) and related employee data at the time of the study. The current pay plan and the progression of employees' salaries through the pay ranges were examined during this process. The findings of this analysis are summarized in **Chapter 2** of this report.

Employee Outreach

Evergreen consultants conducted employee outreach using a blended approach with virtual meetings and an on-line survey tool. Study orientation sessions were provided virtually to employees so they could learn about the purpose of the study and receive specific information related to their participation in the study process. The on-line employee questionnaire and department head interviews allowed County employees, supervisors, and senior leaders to identify practices that were working well and to suggest areas of opportunities for improvement regarding the compensation and classification system, employee benefits and the employee performance evaluation system. The feedback which was received is summarized in **Chapter 3** of this report.

Compensation Philosophy

Evergreen conducted meetings with the County's project team to develop an understanding of its position with regard to employee compensation, i.e., its' compensation philosophy. Several key factors (e.g., desired market position, design and type of pay plan to administer, and method of employee salary progression) were examined and provided the framework for which to align and provide recommendations for the study.

Classification Review - Internal Equity Analysis

To assess the internal equity of the County's classification system, all employees were asked during employee outreach to complete a JAT to describe the work they performed in their own words. Supervisors were then asked to review their employees' JATs and provide additional information as needed about the position. The information provided in the completed JAT's was utilized in the classification analysis in two ways. First, the work described was reviewed



to ensure that classification titles were appropriate. Second, the JAT's were evaluated to quantify, by a scoring method, each classification's relative value within the organization. Each classification's score was based on employee and supervisor responses to the JAT, and the scores allowed for a comparison of classifications across the County.

Salary and Benefits Surveys – External Equity Analysis

For the salary survey, peers were identified that compete with the County for human resources and provide similar services. Classifications representing a cross-section of the departments and levels of work were selected as benchmarks. After the selection of peers and benchmarks, a survey tool was developed for the collection of salary range data for each benchmark. In addition, a benefit survey is being utilized to compare the County's current employee benefits to those of its peers. The data collected during these surveys were analyzed, and a summary of the salary survey results provided in **Chapter 4** of this report. The benefits analysis/comparison will be provided under separate cover.

Recommendations

During the review of the compensation philosophy, the County identified its desire to be at a minimum, competitive with the labor market. Understanding this, and utilizing the findings of both internal and external, a revised compensation system was developed. Recommendations were also provided on how to maintain the compensation system going forward. A summary of all study findings and recommendations can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.

1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report includes the following additional chapters:

- Chapter 2 – Assessment of Current Conditions
- Chapter 3 – Summary of Employee Outreach
- Chapter 4 – Market Summary
- Chapter 5 – Recommendations



Chapter 2 – Assessment of Current Conditions

This chapter provides an overall assessment of the compensation system in place for employees at the County. Data included reflect the demographics in place in April 2022 and should be considered a snapshot in time. This review of the pay structure (pay plans) and employees' salaries provided a baseline for further review throughout the course of this study, though were not sufficient cause for recommendations in isolation. By conducting this assessment, Evergreen gained a better understanding of the County's compensation structure and pay practices in place and identified issues for both further review and potential revision.

2.1 ANALYSIS OF PAY SCALE

The County administered an open-range pay plan for 695 employees in its Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) non-union pay plan. Another open-range pay plan was administered for its 288 represented Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA) employees. Both are included in the following exhibits and analyses. Additionally, another pay plan was administered by the County for uniformed fire positions (also union represented) that is not included in this review. These positions were not included in the additional analyses following due to the nature of their compensation and pay progression. You will note; however, that fire positions that are included in the BOCC plan currently will be discussed in the recommendations chapter later in this report.

The County's BOCC pay plan is shown in **Exhibit 2A** with the following details: the pay grade; the value of each grade/pay range at the minimum, the calculated midpoint, and the pay range maximum; and the range spread for each range (the distance between the pay range minimum and maximum).

As shown in **Exhibit 2A**, the County's pay plan featured 44 pay ranges with constant range spreads of 54 percent. **Exhibit 2B** displays the County's pay plan for its LIUNA employees. This plan featured 17 pay grades also with constant range spreads of 54 percent.



**EXHIBIT 2A
PAY PLAN – BCC**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread
1	\$ 18,324.80	\$ 23,244.00	\$ 28,163.20	54%
2	\$ 19,260.80	\$ 24,460.80	\$ 29,660.80	54%
3	\$ 20,196.80	\$ 25,625.60	\$ 31,054.40	54%
4	\$ 21,216.00	\$ 26,925.60	\$ 32,635.20	54%
5	\$ 22,256.00	\$ 28,277.60	\$ 34,299.20	54%
6	\$ 23,420.80	\$ 29,712.80	\$ 36,004.80	54%
7	\$ 24,544.00	\$ 31,210.40	\$ 37,876.80	54%
8	\$ 25,833.60	\$ 32,760.00	\$ 39,686.40	54%
9	\$ 27,081.60	\$ 34,403.20	\$ 41,724.80	54%
10	\$ 28,371.20	\$ 36,077.60	\$ 43,784.00	54%
11	\$ 29,764.80	\$ 37,866.40	\$ 45,968.00	54%
12	\$ 31,262.40	\$ 39,738.40	\$ 48,214.40	54%
13	\$ 32,864.00	\$ 41,745.60	\$ 50,627.20	54%
14	\$ 34,611.20	\$ 43,950.40	\$ 53,289.60	54%
15	\$ 36,212.80	\$ 46,051.20	\$ 55,889.60	54%
16	\$ 38,064.00	\$ 48,426.70	\$ 58,789.40	54%
17	\$ 39,998.40	\$ 50,887.20	\$ 61,776.00	54%
18	\$ 41,995.20	\$ 53,435.20	\$ 64,875.20	54%
19	\$ 43,825.60	\$ 55,764.80	\$ 67,704.00	54%
20	\$ 45,884.80	\$ 58,385.60	\$ 70,886.40	54%
21	\$ 48,297.60	\$ 61,401.60	\$ 74,505.60	54%
22	\$ 50,731.20	\$ 64,552.80	\$ 78,374.40	54%
23	\$ 53,123.20	\$ 67,371.20	\$ 81,619.20	54%
24	\$ 54,870.40	\$ 69,680.00	\$ 84,489.60	54%
25	\$ 57,512.00	\$ 73,174.40	\$ 88,836.80	54%
26	\$ 60,569.60	\$ 76,783.20	\$ 92,996.80	54%
27	\$ 63,419.20	\$ 80,693.60	\$ 97,968.00	54%
28	\$ 66,664.00	\$ 84,822.00	\$ 102,980.00	54%
29	\$ 69,992.00	\$ 89,055.20	\$ 108,118.40	54%
30	\$ 73,569.60	\$ 93,600.00	\$ 113,630.40	54%
31	\$ 77,147.20	\$ 98,155.20	\$ 119,163.20	54%
32	\$ 80,953.60	\$ 103,001.60	\$ 125,049.60	54%
33	\$ 84,968.00	\$ 108,118.40	\$ 131,268.80	54%
34	\$ 89,128.00	\$ 113,401.60	\$ 137,675.20	54%
35	\$ 93,662.40	\$ 119,173.60	\$ 144,684.80	54%
36	\$ 98,342.40	\$ 125,132.80	\$ 151,923.20	54%
37	\$ 103,251.20	\$ 131,383.20	\$ 159,515.20	54%
38	\$ 108,409.60	\$ 137,945.60	\$ 167,481.60	54%
430	\$ 66,996.80	\$ 85,248.80	\$ 103,500.80	54%
440	\$ 79,996.80	\$ 101,504.00	\$ 123,011.20	54%
450	\$ 90,001.60	\$ 114,504.00	\$ 139,006.40	54%
460	\$ 100,006.40	\$ 127,108.80	\$ 154,211.20	54%
470	\$ 109,990.40	\$ 139,921.60	\$ 169,852.80	54%
480	\$ 120,993.60	\$ 153,920.00	\$ 186,846.40	54%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided by Marion County as of April 2022.



**EXHIBIT 2B
PAY PLAN – LIUNA**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread
2	\$ 19,260.80	\$ 24,460.80	\$ 29,660.80	54%
5	\$ 22,256.00	\$ 28,277.60	\$ 34,299.20	54%
6	\$ 23,420.80	\$ 29,712.80	\$ 36,004.80	54%
7	\$ 24,544.00	\$ 31,210.40	\$ 37,876.80	54%
8	\$ 25,833.60	\$ 32,760.00	\$ 39,686.40	54%
9	\$ 27,081.60	\$ 34,403.20	\$ 41,724.80	54%
10	\$ 28,371.20	\$ 36,077.60	\$ 43,784.00	54%
11	\$ 29,764.80	\$ 37,866.40	\$ 45,968.00	54%
12	\$ 31,262.40	\$ 39,738.40	\$ 48,214.40	54%
13	\$ 32,864.00	\$ 41,745.60	\$ 50,627.20	54%
14	\$ 34,611.20	\$ 43,950.40	\$ 53,289.60	54%
15	\$ 36,212.80	\$ 46,051.20	\$ 55,889.60	54%
16	\$ 38,064.00	\$ 48,426.70	\$ 58,789.40	54%
17	\$ 39,998.40	\$ 50,887.20	\$ 61,776.00	54%
19	\$ 43,825.60	\$ 55,764.80	\$ 67,704.00	54%
20	\$ 45,884.80	\$ 58,385.60	\$ 70,886.40	54%
21	\$ 48,297.60	\$ 61,401.60	\$ 74,505.60	54%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided by Marion County as of April 2022.

2.2 GRADE PLACEMENT ANALYSIS

When assessing the effectiveness of a pay plan and associated practices, it is helpful to analyze where employees' salaries stand in comparison to their classification's pay range. Identifying areas where there are clusters of employees' salaries may illuminate potential pay progression concerns.

It should be noted that the progression of employees' salaries is associated with an organization's compensation philosophy—specifically, the method of salary progression and the availability of resources. Therefore, the placement of salaries should be viewed with this context in mind.

Below or at Minimum and at or Above Maximum

In general, placement of an employee's salary at a classification's grade minimum would generally indicate a newer employee or an employee that was recently promoted into a classification who has not had the opportunity or experience needed to progress through the range. In contrast, an employee at or near the maximum of their grade is generally an employee with longer tenure who has had the opportunity or experience necessary to progress towards the top of the pay range.

Exhibit 2C displays, for the BOCC plan, the number and percentage of employees compensated at or below their pay range minimum and at or above the maximum of their respective pay. Employees not included in this exhibit are compensated somewhere between the upper and lower thresholds. The percentages are based on the total number of employees in that grade. **Exhibit 2D** displays the same for the County's LIUNA pay plan.



EXHIBIT 2C
SALARY PLACEMENT OF EMPLOYEES – BCC
AT OR BELOW MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# < Min	% < Min	# at Max	% at Max	# > Max	% > Max
2	0	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	7	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	1	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	7	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	15	5	33.3%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	22	2	9.1%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
10	19	2	10.5%	1	5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	22	3	13.6%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	5	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
13	77	10	13.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%
14	38	8	21.1%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
15	54	4	7.4%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16	55	8	14.5%	1	2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
17	56	2	3.6%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18	29	2	6.9%	1	3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	38	1	2.6%	0	0%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%
20	23	2	8.7%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21	55	2	3.6%	0	0%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%
22	18	0	0.0%	1	6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
23	18	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24	21	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%
25	20	2	10.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
26	7	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
27	18	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
28	7	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
29	5	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
30	7	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
31	1	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
32	7	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
33	2	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
34	1	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
35	4	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
38	3	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
450	21	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
460	8	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
470	3	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
480	1	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	695	56	8.1%	4	1%	2	0.3%	3	0.4%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided by Marion County as of April 2022.



As can be seen, four employees (1. percent) were compensated below their respective pay range minimum, and three (0.4 percent) were compensated above the maximum. 56 (8.1 percent) of employees were compensated at their minimum, while two (0.3 percent) were compensated at their maximum.

EXHIBIT 2D
SALARY PLACEMENT OF EMPLOYEES - LIUNA
AT OR BELOW MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# < Min	% < Min	# at Max	% at Max	# > Max	% > Max
2	1	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	1	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	3	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	29	3	10.3%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	27	5	18.5%	0	0%	0	0.0%	1	3.7%
9	16	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
10	24	3	12.5%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11	33	5	15.2%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	24	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
13	33	3	9.1%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
14	27	2	7.4%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
15	27	1	3.7%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16	7	2	28.6%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
17	25	1	4.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	6	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	4	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21	1	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	288	25	8.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided by Marion County as of April 2022.

In the LIUNA plan, no employees were compensated below their respective pay range minimum, and one employee (0.3 percent) was compensated above the maximum. There were 25 (8.7 percent) employees at their respective minimum and none at the maximum.

Above or Below Midpoint

In addition to assessing the number of employees at minimum and maximum, an analysis was conducted to determine the number of employees below and above the calculated pay range midpoint. Employees with salaries close to the midpoint of a pay range should be fully proficient in their classification and require minimal supervision to complete their job duties while performing satisfactorily. Within this framework, grade midpoint is commonly considered to be the salary an individual could reasonably expect for similar work in the market. Therefore, it is important to examine the percentage and number of employees with salaries above and below the calculated midpoint.



Exhibit 2E and 2F illustrate the placement of employees' salaries in their pay grades relative to pay grade midpoints. The exhibits contain the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees in classifications assigned to the pay grade,
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries below the midpoint, and
- the number and percentage of employees with salaries above the midpoint of each pay grade.

EXHIBIT 2E
SALARY PLACEMENT OF EMPLOYEES - BOCC
BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
2	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	7	7	100.0%	0	0.0%
6	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
7	7	7	100.0%	0	0.0%
8	15	15	100.0%	0	0.0%
9	22	22	100.0%	0	0.0%
10	19	18	94.7%	1	5.3%
11	22	22	100.0%	0	0.0%
12	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
13	77	70	90.9%	7	9.1%
14	38	36	94.7%	2	5.3%
15	54	50	92.6%	4	7.4%
16	55	51	92.7%	4	7.3%
17	56	54	96.4%	2	3.6%
18	29	24	82.8%	5	17.2%
19	38	33	86.8%	5	13.2%
20	23	20	87.0%	3	13.0%
21	55	44	80.0%	11	20.0%
22	18	18	100.0%	0	0.0%
23	18	17	94.4%	1	5.6%
24	21	15	71.4%	6	28.6%
25	20	17	85.0%	3	15.0%
26	7	5	71.4%	2	28.6%
27	18	13	72.2%	5	27.8%
28	7	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
29	5	2	40.0%	3	60.0%
30	7	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
31	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
32	7	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
33	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
34	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
35	4	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
38	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
450	21	21	100.0%	0	0.0%
460	8	7	87.5%	1	12.5%
470	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
480	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Total	695	610	87.8%	85	12.2%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided Marion County as of April 2022.



EXHIBIT 2F
SALARY PLACEMENT OF EMPLOYEES - LIUNA
BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
2	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
5	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
6	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
7	29	29	100.0%	0	0.0%
8	27	24	88.9%	3	11.1%
9	16	15	93.8%	1	6.3%
10	24	23	95.8%	1	4.2%
11	33	33	100.0%	0	0.0%
12	24	22	91.7%	2	8.3%
13	33	24	72.7%	9	27.3%
14	27	24	88.9%	3	11.1%
15	27	26	96.3%	1	3.7%
16	7	5	71.4%	2	28.6%
17	25	22	88.0%	3	12.0%
19	6	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
20	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
21	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Total	288	260	90.3%	28	9.7%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided Marion County as of April 2022.

As observed in **Exhibit 2E**, 610 employees (87.8 percent) were compensated below their calculated pay range midpoint and 85 (12.2 percent) were compensated above. Additionally, in **Exhibit 2F**, 260 employees (90.3 percent) were compensated below their calculated pay range midpoint and 28 (9.7 percent) were compensated above.

2.3 SALARY QUARTILE ANALYSIS

This section provides an additional analysis of the distribution of employees' salaries across their respective pay ranges at the time of this study. For this analysis, employees' salaries were slotted within one of four equal distributions. The first quartile (0-25) represents the lowest 25 percent of the pay range. The second quartile (26-50) represents the segment of the pay range above the first quartile up to the pay range's midpoint. The third quartile (51-75) represents the part of the pay range above the midpoint up to the 75th percentile of the pay range. The fourth quartile (76-100) is the highest 25 percent of the pay range. This analytical method provided an opportunity to assess how employees' salaries are disbursed throughout each pay range, which can indicate whether clustering of employees' salaries existed.



Exhibits 2G and 2H provide breakdowns of placement of employees' salaries relative to salary quartiles and provide the following:

- the pay grades,
- the number of employees per pay grade, and
- the location (by quartile) of the employees' salaries within each grade.

EXHIBIT 2G
SALARY QUARTILE ANALYSIS – BCC

GRADE	Total	1ST QUARTILE	2ND QUARTILE	3RD QUARTILE	4TH QUARTILE
2	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
5	7	0.43%	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%
6	1	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%
7	7	0.86%	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%
8	15	2.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
9	22	3.02%	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%
10	19	2.16%	0.43%	0.14%	0.00%
11	22	3.02%	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%
12	5	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%
13	77	7.77%	2.30%	0.72%	0.29%
14	38	4.75%	0.43%	0.29%	0.00%
15	54	4.75%	2.45%	0.43%	0.14%
16	55	6.19%	1.15%	0.43%	0.14%
17	56	3.88%	3.88%	0.29%	0.00%
18	29	3.02%	0.43%	0.58%	0.14%
19	38	2.16%	2.59%	0.29%	0.43%
20	23	1.87%	1.01%	0.43%	0.00%
21	55	4.17%	2.16%	1.15%	0.43%
22	18	1.87%	0.72%	0.00%	0.00%
23	18	1.01%	1.44%	0.14%	0.00%
24	21	1.01%	1.15%	0.43%	0.43%
25	20	1.44%	1.01%	0.29%	0.14%
26	7	0.58%	0.14%	0.29%	0.00%
27	18	0.43%	1.44%	0.72%	0.00%
28	7	0.29%	0.29%	0.14%	0.29%
29	5	0.00%	0.29%	0.29%	0.14%
30	7	0.29%	0.29%	0.29%	0.14%
31	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%
32	7	0.00%	0.43%	0.43%	0.14%
33	2	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%	0.14%
34	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%
35	4	0.14%	0.00%	0.29%	0.14%
38	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.43%	0.00%
450	21	2.73%	0.29%	0.00%	0.00%
460	8	0.72%	0.29%	0.14%	0.00%
470	3	0.14%	0.29%	0.00%	0.00%
480	1	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total	100%	61.58%	26.19%	8.92%	3.31%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided by Marion County as of April 2022.



EXHIBIT 2H

SALARY QUARTILE ANALYSIS – LIUNA

GRADE	1ST QUARTILE	2ND QUARTILE	3RD QUARTILE	4TH QUARTILE
2	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%
5	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
6	0.69%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%
7	6.94%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%
8	7.99%	0.35%	0.69%	0.35%
9	5.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.35%
10	7.64%	0.35%	0.35%	0.00%
11	8.33%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%
12	6.94%	0.69%	0.69%	0.00%
13	6.60%	1.74%	1.74%	1.39%
14	6.60%	1.74%	1.04%	0.00%
15	5.21%	3.82%	0.35%	0.00%
16	1.39%	0.35%	0.69%	0.00%
17	3.47%	4.17%	1.04%	0.00%
19	1.04%	0.35%	0.35%	0.35%
20	0.69%	0.35%	0.35%	0.00%
21	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%
Total	69.10%	21.18%	7.29%	2.43%

Source: Created by Evergreen from data provided by Marion County as of April 2022.

As displayed in **Exhibit 2G** for BCC employees, 61.6 percent of employees had salaries in Quartile 1 of their respective range, 26.2 percent were in Quartile 2, 8.9 percent in Quartile 3, and 3.3 percent in Quartile 4. For the LIUNA employees, as seen in **Exhibit 2H**, the distribution was 69.1 percent of employees' salaries in Quartile 1 of their respective range, 21.2 percent were in Quartile 2, 7.3 percent in Quartile 3, and 2.4 percent in Quartile 4.

The quartile analyses, along with the analyses of salaries below and above the midpoint, reveal a clustering of employees' salaries below the midpoints which indicates the County appeared to have struggled to continuously progress employees' salaries through the plans' pay ranges. Employee salary progression should be aligned, to the extent possible, with the County's compensation philosophy. Recommendations in this regard are discussed in **Chapter 5** of this report.

2.4 SUMMARY

The information contained in this chapter identifies a number of strengths and weaknesses related to the overall structure of the compensation system for the County's employees. Notably, the following was found:

- **Pay Plans** – The pay plans utilized by the County were clear, well organized, and had range spreads that are within best practice.
- **Salary Distribution** – Employees' salaries were clustered below the midpoints—suggesting that employees' salaries may not have progressed as expected.



This analysis served as a starting point for the development of recommendations in this report. Paired with market data, Evergreen was able to make recommendations to ensure that the compensation system for the County's employees is structurally sound, competitive with the market, and equitable. Recommendations in this regard can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.



Chapter 3 – Summary of Employee Outreach

Evergreen consultants conducted the process of Employee Outreach in September 2021. This consisted of facilitated virtual orientation sessions to explain the goals of and expectations for the study, with an opportunity for employee questions and answers; a (SurveyMonkey) web-administered questionnaire available to all employees for their feedback regarding the County's classification and compensation system; and interviews with department heads regarding the same. The collective comments, perceptions and suggestions related to each topic area are summarized in this chapter. It is important to note that the views shared may not reflect actual conditions of the County's system.

3.1 GENERAL FEEDBACK

Overall, it was expressed that there is significant satisfaction with the benefits provided by the County to its employees. As well, it was mentioned that employees enjoy the culture of the County, the location, and having the opportunity for career growth and development. Specifically, employees indicated they appreciate:

- participating in the Florida Retirement System;
- the (job) security that is provided by the County; and
- the ample vacation time provided to them.

3.2 COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION

The following additional feedback was provided regarding the County's classification and compensation system:

- there is a perceived disconnect between (appropriate) pay and responsibilities;
- career growth matrices would be appreciated by all;
- added job responsibilities and confusion caused by outdated job descriptions were cited as a concern by many;
- some expressed a desire to have flexible hiring practices with the ability to offer higher starting salary to candidates that possess additional certifications, experience, and/or education beyond minimal qualifications;



- compression of salaries between supervisors and staff appeared to be a concern for some, as well as concern regarding increased compression as the minimum wage increases in Florida;
- pay for specialty jobs or additional certifications would be appreciated; and
- the appropriateness of titles and clear delineation of duties between levels of managers and supervisors would be appreciated.

3.3 MARKET PEERS

Employees and department heads were asked to identify organizations they considered to be market peers competing for employees performing similar work. Listed below are organizations (peers) that were cited and which Evergreen considered when developing the list of peers for the salary and benefits survey:

- Alachua County, FL;
- Lake County, FL;
- Polk County, FL;
- St. John's County, FL;
- Sumter County, FL;
- City of Gainesville, FL;
- City of Ocala, FL; and
- City of Orlando, FL.

3.4 BENEFITS

Feedback regarding employee benefits was collected as well. Overall, the strong benefits plan is appreciated, particularly the wellness center that offers free primary care to employees and dependents. However, the following feedback was received as additional fringe benefits employees consider desirable and believe would assist in attracting new, quality talent:

- increasing the tuition reimbursement rate to reflect actual costs;
- flexibility through remote work opportunities;
- a tiered health care plan to reduce cost or offer monetary incentives for those who do not utilize the insurance options;
- offer compensatory time for salaried exempt employees; and
- buy back unused leave.



3.5 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

While not a focus of the study, Evergreen consultants requested feedback regarding the performance evaluation system (process/forms). The input is summarized below:

- the current system adequately reflects the County's mission, goals and values;
- there was a belief performance evaluation results should be tied to raises, promotions, and discipline, as needed;
- a 360-evaluation system would create a better overall system of review for upper management;
- additional training is needed for supervisors on how to effectively and fairly evaluate employees; and
- it was believed that the system could be simplified and should be job and/or department specific.

3.6 SUMMARY

The feedback received by Evergreen during employee outreach was considered throughout the study as well as during the subsequent development of overall recommendations. The employees and department heads were engaged during this process and eager to contribute and provide observations with respect to compensation and classification strengths and areas for opportunity. The top concerns were equity in pay and appropriate classifications for all. Contributors also spoke highly of the benefits offered by the County. While some emphasized potential concern areas, many of these issues are commonly found in other organizations today.

As a whole, it was believed that employees take pride in their work, enjoy serving their community, refer to themselves as public servants, and strive to make valuable contributions to their County and community. The Evergreen team considered the feedback gathered from this process throughout the remainder of this study and when arriving at the recommendations found in **Chapter 5** of this report.



Chapter 4 – Market Summary

This chapter provides a market analysis comparing the County's salary ranges to those at peer organizations. The data from targeted market peers were used to evaluate the competitiveness of the County's pay plan at the time of this study. It is important to note that the market comparisons contained herein do not translate at the individual level and are instead used to provide an overall analysis. The utilized methodology is not intended to evaluate salaries paid to individuals. Also, employee's compensation is determined through a combination of factors, which could include: the market conditions for the job, the geographic location of the organization, the candidate's prior related education and experience, and/or the individual's negotiation skills during the hiring process.

It should be noted that market comparisons are best thought of as a snapshot of current market conditions. In other words, market conditions can change; therefore, these market survey findings will be helpful for the County to remain current with its peers under the present market conditions.

4.1 SALARY SURVEY RESULTS

Evergreen collected pay range information from target (peer) organizations utilizing a salary survey tool. The development of this tool included a subset, or cross-section of classifications in the County. The job title, a description of assigned duties, and the education and experience requirements for each classification were provided in the survey tool so that peers could determine if the position existed within their organization.

Evergreen received concurrence from the County's project team regarding the target peer organizations to which the survey was provided. Several factors were utilized when developing this peer list, including geographic proximity to the County, similar service offerings, and organization size.

Exhibit 4A provides the list of 14 peer organizations from which data was collected for 74 benchmark classifications from which salary range data were collected.



EXHIBIT 4A
MARKET PEERS

Market Peers
Gainesville, FL
Kissimmee, FL
Ocala, FL
Alachua County, FL
Citrus County, FL
Clay County, FL
Collier County, FL
Lake County, FL
Leon County, FL
Levy County, FL
Polk County, FL
Putnam County, FL
St. Johns County, FL
Sumter County, FL
Volusia County, FL
Marion County Sheriff's Office
Central Florida Community College
Marion County Public Schools

*Data were collected from those in **bold**

The County expressed a desire to have a salary structure that would be reflective of a competitive position with its' market peers. Based on this, Evergreen utilized a comparison of its current structure, or salary ranges for the benchmark classifications to the targets' data at the average of the peers' responses. **Exhibit 4B** provides a summary of these results and contains the following information:

- The market salary range information for each classification. This indicates the average of the minimum, midpoint, and maximum of the peer survey data for each benchmarked classification.
- The percent differentials (to the County's existing salary ranges). A positive differential indicates the County's pay range for these positions was above the average for that classification at the minimum, midpoint, or maximum. A negative differential indicates the County's pay range was below the average for that classification. The final row provides the average of the average differentials for the ranges' minimums, midpoints, and maximums for all benchmarked classifications.
- The survey average range width. This provides the average range width for each classification surveyed determined by average minimum and maximum salaries of the respondents, relative to the minimum. The average range width for all the classifications is provided in the final row.



EXHIBIT 4B SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY AT MARKET AVERAGE

Classification	Minimum % Diff	Midpoint % Diff	Maximum % Diff	Average Range Width	# of Data Points
911 SPECIALIST	-4.0%	0.9%	4.3%	42.2%	4
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF ASSISTANT	-10.6%	-8.8%	-7.6%	50.5%	7
ANIMAL CARE TECHNICIAN	-6.0%	-7.5%	-8.5%	58.4%	6
ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER	-7.1%	-10.9%	-13.2%	64.0%	5
ANIMAL SERVICE DIRECTOR	3.1%	0.5%	-1.1%	60.8%	4
ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST I	-24.6%	-23.5%	-22.7%	51.1%	3
ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY	-0.3%	-6.0%	-9.5%	69.2%	11
BATTALION CHIEF	42.9%	41.4%	40.5%	58.0%	8
BUILDING GROUNDS MAINTENANCE TECHNICIAN I	-17.9%	-19.5%	-20.4%	58.3%	7
BUILDING MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR	-4.6%	-0.3%	2.5%	44.7%	5
BUSINESS ANALYST	1.7%	2.3%	2.8%	53.0%	5
BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST	-3.8%	-3.3%	-3.0%	52.7%	6
CAPTAIN	-10.8%	-8.5%	-6.9%	48.7%	6
CLIENT SERVICES SPECIALIST	-10.3%	-15.2%	-18.3%	66.7%	5
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	5.4%	4.3%	3.7%	57.2%	10
COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTOR	-22.3%	-23.2%	-23.8%	56.8%	8
COUNTY ENGINEER	0.9%	-2.0%	-3.8%	61.9%	6
CUSTODIAN	-26.1%	-22.4%	-19.9%	44.9%	10
CUSTOMER SERVICE SPECIALIST	23.6%	22.4%	21.6%	57.8%	6
EMERGENCY MEDICAL TECHNICIAN (EMT)	-50.1%	-20.5%	-4.5%	52.0%	5
EMERGENCY TELECOMMUNICATOR SUPERVISOR	-1.9%	0.1%	1.5%	49.4%	5
EMERGENCY TELECOMMUNICATOR	9.0%	10.1%	10.8%	50.3%	4
ENGINEER	24.3%	21.1%	19.0%	62.8%	10
ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR	-14.4%	-17.1%	-18.9%	61.0%	6
ENGINEERING PROJECT MANAGER I	-16.2%	-16.7%	-17.0%	55.6%	4
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	11.2%	10.5%	10.1%	56.3%	7
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY	-0.2%	-0.1%	0.0%	54.0%	6
EXECUTIVE COORDINATOR	-16.1%	-15.4%	-14.9%	52.6%	5
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT CONSTRUCTION MANAGER	2.5%	1.5%	0.8%	57.2%	8
FACILITY TRADES TECHNICIAN	18.0%	16.5%	15.6%	58.4%	7
FIREFIGHTER	-17.0%	9.4%	23.2%	55.6%	9
FISCAL ANALYST	3.8%	2.2%	1.2%	58.9%	7
FLEET VEHICLE TECHNICIAN	20.3%	17.8%	16.3%	60.2%	10
GIS COORDINATOR	1.4%	2.6%	3.4%	51.6%	7
GIS TECHNICIAN ANALYST	-0.5%	0.4%	1.0%	52.5%	7
GROWTH SERVICES DIRECTOR	-9.7%	-13.1%	-15.2%	62.7%	7
HEAVY EQUIPMENT OPERATOR	1.2%	-0.4%	-1.5%	58.4%	7
HUMAN RESOURCES TECHNICIAN	-12.8%	-12.7%	-12.5%	54.3%	10
HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE TECHNICIAN	-9.0%	-12.4%	-14.6%	63.3%	6
IT SECURITY OFFICER	-8.2%	-8.6%	-8.9%	55.5%	6
INFORMATION SYSTEMS ANALYST	-14.1%	-14.0%	-14.0%	54.7%	6
IT DIRECTOR	-14.8%	-16.6%	-17.7%	59.1%	12
INSPECTOR PLANS EXAMINER	-4.9%	-7.6%	-9.3%	61.4%	6
IT PROJECT MANAGER	-25.9%	-24.0%	-22.7%	50.0%	5
IT SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR	-23.5%	-22.0%	-21.1%	51.0%	7
LIBRARY DIRECTOR	-3.9%	-4.9%	-5.5%	56.9%	6
MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR	-7.9%	-10.0%	-11.4%	60.0%	5
MEDICAL BILLING SPECIALIST	19.4%	19.0%	18.7%	55.7%	3
MULTIMEDIA COORDINATOR	-6.7%	-6.3%	-6.0%	53.4%	7
PARALEGAL	-19.2%	-18.4%	-18.0%	52.9%	10
PARAMEDIC	-69.0%	-42.3%	-27.9%	56.3%	6
PARK SERVICES WORKER	0.7%	4.2%	6.5%	46.0%	9
PARKS RECREATION DIRECTOR	-1.0%	-3.8%	-5.5%	61.3%	9
PERMITTING LICENSING TECH	6.0%	7.2%	8.0%	51.4%	8
PROJECTS COORDINATOR II	-4.7%	-4.7%	-4.8%	54.7%	4
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER I	-15.8%	-12.0%	-9.5%	45.4%	9
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATION DIRECTOR	6.7%	15.5%	21.5%	33.4%	5
PUBLIC SERVICES LIBRARIAN I	-11.9%	-15.8%	-18.3%	64.4%	3
RISK MANAGER	-18.4%	-17.9%	-17.6%	53.3%	9
SCALE OPERATIONS SPECIALIST	1.9%	0.0%	-1.3%	59.5%	5
SENIOR PLANNER	2.6%	0.4%	-1.0%	59.7%	9
SERVICE WRITER	-6.3%	-4.5%	-3.3%	49.6%	6
SOLID WASTE OPERATOR	13.4%	13.7%	13.9%	53.6%	5
SURVEY TECHNICIAN	-15.2%	-15.2%	-15.2%	53.5%	6
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR	0.7%	1.4%	1.9%	52.7%	4
TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT SPECIALIST	-1.7%	-0.6%	0.2%	52.3%	6
TOURISM DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR	-20.3%	-21.0%	-21.4%	56.0%	4
TRANSPORTATION PLANNER	12.4%	10.5%	9.3%	59.3%	7
UTILITIES CONSTRUCTION MANAGER	8.2%	9.0%	9.5%	52.4%	3
UTILITIES FIELD TECHNICIAN	-5.7%	-8.9%	-10.9%	62.6%	5
UTILITIES GIS TECHNICIAN	-39.6%	-41.9%	-43.4%	59.9%	5
UTILITIES PLANT OPERATOR	0.8%	0.0%	-0.6%	56.9%	5
VETERANS SERVICES OFFICER	-31.0%	-27.7%	-25.5%	46.4%	6
ZONING TECHNICIAN	-0.2%	3.4%	5.8%	44.7%	4
Overall Average	-5.7%	-4.9%	-4.4%	55.1%	6.4



Market Minimums

A starting point of the analysis was to compare the peer's market minimum for each classification to County's range minimums. Market minimums are generally considered an entry level salary for employees who meet the minimum qualifications of a classification. Employees with salaries at or near the range minimums typically have not mastered the job and probably have not acquired the skills and experience necessary to be fully proficient in their classification.

As **Exhibit 4A** illustrates for surveyed classifications, County was, on average, approximately 5.7 percent below the average market position at the minimum of the respective salary ranges.

Market Midpoints

Market midpoints are important to consider because they are commonly recognized as the salary point at which employees are fully proficient in satisfactorily performing their work. As such, midpoint is often considered as the salary point at which a fully proficient employee could expect his or her salary to be placed.

As **Exhibit 4A** illustrates for the surveyed classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 4.9 percent below the average market position at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges.

Market Maximums

In this section, salary range maximums are compared to the peers' average of maximums for each benchmarked classification. The market maximum is significant as it represents the upper limit salary that an organization might provide to retain and/or reward experienced and high performing employees. Additionally, being competitive at the maximum allows organizations to attract highly qualified individuals for in-demand classifications.

As **Exhibit 4A** illustrates for the surveyed classifications, the County was, on average, approximately 4.4 percent below the average market position at the maximum of the respective salary ranges.

4.2 SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY

It should again be noted that the standing of a classification's pay range compared to the market is not a definitive assessment of an individual employee's salary being equally above or below market. A salary range does, however, speak to County's general ability to recruit and retain talent over time. If a range minimum is significantly lower than the market would offer, the County could find itself losing out to its market peers when it seeks to fill a position. It is equally true that range maximums lower than the market maximums may serve as a disincentive for experienced employees to remain at the County. From the analysis of the data gathered and discussed above, the surveyed classifications' ranges were generally



found to below the County's desired competitive (average) market position. All study findings and subsequent recommendations can be found in the next chapter of this report.

Additionally, at the time of this report, Evergreen was finalizing an analysis of peers' employee benefits as compared to its' peers. The results will be provided under separate cover, and utilized to assist the County in determining if changes and/or modifications should be made to the benefits provided and offered to its employees.



Chapter 5 - Recommendations

The analysis of the County's classification and compensation system revealed some areas of opportunity for improvement. Evergreen focused primarily on developing a highly competitive pay plan, as well as reviewing and making recommendations to the classification structure. Study recommendations, as well as the findings that led to each, are discussed in this chapter.

5.1 CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

An organization's classification system establishes how its human resources are employed to perform its core services. The classification system consists of the titles and descriptions of the different classifications, or positions, which define how work is organized and assigned. It is essential that the titles and descriptions of an organization's classifications accurately depict the work being performed by employees in the classifications to ensure equity within the organization and to enable comparisons with positions at peer organizations. The purpose of a classification analysis is to identify such issues as incorrect titles and inconsistent titles across departments.

In the analysis of the County's classification system, Evergreen collected classification data through the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) and Management Issues Tool (MIT) processes. The JATs, which were completed by employees and reviewed by their supervisors, provided information about the type and level of work being performed for each of the County's classifications. Evergreen reviewed and utilized the data provided in the JATs as a basis for the classification recommendations below.

FINDING

Overall, the classification system utilized by the County was sound. However, there were a few instances of titles for positions that could be modified.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Revise the titles of some classifications to better reflect job duties.

Exhibit 5A provides a list of the recommended changes to the classification system. The foundation for these recommendations was the work performed by employees as described in their JATs, best practice in the Human Resources field, or unique needs which required a specific titling method.



EXHIBIT 5A PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Class Title	Proposed Class Title
Community Services Manager	Administrative Manager
Community Srv Compliance Mont	Compliance Monitor
Cont Of Care Admin Assistant	Continuum of Care Program Coordinator
SELP Bldg Grds Maint Tech II	Event Service Specialist II
SELP Bldg Grds Maint Tech III	Event Service Specialist III
SELP Bldg Grds Maint Tech Iv	Event Service Specialist IV
Customer Servs Rep II	Extension Customer Service Representative II
Fleet Manager	Fleet Operations Manager
OCE GIS Technician Analyst	OCE GIS Analyst
Park Services Worker I	Park Maintenance Technician I
Park Services Worker II	Park Maintenance Technician II
Park Services Worker III	Park Maintenance Technician III
Park Services Worker IV	Park Maintenance Technician IV
Park Services Worker V	Park Maintenance Technician V
Planner II	Planner
Admin Business Specialist	Procurement Analyst
Procure Contract Analyst Coor	Procurement Coordinator
Communications Manager	Public Safety Communications Manager
Mapping Asset Specialist	Utility Asset Coordinator

FINDING

When comparing the County's current job descriptions to the work described by employees in the JATs, Evergreen noted some tasks that were missing from the current job descriptions. This can happen over a period of time if the descriptions are not reviewed and updated on a regular basis. Some tasks in one classification are often reassigned to another classification. As such, these changes make it necessary that the County continues to update its job descriptions periodically to ensure each job description accurately reflects the work performed.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Revise all job descriptions to include updated classification information provided in the JAT, and review job descriptions annually for accuracy.

The process of reviewing and updating the County's job descriptions, as well as comments received from employees and supervisors during outreach, revealed that the descriptions may not, in some cases, accurately reflect current work performed. To minimize this becoming a concern again in the future, Evergreen recommends a regular review of these descriptions, including FLSA status determinations.



A review of the employee's assigned job classification (description) should occur at least annually. Review of the FLSA determination for exempt or non-exempt status as well as other aspects of the job, (such as physical requirements required to perform essential functions) will also ensure consistent, continuous compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) protection. At the time of this report, Evergreen was in the process of revising the job descriptions for all classifications. The descriptions will be provided to the County under separate cover.

5.2 COMPENSATION SYSTEM

The compensation system analysis consisted of two parts: an external market assessment and an internal equity assessment. During the external market assessment, the County's pay ranges for its classifications were compared to the average of the identified market. Details regarding the external market assessment were provided in **Chapter 4** of this report.

During the internal equity assessment, consideration of the relationships between positions and the type of work being performed by the County employees were reviewed and analyzed. Specifically, a composite score was assigned to each of the classifications that quantified the classification's level of five separate compensatory factors (leadership, working conditions, complexity, decision-making, and relationships). The level for each factor was determined based on responses to the JAT. The results of both analyses were utilized when developing the recommendations below.

FINDING

The County's salary ranges were overall found to be behind the desired average market position at the minimum, midpoint, and maximum. Implementing a new, competitive pay structure (pay plans) would provide the County with an improved ability to attract, hire and retain employees.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Revise the BCC and LIUNA pay plans to be competitive at the average of the market and create an open-range plan for Fire Chiefs; slot all classifications into the plans based on external and internal equity; and transition employees' salaries into the revised plans.

Exhibit 5B shows the revised open-range pay plan for BCC employees. This plan has 25 pay grades and constant range spreads of 55 percent. **Exhibit 5C** displays the new open-range pay plan for LIUNA employees. This plan has 15 pay grades and constant range spreads of 55 percent. **Exhibit 5D** displays the newly created open-range pay plan for Fire Chief employees. This plan has nine pay grades and constant range spreads of 55 percent.



EXHIBIT 5B
PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN – BCC

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread
101	\$27,040.00	\$34,476.00	\$41,912.00	55.0%
102	\$28,932.80	\$36,888.80	\$44,844.80	55.0%
103	\$31,200.00	\$39,780.00	\$48,360.00	55.0%
104	\$33,134.40	\$42,234.58	\$51,355.20	55.0%
105	\$35,464.00	\$45,219.20	\$54,974.40	55.0%
106	\$37,939.20	\$48,370.40	\$58,801.60	55.0%
107	\$40,580.80	\$51,740.00	\$62,899.20	55.0%
108	\$43,430.40	\$55,369.60	\$67,308.80	55.0%
109	\$46,467.20	\$59,248.80	\$72,030.40	55.0%
110	\$49,732.80	\$63,408.80	\$77,084.80	55.0%
111	\$53,206.40	\$67,839.20	\$82,472.00	55.0%
112	\$56,929.60	\$72,581.60	\$88,233.60	55.0%
113	\$60,923.20	\$77,677.60	\$94,432.00	55.0%
114	\$65,187.20	\$83,116.80	\$101,046.40	55.0%
115	\$69,742.40	\$88,920.00	\$108,097.60	55.0%
116	\$74,630.40	\$95,149.60	\$115,668.80	55.0%
117	\$79,851.20	\$101,805.60	\$123,760.00	55.0%
118	\$85,446.40	\$108,940.00	\$132,433.60	55.0%
119	\$91,416.00	\$116,552.80	\$141,689.60	55.0%
120	\$100,568.00	\$128,221.60	\$155,875.20	55.0%
121	\$110,614.40	\$141,034.40	\$171,454.40	55.0%
122	\$121,680.00	\$155,147.20	\$188,614.40	55.0%
123	\$133,848.00	\$170,653.60	\$207,459.20	55.0%
124	\$147,222.40	\$187,709.60	\$228,196.80	55.0%
125	\$161,948.80	\$206,481.60	\$251,014.40	55.0%



**EXHIBIT 5C
PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN – LIUNA**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread
200	\$ 27,643.20	\$ 35,058.40	\$ 42,473.60	54%
201	\$ 28,974.40	\$ 36,805.60	\$ 44,636.80	54%
202	\$ 31,200.00	\$ 39,624.00	\$ 48,048.00	54%
203	\$ 32,323.20	\$ 40,757.60	\$ 49,192.00	52%
204	\$ 33,446.40	\$ 42,515.20	\$ 51,584.00	54%
205	\$ 35,172.80	\$ 44,668.00	\$ 54,163.20	54%
206	\$ 37,024.00	\$ 47,018.40	\$ 57,012.80	54%
207	\$ 38,750.40	\$ 49,275.20	\$ 59,800.00	54%
208	\$ 40,726.40	\$ 51,812.80	\$ 62,899.20	54%
209	\$ 42,806.40	\$ 54,454.40	\$ 66,102.40	54%
210	\$ 44,928.00	\$ 57,177.12	\$ 69,409.60	54%
211	\$ 46,883.20	\$ 59,664.80	\$ 72,446.40	55%
212	\$ 49,088.00	\$ 62,472.80	\$ 75,857.60	55%
213	\$ 51,688.00	\$ 65,707.20	\$ 79,726.40	54%
214	\$ 54,267.20	\$ 68,983.20	\$ 83,699.20	54%

**EXHIBIT 5D
PROPOSED NEW PAY PLAN – FIRE CHIEFS**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread
300	\$79,851.20	\$101,805.60	\$123,760.00	55.0%
301	\$85,446.40	\$108,940.00	\$132,433.60	55.0%
302	\$91,416.00	\$116,552.80	\$141,689.60	55.0%
303	\$100,568.00	\$128,221.60	\$155,875.20	55.0%
304	\$110,614.40	\$141,034.40	\$171,454.40	55.0%
305	\$121,680.00	\$155,147.20	\$188,614.40	55.0%
306	\$133,848.00	\$170,653.60	\$207,459.20	55.0%
307	\$147,222.40	\$187,709.60	\$228,196.80	55.0%
308	\$161,948.80	\$206,481.60	\$251,014.40	55.0%



Evergreen then slotted each proposed classification into the appropriate pay range in the pay plan. Both internal and external equity were analyzed when slotting the classifications. Assigning pay grades to classifications requires a balance of internal equity, desired market position, and recruitment and retention concerns. Thus, market range data shown in **Chapter 4** were not the sole criteria for the proposed pay ranges. Some classifications' grade assignments varied from their associated market range due to the other factors mentioned above. **Exhibit 5E** shows the proposed pay ranges for all classifications in the three proposed new plans.



EXHIBIT 5E
PROPOSED PAY GRADES – ALL PLANS

Proposed Class Title	Proposed Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
911 Specialist I Airport Operations Technician Assessment Specialist I Circulation Assistant Client Services Specialist Trainee Code Enforcement Officer Trainee Engineer Trainee Extension Customer Service Representative I Human Resources Technician Lead Custodian Legal Assistant Park Maintenance Technician I Purchasing Inventory Assist Recreation Leader I RLE Maint Tech Equip Operator Staff Assistant I Supply Inventory Technician I	103	\$ 31,200.00	\$ 39,780.00	\$ 48,360.00
Accounting Specialist II Animal Control Officer I Code Enforcement Officer I Emergency Telecommunicator I Extension Customer Service Representative II License Permitting Investigator Permitting Licensing Tech Trainee Records Lien Technician Recreation Leader II Solid Waste Dispatcher Staff Assistant II Supply Inventory Technician II	104	\$ 33,134.40	\$ 42,234.58	\$ 51,355.20
Airport Operations Lead Technician Alternative Sanctions Coordinator Conservation Technician Department Dispatcher Extension Program Assistant Fire EMS Purchasing Coordinator Library Technician II Logistics Inventory Tech Medical Billing Specialist I Purchasing Inventory Coordinator Recreation Leader III Staff Assistant III Supply Inventory Technician III Veterans Services Specialist Visitor Relations Representative Zoning Technician Trainee	105	\$ 35,464.00	\$ 45,219.20	\$ 54,974.40
911 Specialist II Assessment Specialist II Business Services Specialist Catalog Specialist Client Services Specialist I Code Enforcement Officer II Court Alternative Coordinator Customer Service Specialist Emergency Telecommunicator II Human Resources Risk Assistant Medical Billing Specialist II OCE Customer Service Special I Public Service Assistant Radio Systems Specialist Staff Assistant IV Technology Support Specialist Trainee Tourism Development Specialist Utilities Billing Account Spec I Veteran Services Officer Zoning Technician I	106	\$ 37,939.20	\$ 48,370.40	\$ 58,801.60



EXHIBIT 5E (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES – ALL PLANS

Proposed Class Title	Proposed Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
Animal Control Officer II Budget Administrative Coordinator Circulation Specialist Client Services Specialist II Compliance Monitor Continuum Of Care Program Coor Continuum Of Care Program Coordinator Contractor Licensing Special Court Program Specialist I Justice Information Systems Coordinator Medical Billing Specialist III OCE Customer Service Special II Paralegal Parks Operations Specialist Permitting Licensing Tech I Pretreatment Coordinator Project Assistant Purchasing Inventory Coordinator Senior Catalog Specialist Service Writer Technology Support Specialist I Utilities Billing Account Spec II Utilities Cmms Technician Zoning Technician II	107	\$ 40,580.80	\$ 51,740.00	\$ 62,899.20
911 Specialist III Admin Services Coordinator Admin Spec III Social Med Coor Administrative Staff Assistant Animal Control Officer III Animal Serv Mitigation Special Animal Services Program Spec Client Services Specialist I Code Enforcement Officer III Community Engagement Coord Emergency Telecommunicator III Engineering Technician III Fire Inspector I GIS Technician Analyst Health Wellness Coordinator Human Resources Coordinator Land Management Agent I Legal Executive Staff Assistant Marion Oaks Crew Leader Medical Billing Specialist IV OCE Customer Service Special III Permitting Licensing Tech II Risk And Benefits Assistant Senior Purchasing Inventory Coordinator Survey Party Chief Technology Support Specialist II Traffic Engineering Technician Transportation Contract Coor User Support Analyst Utilities Billing Account Spec III Zoning Technician III	108	\$ 43,430.40	\$ 55,369.60	\$ 67,308.80
Animal Service Support Special Brand Content Coordinator Client Services Specialist IV Development Review Coordinator Emergency Telecommunicator IV Executive Assistant To The Bcc Executive Coordinator Fire Inspector II Information Systems Analyst Inspector Plans Examiner Trainee Marion Soil Dist Administrator Medical Billing Specialist V Procurement Contract Analyst Public Services Librarian I Scale Operations Supervisor Senior Human Resources Coordinator Sports Field Specialist Technology Support Specialist III Training QA Technician Utilities Billing Account Spec IV	109	\$ 46,467.20	\$ 59,248.80	\$ 72,030.40



EXHIBIT 5E (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES – ALL PLANS

Proposed Class Title	Proposed Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
Animal Compliance Official	110	\$ 49,732.80	\$ 63,408.80	\$ 77,084.80
Branch Library Supervisor II				
Circulation Manager				
Code Enforcement Officer IV				
Crew Supervisor				
Develop Review Officer Utiliti				
E911 GIS Analyst				
Emergency Telecommunicator Supervisor				
Fire Inspector III				
General Services Maintenance Supervisor				
Inspector Plans Examiner I				
It Security Analyst				
Marketing And Comm Supervisor				
Permitting Licensing Supervisor				
Procurement Analyst				
Projects Coordinator II				
Public Services Librarian II				
Recreation Specialist				
Recreation Supervisor				
Solid Waste Supervisor				
Senior Animal Control Officer				
Traffic Supervisor				
Utilities Instrumentation Technician				
Vendor Liaison				
Veteran Services Supervisor				
Animal Center Supervisor	111	\$ 53,206.40	\$ 67,839.20	\$ 82,472.00
Animal Compliance Official				
Animal Control Coordinator				
Benefits Analyst				
Business Analyst				
Collection Develop Librarian				
Engineering Project Manager				
Fac Mgmt. Admin Sup				
Facilities Mgmt. Proj Mgr				
Fire Inspector IV				
Fire Life Safety Educator				
Fire Prevention Supervisor				
Fiscal Analyst				
GIS Programmer Analyst				
Grant Coord Fiscal Planner				
Group Sales Supervisor				
Growth Services Coordinator				
Growth Srv Develop Review Coor				
Info Technology Office Manager				
Inspector Plans Examiner II				
IT Project Manager				
IT System Administrator				
IT Web Multimedia Specialist				
Land Management Agent II				
Legislative Liaison				
Library Community Liaison				
Library Systems Supervisor				
Mstu Project Manager				
Network Systems Analyst				
OCE GIS Analyst				
Park Ranger				
Parks Designer				
Planning And Zoning Supervisor				
Procurement Coordinator				
Public Relations Specialist				
Public Services Librarian III				
Quality Assurance Specialist				
Selp Facil Mgmt Supervisor				
Solid Waste Resources Liaison				
Utilities Billing And Acct Sup				
Utilities Business Analyst				
Utilities Construction Officer				
Water Resources Liaison				



EXHIBIT 5E (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES – ALL PLANS

Proposed Class Title	Proposed Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
Administrative Logistic Manager	112	\$ 56,929.60	\$ 72,581.60	\$ 88,233.60
Administrative Manager				
Branch Library Supervisor III				
Building Maintenance Supervisor				
Business Systems Analyst				
Code Enforcement Supervisor				
Communications Compliance And Information Special				
Community Center Manager				
Community Serv Fiscal Manager				
Development Review Manager				
Environ Services Admin Manager				
Executive Staff Manager				
Facilities Fiscal Manager				
General Services Maintenance Manager				
Growth Services Administrative Manager				
Human Resources Supervisor				
Infrastructure Analyst				
Inspector Plans Examiner III				
Library Division Manager				
Multimedia Coordinator				
OCE Eng Project Manager II				
Paramedic Training Specialist				
Park Operations Supervisor				
Planner				
Procurement Supervisor				
Quality Assurance Technician				
Rle Mun Srv District Manager				
Road Maintenance Manager				
Safety Training & Comp Manager				
Safety Training Manager				
TPO Transportation Planner				
Traffic Atms Signal Supervisor				
Trial Court Staff Attorney				
Utilities Field Services Supervisor				
Utilities Maintenance Supervisor				
Utilities Operation Supervisor				
Utility Asset Coordinator				
Airport Manager	113	\$ 60,923.20	\$ 77,677.60	\$ 94,432.00
Animal Control Manager				
Building Business Manager				
Clinic Manager Register Nurse				
Engineer I				
GIS Coordinator				
Inspector Plans Examiner IV				
Livestock Pavilion Manager				
Medical Billing Manager				
Permitting Licensing Division Manager				
Recreation Manager				
Right Of Way Manager				
Risk Benefits Asset Analyst				
Senior Business System Analyst				
Senior Infrastructure Analyst				
Sr Public Relations Specialist				
Talent Manager				
Training Accreditation Coordinator				



EXHIBIT 5E (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES – ALL PLANS

Proposed Class Title	Proposed Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
Administrative Financial Services Manager Animal Services Operations Mgr Continuum Of Care Manager Database Administrator Environ Serv Business Manager Environmental Services Fiscal Manager Facilities Management Operations Manager Facilities Manager Construction Manager Fleet Operations Manager Housing Grant Manager Inspector Plans Examiner Supervisor Inspector Plans Examiner V Logistics Manager Network Systems Administrator Operations Manager Procurement Manager Radio Systems Manager Roads Superintendent Senior Planner Solid Waste Operations Manager Sr Library Division Manager Tourism Development Manager TPO Sr Transportation Planner Transportation Administrative Manager Transportation Asset Manager Transportation Construction Manager Transportation Planner Utilities Construction Manager Utilities Maintenance Manager Utilities Operations Manager	114	\$ 65,187.20	\$ 83,116.80	\$ 101,046.40
Community Development Grant Administrator Community Develop Administrator Info Tech Applications Mgr Info Tech Infrastructure Mgr Info Tech Security Officer Information Technology Systems Manager Public Safety Communications Manager Risk Manager Systems Administrator	115	\$ 69,742.40	\$ 88,920.00	\$ 108,097.60
Assistant County Attorney Assistant Library Director County Surveyor Div Mgr Plans Exam Inspect Engineer II Facilities Assistant Director Human Resources Assistant Director OCE Eng Project Manager III Parks Assistant Director E911 Management Director Engineer III	116	\$ 74,630.40	\$ 95,149.60	\$ 115,668.80
PR Communications Director Procurement Director Tourism Development Director Veteran Services Director	117	\$ 79,851.20	\$ 101,805.60	\$ 123,760.00
Animal Service Director Assist Cnty Engineer Traffic Assistant County Engineer, Road Construction Assistant County Engineer, Road Maintenance Assistant County Eningeer, Stormwater Community Services Director Environ Serv Engineer Manager Fleet Management Director Growth Svs Deputy Director Library Director MTSU Assessment Director Public Safety Communications Director Senior Assistant County Attorney	118	\$ 85,446.40	\$ 108,940.00	\$ 132,433.60



EXHIBIT 5E (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES – ALL PLANS

Proposed Class Title	Proposed Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
Animal Center Veterinarian Building Safety Director Deputy County Engineer Environmental Services Deputy Director Facilities Management Director Fire Marshall Growth Services Director Information Technology Director Parks And Recreation Director Transportation Planning Organization Director	119	\$ 91,416.00	\$ 116,552.80	\$ 141,689.60
County Engineer Environmental Services Director Executive Director Administration Services Executive Director Internal Services	120	\$ 100,568.00	\$ 128,221.60	\$ 155,875.20
Assistant County Administrator Chief Assistant County Attorney	122	\$ 121,680.00	\$ 155,147.20	\$ 188,614.40
Animal Care Technician Building Grounds Maintenance Technician I Courier Custodian Facility Trades Technician Trainee Highway Maintenance Technician I Highway Maintenance Technician II Light Equipment Operator I Right Of Way Maintenance Technician Scale Operations Specialist Survey Technician I	202	\$ 31,200.00	\$ 39,624.00	\$ 48,048.00
Building Grounds Maintenance Technician II Event Service Specialist II Fleet Generator and Fuel Tank Specialist Assistant Hazardous Waste Spotter Light Equipment Operator II Marion Oaks Maintenance Technician Equipment Park Maintenance Technician II Survey Technician II Utilities Field Technician Trainee Utilities Lift Station Tech Trainee	203	\$ 32,323.20	\$ 40,757.60	\$ 49,192.00
Building And Grounds Maintenance Technician III SSS Building Grounds Maintenance Technician III Engineering Construction Inspector I Litter Crew Leader Marion Oaks Maintenance Technician Equipment OCE Medium Equipment Operator I Senior Animal Care Technician Survey Technician III Traffic Maintenance Technician I Utilities GIS Technician Utilities Plant Operator Trainee Utilities Plant Technician I	204	\$ 33,446.40	\$ 42,515.20	\$ 51,584.00
Event Service Specialist III Litter Crew Leader Operator III MSTU Facilities Trades Technician I Park Maintenance Technician III Solid Waste Litter Specialist Traffic Maintenance Technician II Transportation Service Technician I Utilities Field Technician I Utilities Lift Station Technician I	205	\$ 35,172.80	\$ 44,668.00	\$ 54,163.20



EXHIBIT 5E (CONTINUED)
PROPOSED PAY GRADES – ALL PLANS

Proposed Class Title	Proposed Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum
Animal Control Representative Animal Service Representative Engineering Construction Inspector II OCE Medium Equipment Operator II Solid Waste Collections Driver Trainee Traffic Maintenance Technician III Traffic Signal Technician I Utilities Construction Representative Utilities Plant Operator I	206	\$ 37,024.00	\$ 47,018.40	\$ 57,012.80
Engineering Construction Inspector III Event Service Specialist IV Fleet Vehicle Technician I Hazardous Waste Specialist Park Maintenance Technician IV Utilities Field Technician II Utilities Lift Station Tech II	207	\$ 38,750.40	\$ 49,275.20	\$ 59,800.00
Animal Care Technician Coordinator Animal Services Representative Coordinator Animal Services Maintenance Care Technician Facility Trades Technician I Heavy Equipment Operator I Solid Waste Collections Driver I Transportation Service Technician II Utilities Field Technician III Utilities Lift Station Technician III Utilities Plant Technician II	208	\$ 40,726.40	\$ 51,812.80	\$ 62,899.20
Backflow Cross Connection Control Coordinator Fleet Vehicle Technician II Hazardous Waste Specialist Heavy Equipment Operator II MSTU Facilities Trades Technician II Park Maintenance Technician V Solid Waste Collections Driver II Solid Waste Operator Traffic Sign Shop Technician Traffic Signal Technician II Utilities Field Technician IV Utilities Lift Station Tech IV Utilities Plant Operator II Utilities Plant Technician III	209	\$ 42,806.40	\$ 54,454.40	\$ 66,102.40
Engineering Construction Inspector IV Facility Trades Technician II Fleet Vehicle Technician III Heavy Equipment Operator III Utilities Plant Technician IV	210	\$ 44,928.00	\$ 57,177.12	\$ 69,409.60
Heavy Equipment Operator IV Solid Waste Semi Truck Driver Traffic Signal Technician III Utilities Plant Operator III	211	\$ 46,883.20	\$ 59,664.80	\$ 72,446.40
Facility Trades Technician III Fleet Vehicle Technician IV	212	\$ 49,088.00	\$ 62,472.80	\$ 75,857.60
Fleet Generator Fuel Tank Spec Fleet Vehicle Technician V Utilities Industrial Electrician	213	\$ 51,688.00	\$ 65,707.20	\$ 79,726.40
Facility Trades Technician IV	214	\$ 54,267.20	\$ 68,983.20	\$ 83,699.20
Battalion Chief Battalion Chief Community Risk Reduction	302	\$ 91,416.00	\$ 116,552.80	\$ 141,689.60
Division Chief	303	\$ 100,568.00	\$ 128,221.60	\$ 155,875.20
Deputy Chief	304	\$ 110,614.40	\$ 141,034.40	\$ 171,454.40
Fire Chief	305	\$ 121,680.00	\$ 155,147.20	\$ 188,614.40



After assigning pay grades to classifications, the next step was to develop appropriate methods (options) for transitioning employees' salaries into the proposed plan. This was done utilizing equitable methods for calculating salaries in the plans and determining whether adjustments were necessary to individual salaries to bring them to their calculated salary. Evergreen calculated and provided multiple options for implementing the new structure. At the time of this report, the County was considering the options.

5.3 SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION

The County's compensation system will continue to require periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided to improve the competitiveness of the plan were developed based on conditions at the time the data were collected. Without proper upkeep, the potential for recruitment and retention issues may increase as the compensation system becomes dated and less competitive.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Conduct small-scale salary surveys as needed to assess the market competitiveness of hard-to-fill classifications and/or classifications with retention issues, and make changes to pay grade assignments if necessary.

While it is unlikely that the pay structure (plans) in total will need to be adjusted for several years, a small number of classifications' pay grades may need to be reassigned more frequently. If the County is experiencing difficulty high turnover or challenges with recruiting one or more classifications, the County should collect salary range data from peer organizations to determine whether an adjustment is needed for the pay grade of the classification(s).

RECOMMENDATION 5: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every three to five years, subject to budget constraints and as market conditions are warranted.

Small-scale salary surveys can improve the market position of specific classifications, but it is recommended that a full classification and compensation study be conducted every three to five years to preserve both internal and external equity. Changes to classification and compensation do occur, and while the increments of change may seem minor, they can compound over time. A failure to react to these changes quickly has the potential to place the County in less than desirable position for recruiting and retaining quality employees.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Review and revise, as appropriate, existing pay practice guidelines including those for determining salaries of newly hired employees, progressing employee salaries through the pay plans and determining pay increases for employees who have been promoted to a different classification.

The method of moving salaries through the pay plan and setting new salaries for new hires, promotions, and transfers depends largely on an organization's compensation philosophy. It is important for the County to have established guidelines for each of these situations, and to ensure that they are followed consistently for all employees. Common practices for progressing and establishing employee salaries are outlined below.



New Hire Salaries

Typically, an employee holding the minimum education and experience requirements for an existing classification is hired at or near the classification's pay grade minimum. Sometimes, for recruiting purposes an organization might need to consider the ability to offer salaries to new employees that consider prior related experience. It is recommended that the County continue its current practices of establishing new hire salaries while preserving the internal equity of employees' salaries within each classification to the extent possible. Current employees' salaries should be improved, with implementation of the revised plan and the proposed adjustments to employees' salaries.

Salary Progression

There are several common methods for salary progression including cost of living adjustments (COLA)/across the board and performance-based. It is recommended that the County evaluate, annually, whether a COLA needs to be applied (to both the pay plans and employees' salaries) to keep up with cost of living. Additionally, the County should continue to provide merit increases, as warranted by employees' performance evaluations and as budgets permit. It is recommended that the County continuously evaluate its practices to progress employees' salaries and if necessary, make improvements to preserve equitable pay practices, particularly in the administration of the employee performance evaluation process.

5.4 SUMMARY

The recommendations in this chapter provide an update to the compensation and classification system for the County's employees. Upon implementation, the County's competitiveness in the labor market will be improved and have a responsive compensation system for several years to come. While the upkeep of this will require work, the County will find that having a competitive compensation system that enhances strong recruitment and employee retention is well worth this commitment.

