

Compensation and Classification Study for Alachua County BOCC, Library District, Sheriff, Property Appraiser and Supervisor of Elections Offices, FL

FINAL REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC

August 9, 2016

Table of Contents

	PAGE
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Study Methodology.....	1-2
1.2 Report Organization.....	1-4
2.0 SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE OUTREACH.....	2-1
2.1 General Feedback.....	2-1
2.2 Compensation.....	2-2
2.3 Classification.....	2-2
2.4 Market Peers.....	2-2
2.5 Benefits.....	2-3
2.6 Performance Evaluation.....	2-4
2.7 Summary.....	2-4
3.0 ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CONDITIONS.....	3-1
3.1 Pay Plan Analysis.....	3-1
3.2 Employee Salary Placement.....	3-7
3.3 Salary Quartile and Tenure Analysis.....	3-20
3.4 Summary.....	3-27
4.0 MARKET SUMMARY.....	4-1
4.1 Public Sector Salary Survey Results.....	4-1
4.2 Private Sector Market Data.....	4-9
4.3 Summary.....	4-10
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5-1
5.1 Classification System.....	5-1
5.2 Compensation System.....	5-8
5.3 Compensation and Classification System Administration.....	5-27
5.4 Summary.....	5-28



Chapter 1 - Introduction

Evergreen Solutions was retained in May, 2015 by Alachua County (County) to conduct a Compensation and Classification Study of jobs under the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC). In addition, the Library District, Property Appraiser, Sheriff, and Supervisor of Elections (SOE) Constitutional Offices were included in this study.

The purpose was to analyze the County's and Constitutional Offices' compensation and classification systems and make recommendations to improve their competitiveness. This involved analyzing both the internal and external equity of the systems.

A job assessment tool was utilized to gather information about and understand the work (jobs) performed by employees. Internal equity analysis was reviewed by analyzing this data. External equity, or the market competitiveness of the compensation systems were reviewed by analyzing the results of a salary survey. Both of these analyses were considered when proposing new market competitive salary structures for the County and the Constitutional Offices.

Specifically, Evergreen Solutions was tasked with the following:

- leading orientation and focus group sessions for employees and conducting interviews with department heads;
- evaluating the existing salary structures to determine strengths and weaknesses;
- collecting classification information through the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) to analyze the internal equity of the jobs;
- developing recommendations for improvements to job (classification) titles and the creation of new titles, if necessary;
- facilitating discussions with County and Constitutional Office leaders to develop compensation philosophies;
- conducting a salary survey to assess the competitiveness of the existing pay plans;
- developing market competitive compensation structures and slotting classifications into those structures while ensuring internal and external equity;
- developing implementation strategies and providing cost estimates for implementation;



- updating job descriptions that reflect recommended classification changes and employee responses to the JAT, and Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) recommendations; and
- developing and submitting draft and final reports that summarize the study findings and recommendations.

1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY

Evergreen Solutions utilized qualitative and quantitative data analysis to produce recommendations that align with the compensation philosophy of each organization. Study activities included:

- conducting a study kick-off meeting;
- conducting employee outreach;
- conducting job assessment utilizing input collected from completed JATs;
- analyzing the conditions of the existing compensation systems;
- facilitating discussions and developing a compensation philosophy for each organization;
- conducting a salary survey;
- developing market competitive classification and compensation structure recommendations;
- developing implementation options for the proposed structures;
- developing recommendations for maintaining the new systems;
- updating job descriptions to accurately reflect work performed; and
- creating draft and final reports.

Kick-off Meetings

Kick-off meetings allowed members of the study team from the County, the Constitutional Offices and Evergreen Solutions to discuss different aspects of the study. During these meetings, information about the existing compensation and classification structures and philosophies was shared and the work plan for the study was finalized. The meetings also provided an opportunity for Evergreen Solutions to explain the types of data needed to conduct the study.

Employee Outreach

Employee Outreach consisted of orientation sessions, focus group meetings, and department head interviews. Orientation sessions provided an opportunity for employees and supervisors to learn more information about the purpose of the study, and receive specific information related to their participation in the study process. The focus group sessions and department head interviews allowed employees, supervisors, and senior management to identify practices that were working well and to suggest areas for improvement with regard to compensation,



classification, benefits, and the performance evaluation process. The collective feedback received during these sessions is summarized in **Chapter 2** of this report.

Classification Analysis

To perform an analysis of the classification systems, all employees were asked to complete a JAT in which they had the opportunity to describe the work they performed in their own words. Supervisors then reviewed the employees' JATs and provided additional information as needed. The information provided in the completed JATs was then utilized in the classification analysis in two ways. First, the work described was reviewed to ensure that classification titles were appropriate. Second, the JATs were evaluated to quantify, by a scoring method, each classification's relative value within each organization. Each classification's score was based on the employee and supervisor's responses to the JAT, and the scores allowed for a comparison of classifications across each studied organization.

Analysis of Current Conditions

These analyses provided an overall assessment of the existing pay plans and related employee data at the time the study began. The existing pay plans, the progression of employee' salaries through pay grades, employee tenure, and the distribution of employees among County and Constitutional Office departments were all examined during this process. The findings of these analyses are summarized in **Chapter 3** of this report.

Compensation Philosophy

Evergreen Solutions facilitated meetings with the study and leadership team for each organization to develop a documented philosophy with regard to employee compensation. These philosophies were based on arriving at decisions on several key factors and provided the framework for the recommended classification and compensation systems, and related pay practices. These statements were provided to each organization under separate cover for use and communication to and with employees.

Market Analysis

To conduct the market analysis, a salary survey was conducted. Target peers were identified that compete with the respective County and Constitutional Offices for human resources and provide similar services. A number of classifications were selected as benchmarks representing a cross-section of the departments and levels of work within each organization. After the selection of peers and benchmarks, a survey tool was developed for the collection of salary range data for each benchmark classification. The salary data collected were analyzed, and a summary of the data can be found in **Chapter 4** of this report.

Recommendations

During the recommendation phase of the study, Evergreen Solutions developed a market-based pay plan for each organization and slotted classifications into the plan based on internal and external equity. Next, implementation options were developed to transition

employee' salaries into the new pay plans, and the associated costs of adjusting employee salaries were estimated. Information was then provided to the County and the Constitutional Offices on how to execute the recommended salary adjustments, as well as how to maintain the recommended compensation and classification system over time. A summary of the findings of the study and the associated recommendations can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.

1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report includes the following additional chapters:

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



Chapter 2 - Summary of Employee Outreach

Following the study kick-off, an Evergreen Solutions team visited the County and the Constitutional Offices in June 2015 to conduct employee outreach. The purpose was to continue to collect and review current environmental conditions regarding the compensation and classification systems for these organizations. This process consisted of facilitating orientation and focus group meetings with employees and supervisors as well as interviews with department heads. During the orientation sessions, Evergreen Solutions staff provided information to participants about the goals of the study and their role in the study process. During the focus groups and the department head interviews, the team asked questions designed to gather feedback on several topics related to the study.

Participant responses provided the study team with valuable information regarding the employees' and leaders' perceptions of the current compensation and classification systems. For those employees who were unable to attend the focus groups sessions, an online survey process and feedback tool was provided which allowed employees to provide responses to the same questions asked in the focus groups. The employee outreach sessions were well attended, and participants actively provided valuable feedback to the Evergreen Solutions team. As well, 372 employees provided responses to the focus group questions utilizing the online survey tool process. Summarized below are comments and perceptions of participants from both approaches.

2.1 GENERAL FEEDBACK

Overall, employees stated that they enjoyed working for the County and the Constitutional Offices and serving the community in which they live. They also appreciated the benefits packages and the ability to serve the citizens in the community. Employees stated that the positive relationships they had with their co-workers were also a factor that made these organizations pleasant working environments. While participants suggested potential areas for improvement in the respective compensation and classification systems, they also provided several positive comments regarding their employment, including:

- their participation in the state retirement system,
- that the work was challenging and gave employees a sense of purpose, and
- that overall the County and the Constitutional Offices were viewed by peers as quality organizations and a good place to work.

While most of the comments received during outreach were positive, there was a perception by some that in general, they had not received pay increases that reflect the increased cost of living. While Evergreen Solutions receives this input frequently, this belief was expressed in most of the outreach sessions conducted with the employees and was a predominant theme.

2.2 COMPENSATION

Focus group participants contributed the following information related specifically to compensation:

- there was a sentiment that current salary ranges were well below comparable cities and counties,
- tasks, duties, and responsibilities required for their positions had increased without corresponding increases in compensation, and
- many employees believed that some supervisors were making less than their staff; this appeared to dissuade employees from wanting to progress to supervisory positions.

2.3 CLASSIFICATION

The following concerns and suggestions specific to the classification systems were:

- the notion that some jobs had no natural progression and as such, what should have been classification changes (promotions) resulted in lateral movement only,
- the belief that some employees were performing similar work yet were assigned different job classifications across departments within an organization, and
- that some classifications performed supervisory duties but did not have a supervisor title or receive the requisite level of compensation for these responsibilities.

2.4 MARKET PEERS

Outreach participants were asked to name organizations they considered to be market peers competing for employees performing similar work. The most common responses are listed below and were considered when developing the list of peers for the salary survey:

- Duval County, FL;
- Gilchrist County, FL;
- Hillsborough County, FL;



- Lake County, FL;
- Leon County, FL;
- Levy County, FL;
- Marion County, FL;
- Orange County, FL;
- Pasco County, FL;
- Pinellas County, FL;
- Polk County, FL;
- Santa Rosa County, FL;
- Sarasota County, FL;
- St. Johns County, FL;
- St. Lucie County, FL;
- Volusia County, FL;
- City of Gainesville, FL;
- City of Lake City, FL; and
- City of Ocala, FL.

2.5 BENEFITS

While Evergreen Solutions was not asked to conduct a benefits survey as a component of this study, the team also asked employees, supervisors, and department heads for feedback regarding the current benefits packages. Some of the positive feedback received included:

- appreciation that the employees were offered various benefit options and providers to fit their individual needs,
- that Sheriff's Officers were provided a take home car, and
- that there was an education incentive program that rewarded employees for receiving certain degrees and certifications.

Suggested areas for improvement included:

- revisiting the leave policies to consider an option for employees to roll over unused sick days to the following year, convert them into vacation time, or sell them back for compensation,
- revisiting the vesting period because the number of years to vest had increased from when some employees were originally hired, and
- addressing the rise in the employee cost of insurance since employee' salaries have not increased at the same pace.



2.6 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Evergreen Solutions was not asked to review or make recommendations to the organizations' performance evaluation systems. However, the team asked for general input in this area as these systems correlate with the compensation and classification systems and practices. Outreach participants' suggestions for improvements in this regard are summarized below:

- some employees expressed the belief that an improved performance evaluation form/system may enhance an employee's opportunity for career advancement,
- a number of employees stated that they wanted the ability to evaluate themselves and provide this input for their review, as well as provide an evaluation of their supervisors, and
- many employees stated they wanted to have an evaluation form that reflected work performed specific to their department rather than the generic model that was not believed to be appropriate and utilized by some of the organizations.

2.7 SUMMARY

The concerns expressed and reported above are common and exist in many organizations today. The County and Constitutional Offices' commitment to seeking employee input and feedback regarding the compensation and classification systems is a positive step toward improvement in these areas. Overall, employees appreciated working with their co-workers and the opportunity to serve the citizens of and visitors to Alachua County. Employees valued the current benefits packages, but also included it as an area in which improvements could be made.

The information received during this employee outreach provided a foundation for understanding the current environment while conducting the remainder of the study. The feedback aided Evergreen Solutions in the consideration for and development of recommendations with regard to each organization' compensation and classifications systems. These recommendations can be found in **Chapter 5** of this report.



Chapter 3 – Assessment of Current Conditions

The purpose of the following assessment is to provide information regarding the current compensation structures of the County and Constitutional Offices and the placement of employee' salaries in those structures. The data included here reflects the demographics and compensation structures in place at the time of the study and should be considered as an assessment at a point in time only. The analyses are intended to reflect a review of this information at that time, and reveal potential areas of concern as it relates to the compensation structures and practices going forward. During the course of the study, changes were made to some of the compensation structures, and salary increases were provided to employees. That information was provided to Evergreen Solutions and updated prior to making the recommendations provided later in this report. The analyses below provided Evergreen Solutions an understanding of conditions at a specific point in time, and identified issues for further review and subsequent recommendations.

3.1 PAY PLAN ANALYSIS

All studied pay structures are included in this analysis. **Exhibits 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, and 3E** provide the pay plans for each organization. Each pay plan (displayed below) includes only those grades which are currently occupied by at least one employee. The minimums in each exhibit are the beginning salary of the pay range and the maximums are the highest salary for each of the ranges. The midpoints were calculated by Evergreen Solutions as the halfway point between the minimums and maximums regardless of whether or not each plan is an open range or step plan. Range spreads are the measure of the width of pay grades, calculated as the percent difference between the pay grade minimum and maximum, relative to the minimum.

Exhibit 3A provides the seven pay plans in use by the County (BOCC). At the time of this analysis the BOCC employed 806 individuals, 13 of whom were part-time and were in the bargaining or non-bargaining pay plans. All seven pay plans were designed as open range with range spreads varying between 50.0 and 69.9 percent, with two outlying grades (50 and 51 of the BAR pay plan) having range spreads of 140.0 percent. The BAR pay plan covered bargaining employees; the EXS plan covered executive service employees; the FBR and FRB covered fire employees who worked 56 and 40 hours, respectively; the MFU and FMB covered fire management employees who worked 56 and 40 hours, respectively; and the NBR plan included non-bargaining employees.



EXHIBIT 3A
BOCC PAY PLANS

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
BAR					
2	\$ 21,253.02	\$ 26,566.28	\$ 31,879.53	50.0%	8
3	\$ 22,379.55	\$ 27,974.44	\$ 33,569.32	50.0%	20
4	\$ 23,565.77	\$ 29,457.06	\$ 35,348.35	50.0%	16
5	\$ 24,814.81	\$ 31,018.31	\$ 37,221.80	50.0%	19
6	\$ 26,129.58	\$ 32,662.13	\$ 39,194.68	50.0%	34
7	\$ 27,514.65	\$ 35,081.17	\$ 42,647.69	55.0%	26
8	\$ 28,973.15	\$ 36,940.48	\$ 44,907.82	55.0%	31
9	\$ 30,508.19	\$ 38,898.18	\$ 47,288.17	55.0%	21
10	\$ 32,125.60	\$ 40,960.08	\$ 49,794.57	55.0%	23
11	\$ 33,827.87	\$ 43,130.67	\$ 52,433.47	55.0%	1
12	\$ 35,621.04	\$ 45,416.80	\$ 55,212.56	55.0%	14
13	\$ 37,508.84	\$ 48,761.64	\$ 60,014.44	60.0%	10
14	\$ 39,496.70	\$ 51,345.63	\$ 63,194.56	60.0%	2
16	\$ 43,794.60	\$ 56,932.82	\$ 70,071.04	60.0%	2
18	\$ 48,559.88	\$ 63,127.68	\$ 77,695.48	60.0%	2
50	\$ 33,827.24	\$ 57,506.48	\$ 81,185.72	140.0%	10
51	\$ 37,508.84	\$ 63,765.20	\$ 90,021.56	140.0%	3
EXS					
22	\$ 59,701.82	\$ 77,670.52	\$ 95,639.23	60.2%	4
25	\$ 69,706.62	\$ 90,686.23	\$ 111,665.84	60.2%	1
28	\$ 81,387.90	\$ 107,858.71	\$ 134,329.52	65.0%	5
29	\$ 85,701.61	\$ 115,655.17	\$ 145,608.73	69.9%	10
FBR					
11	\$ 32,357.14	\$ 41,255.55	\$ 50,153.95	55.0%	55
13	\$ 35,878.16	\$ 46,641.75	\$ 57,405.33	60.0%	30
16	\$ 41,890.53	\$ 54,457.72	\$ 67,024.92	60.0%	13
17	\$ 44,110.97	\$ 57,344.10	\$ 70,577.22	60.0%	22
18	\$ 46,448.56	\$ 60,383.23	\$ 74,317.90	60.0%	39
20	\$ 51,502.46	\$ 68,240.80	\$ 84,979.14	65.0%	16
21	\$ 54,232.08	\$ 71,857.51	\$ 89,482.93	65.0%	17
FRB					
11	\$ 32,357.31	\$ 41,255.65	\$ 50,154.00	55.0%	1
13	\$ 35,878.33	\$ 46,641.81	\$ 57,405.29	60.0%	1
14	\$ 37,779.66	\$ 49,113.48	\$ 60,447.29	60.0%	1
16	\$ 41,890.57	\$ 54,457.62	\$ 67,024.67	60.0%	1
17	\$ 44,110.76	\$ 57,343.93	\$ 70,577.10	60.0%	1
18	\$ 46,448.68	\$ 60,383.23	\$ 74,317.77	60.0%	1

EXHIBIT 3A (CONTINUED)
BOCC PAY PLANS

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
FMB					
21	\$ 56,696.84	\$ 73,761.06	\$ 90,825.28	60.2%	4
MFU					
23	\$ 62,866.58	\$ 81,787.16	\$100,707.73	60.2%	5
NBR					
9	\$ 30,508.19	\$ 38,209.49	\$ 45,910.80	50.5%	34
10	\$ 32,125.60	\$ 40,234.89	\$ 48,344.19	50.5%	13
11	\$ 33,827.87	\$ 42,367.10	\$ 50,906.33	50.5%	10
12	\$ 35,621.04	\$ 44,612.77	\$ 53,604.51	50.5%	25
13	\$ 37,508.84	\$ 47,887.63	\$ 58,266.41	55.3%	32
14	\$ 39,496.70	\$ 50,425.33	\$ 61,353.96	55.3%	38
15	\$ 41,590.01	\$ 53,097.92	\$ 64,605.84	55.3%	10
16	\$ 43,794.60	\$ 55,912.37	\$ 68,030.14	55.3%	15
17	\$ 46,115.68	\$ 58,875.75	\$ 71,635.82	55.3%	34
18	\$ 48,559.88	\$ 61,996.16	\$ 75,432.44	55.3%	17
19	\$ 51,133.47	\$ 66,523.08	\$ 81,912.68	60.2%	7
20	\$ 53,843.29	\$ 70,048.57	\$ 86,253.85	60.2%	41
21	\$ 56,696.84	\$ 73,761.06	\$ 90,825.28	60.2%	12
22	\$ 59,701.82	\$ 77,670.52	\$ 95,639.23	60.2%	15
23	\$ 62,866.33	\$ 81,787.05	\$100,707.77	60.2%	11
24	\$ 66,198.08	\$ 86,121.88	\$106,045.68	60.2%	14
25	\$ 69,706.62	\$ 90,686.23	\$111,665.84	60.2%	6
26	\$ 73,401.12	\$ 97,274.32	\$121,147.52	65.0%	3

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by BOCC as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3B displays the open range pay plans (BAR, NBR, and LAW) that were in use by the Library District. The PG pay plan is shown separately to distinguish it from the other pay plans as it was designed specific for the Library Page position with a narrow range spread. The range spreads for the other plans varied between 55.0 and 60.0 percent. The BAR pay plan covered bargaining unit employees; the NBR pay plan covered non-bargaining unit employees; and the LAW plan covered the non-bargaining at-will employees.

**EXHIBIT 3B
LIBRARY DISTRICT PAY PLANS**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
PG					
1	\$ 17,457.02	\$ 19,202.56	\$ 20,948.09	20.0%	49

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
BAR					
5	\$ 23,199.48	\$ 29,579.36	\$ 35,959.24	55.0%	3
7	\$ 25,577.55	\$ 32,611.38	\$ 39,645.21	55.0%	36
8	\$ 26,856.54	\$ 34,242.10	\$ 41,627.66	55.0%	1
10	\$ 29,609.21	\$ 37,751.79	\$ 45,894.36	55.0%	37
11	\$ 31,089.76	\$ 39,639.49	\$ 48,189.23	55.0%	6
12	\$ 32,644.14	\$ 41,621.21	\$ 50,598.28	55.0%	7
13	\$ 34,276.32	\$ 43,702.36	\$ 53,128.40	55.0%	7
14	\$ 35,990.24	\$ 45,887.50	\$ 55,784.76	55.0%	1
15	\$ 37,789.64	\$ 48,182.05	\$ 58,574.46	55.0%	3
16	\$ 39,679.32	\$ 50,590.90	\$ 61,502.48	55.0%	5
17	\$ 41,663.44	\$ 54,162.26	\$ 66,661.08	60.0%	29
19	\$ 45,933.88	\$ 59,713.78	\$ 73,493.68	60.0%	7
NBR					
17	\$ 41,663.44	\$ 54,162.26	\$ 66,661.08	60.0%	3
18	\$ 43,746.14	\$ 56,870.00	\$ 69,993.87	60.0%	1
19	\$ 45,934.09	\$ 59,713.88	\$ 73,493.68	60.0%	1
20	\$ 48,230.62	\$ 62,699.52	\$ 77,168.41	60.0%	10
22	\$ 53,173.95	\$ 69,126.20	\$ 85,078.44	60.0%	5
24	\$ 58,624.17	\$ 76,211.40	\$ 93,798.64	60.0%	6
LAW					
27	\$ 67,864.99	\$ 88,224.55	\$ 108,584.11	60.0%	2

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Library District Office as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3C provides the salary ranges utilized by the Property Appraiser's Office. While there were set open salary ranges, there were no unique grade identifiers for each of the ranges. The ranges are sorted in ascending order in the exhibit based on the range minimums. At the time of this analysis the Property Appraiser's Office employed 50 individuals; all were full-time. The range spreads in this Office's structure were very similar and only varied between 49.8 and 50.6 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3C
PROPERTY APPRAISER SALARY RANGES**

Range Minimum	Range Midpoint	Range Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
\$ 25,506.00	\$ 31,907.00	\$ 38,288.00	50.1%	2
\$ 26,802.00	\$ 35,502.00	\$ 40,203.00	50.0%	1
\$ 28,142.00	\$ 35,178.00	\$ 42,213.00	50.0%	9
\$ 32,578.00	\$ 40,722.00	\$ 48,867.00	50.0%	7
\$ 34,207.00	\$ 42,578.00	\$ 51,310.00	50.0%	6
\$ 35,917.00	\$ 44,896.00	\$ 53,876.00	50.0%	5
\$ 39,599.00	\$ 49,498.00	\$ 59,398.00	50.0%	2
\$ 41,579.00	\$ 51,973.00	\$ 62,638.00	50.6%	6
\$ 45,840.00	\$ 57,300.00	\$ 68,671.00	49.8%	1
\$ 58,505.00	\$ 73,132.00	\$ 87,756.00	50.0%	3
\$ 67,727.00	\$ 84,659.00	\$ 101,591.00	50.0%	5
\$ 78,403.00	\$ 98,003.00	\$ 117,604.00	50.0%	3

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by PA Office as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3D provides the information regarding the pay plans in use by the Sheriff's Office. There were two pay plans for its regular employees. Both are designed as step plans. There was also a pay schedule for the part-time School Crossing Guard position, which had one established pay rate. There was a pay plan for the Office's civilian employees, and another pay plan for sworn and certified employees. The range spreads for these plans varied between 21.3 and 59.9 percent. At the time of this analysis, the Sheriff's Office employed 34 part-time and 795 full-time employees, with 17 of the part-time employees in the civilian pay plan.

**EXHIBIT 3D
SHERIFF PAY PLANS**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
Civilian					
16	\$ 25,750.00	\$ 33,457.50	\$ 41,165.00	59.9%	72
17	\$ 27,319.00	\$ 35,496.00	\$ 43,673.00	59.9%	27
22	\$ 28,836.00	\$ 37,467.50	\$ 46,099.00	59.9%	48
26	\$ 30,887.00	\$ 40,132.00	\$ 49,377.00	59.9%	30
32	\$ 32,787.00	\$ 42,601.00	\$ 52,415.00	59.9%	4
38	\$ 34,718.00	\$ 45,110.50	\$ 55,503.00	59.9%	24
40	\$ 36,811.00	\$ 47,829.50	\$ 58,848.00	59.9%	26
44	\$ 38,079.00	\$ 49,477.00	\$ 60,875.00	59.9%	23
48	\$ 40,745.00	\$ 52,940.50	\$ 65,136.00	59.9%	14
50	\$ 43,291.00	\$ 56,249.00	\$ 69,207.00	59.9%	4
54	\$ 48,344.00	\$ 62,814.50	\$ 77,285.00	59.9%	11
55	\$ 48,629.00	\$ 63,185.00	\$ 77,741.00	59.9%	1
58	\$ 54,899.00	\$ 71,331.50	\$ 87,764.00	59.9%	2
59	\$ 58,760.00	\$ 76,348.50	\$ 93,937.00	59.9%	11
61	\$ 71,338.00	\$ 92,691.50	\$114,045.00	59.9%	2
62	\$ 82,400.00	\$107,064.50	\$131,729.00	59.9%	2
Sworn & Certified					
DD1	\$ 34,878.00	\$ 39,899.00	\$ 44,920.00	28.8%	56
DD2	\$ 40,556.00	\$ 44,870.00	\$ 49,184.00	21.3%	16
DD3	\$ 44,612.00	\$ 56,949.50	\$ 69,287.00	55.3%	3
DO1	\$ 34,878.00	\$ 39,899.00	\$ 44,920.00	28.8%	81
DO2	\$ 40,556.00	\$ 44,870.00	\$ 49,184.00	21.3%	34
DO3	\$ 44,612.00	\$ 56,949.50	\$ 69,287.00	55.3%	20
45	\$ 38,110.00	\$ 49,517.50	\$ 60,925.00	59.9%	200
56	\$ 49,049.00	\$ 58,448.50	\$ 67,848.00	38.3%	27
57	\$ 51,500.00	\$ 59,674.00	\$ 67,848.00	31.7%	37
60	\$ 64,890.00	\$ 74,778.50	\$ 84,667.00	30.5%	26
63	\$ 82,400.00	\$ 92,653.00	\$102,906.00	24.9%	7
64	\$ 96,820.00	\$108,867.50	\$120,915.00	24.9%	3
65	\$115,327.00	\$129,677.50	\$144,028.00	24.9%	1

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Sheriff's Office as of June 2015.



The ELO pay plan in **Exhibit 3E** covered the Supervisor of Elections Office general employees, while the ELN plan covered the Office's management employees. Both pay plans were open range with range spreads between 45.6 and 60.2 percent. There were nine full-time employees in the SOE Office at the time of this analysis.

EXHIBIT 3E SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS PAY PLANS

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
ELO					
4	\$23,565.77	\$28,942.26	\$34,318.75	45.6%	1
6	\$26,129.58	\$32,091.38	\$38,053.18	45.6%	2
13	\$37,508.84	\$47,887.63	\$58,266.41	55.3%	2
ELN					
16	\$43,794.60	\$55,257.17	\$66,719.74	52.3%	2
20	\$53,843.29	\$70,048.57	\$86,253.85	60.2%	2

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by SOE Office as of June 2015.

3.2 EMPLOYEE SALARY PLACEMENT

Exhibits 3F, 3G, 3H, 3I, and 3J provide a breakdown of the placement of employee' salaries within the pay grade for the plans in each organization. This review is important to assess the effectiveness of the pay practices. Identifying areas in a pay structure where employee' salaries may be clustered in particular segments of their respective classification's pay grades could illuminate potential pay salary progression concerns within each structure. The following exhibits show the distribution of employees with salaries at the minimum or maximum of the pay plans. Employees with salaries at the grade minimum are typically relatively new to the organization or to the classification after a recent promotion. In contrast, employees at the grade maximum are typically highly experienced and highly proficient in their classification.

Exhibit 3F provides the number of BOCC employees with salaries at the minimum and maximum of their classifications' pay grades. The BOCC had 11.9 percent (96 employees) of its workforce at the minimum of their classifications' respective pay grades. There were only six employees (0.7 percent) with salaries at the maximum of their classifications' pay grade. These employees may have been new to the organization or had not received raises to progress their salaries higher than the minimums.



EXHIBIT 3F
BOCC - AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# at Max	% at Max
BAR					
2	8	3	37.5%	0	0.0%
3	20	3	15.0%	1	5.0%
4	16	1	6.3%	0	0.0%
5	19	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	34	12	35.3%	0	0.0%
7	26	1	3.8%	0	0.0%
8	31	9	29.0%	0	0.0%
9	21	3	14.3%	0	0.0%
10	23	6	26.1%	0	0.0%
11	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	14	2	14.3%	0	0.0%
13	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
14	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
50	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
51	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
EXS					
22	4	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
25	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
28	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
29	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
FBR					
11	55	1	1.8%	2	3.6%
13	30	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16	13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
17	22	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18	39	9	23.1%	0	0.0%
20	16	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21	17	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
FRB					
11	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
13	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
14	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
17	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

EXHIBIT 3F (CONTINUED)
BOCC - AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# at Max	% at Max
FMB					
21	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
MFU					
23	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
NBR					
9	34	7	20.6%	0	0.0%
10	13	0	0.0%	1	7.7%
11	10	2	20.0%	0	0.0%
12	25	10	40.0%	0	0.0%
13	32	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
14	38	9	23.7%	0	0.0%
15	10	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
16	15	1	6.7%	0	0.0%
17	34	10	29.4%	0	0.0%
18	17	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	7	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
20	41	1	2.4%	0	0.0%
21	12	0	0.0%	1	8.3%
22	15	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
23	11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24	14	1	7.1%	0	0.0%
25	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
26	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	806	96	11.9%	6	0.7%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by BOCC as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3G provides the number of Library District employees with salaries at the minimum and maximum of their classifications' pay grades. The data below indicates that the Library District's had 44 employees (25.9 percent) with salaries at pay grade minimums. These employees may have been new to the organization or employees had not received increases to progress their salaries beyond the minimum points. There were only three employees (1.8 percent) with salaries at the maximum of their classifications' pay grade. The data for the PG plan is not shown in this exhibit as salary progression for this classification of employee, Library Page, differed from the other plans and was not relevant for the purpose of this analysis.

EXHIBIT 3G
LIBRARY DISTRICT - AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# at Max	% at Max
BAR					
5	3	2	66.7%	0	0.0%
7	36	19	52.8%	1	2.8%
8	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
10	37	5	13.5%	0	0.0%
11	6	4	66.7%	0	0.0%
12	7	1	14.3%	1	14.3%
13	7	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
14	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
15	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16	5	0	0.0%	1	20.0%
17	29	8	27.6%	0	0.0%
19	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
NBR					
17	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
18	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
22	5	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
24	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
LAW					
27	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	170	44	25.9%	3	1.8%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Library District Office as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3H provides the number of Property Appraiser's Office employees with salaries at the minimum and maximum of their classifications' pay grades. There are two employees (4.0 percent) with salaries at their classifications' grade minimums and seven (14.0 percent) at the maximum (14.0 percent). This relatively low number of employees with salaries at classification grade minimum or maximum typically indicates that employee' salaries have progressed over time.

EXHIBIT 3H
PROPERTY APPRAISER - AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Range Minimum	Range Midpoint	Range Maximum	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# at Max	% at Max
\$ 25,506.00	\$ 31,907.00	\$ 38,288.00	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 26,802.00	\$ 35,502.00	\$ 40,203.00	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 28,142.00	\$ 35,178.00	\$ 42,213.00	9	0	0.0%	2	22.2%
\$ 32,578.00	\$ 40,722.00	\$ 48,867.00	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 34,207.00	\$ 42,578.00	\$ 51,310.00	6	0	0.0%	4	66.7%
\$ 35,917.00	\$ 44,896.00	\$ 53,876.00	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 39,599.00	\$ 49,498.00	\$ 59,398.00	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 41,579.00	\$ 51,973.00	\$ 62,368.00	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 45,840.00	\$ 57,300.00	\$ 68,671.00	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 58,505.00	\$ 73,132.00	\$ 87,756.00	3	0	0.0%	1	33.3%
\$ 67,727.00	\$ 84,659.00	\$ 101,591.00	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 78,403.00	\$ 98,003.00	\$ 117,604.00	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total			50	2	4.0%	7	14.0%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by PA Office as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3I provides the number of Sheriff's Office employees with salaries at the minimum and maximum of their classifications' pay grades. Nearly one quarter (22.0 percent) of the total Sheriff's employees' salaries fell at the minimum of their classifications' pay range. Twenty-two, or 2.7 percent, of the employees had salaries at their classifications' range maximum. Again the split indicates that many of these employees were either new to the organization or they had not received recent raises to push their salaries higher than the minimums.

EXHIBIT 3I
SHERIFF - AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# at Max	% at Max
Civilian					
16	72	28	38.9%	0	0.0%
17	27	20	74.1%	0	0.0%
22	48	9	18.8%	0	0.0%
26	30	10	33.3%	1	3.3%
32	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
38	24	5	20.8%	0	0.0%
40	26	7	26.9%	0	0.0%
44	23	4	17.4%	0	0.0%
48	14	1	7.1%	1	7.1%
50	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
54	11	1	9.1%	0	0.0%
55	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
58	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
59	11	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
61	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
62	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sworn & Certified					
DD1	56	29	51.8%	0	0.0%
DD2	16	4	25.0%	0	0.0%
DD3	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
DO1	81	9	11.1%	0	0.0%
DO2	34	8	23.5%	0	0.0%
DO3	20	3	15.0%	0	0.0%
45	200	18	9.0%	3	1.5%
56	27	7	25.9%	0	0.0%
57	37	3	8.1%	10	27.0%
60	26	5	19.2%	6	23.1%
63	7	3	42.9%	1	14.3%
64	3	2	66.7%	0	0.0%
65	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	812	179	22.0%	22	2.7%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Sheriff's Office as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3J provides the number of Supervisor of Elections Office employees with salaries at the minimum and maximum of their classifications' pay grades. Out of the nine total employees, none had salaries at the minimum or maximum of their classifications' range.

EXHIBIT 3J
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS - AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# at Min	% at Min	# at Max	% at Max
ELO					
4	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
13	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
ELN					
16	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by SOE Office as of June 2015.



Grade Midpoint

Grade midpoints are generally considered the most accepted representation of market rate. Those employees with salaries at grade midpoint should be fully proficient in their job and require minimal supervision to complete their job duties. With this understanding, it is important to examine the percentage of employees with salaries that fell above and below the calculated midpoint of their respective classifications' pay grades. **Exhibits 3K, 3L, 3M, 3N, and 3O** provide the breakdown of employees with salaries that fell above and below midpoint by pay grade for all analyzed pay plans, each organization.

Exhibit 3K provides the breakdown of employee' salaries that fell above and below midpoint by pay grade for the County. Of the 806 employees, 707 (87.7 percent) had salaries that fell below the midpoint and 99 (12.3 percent) fell above the midpoint. Overall, a large portion of employee' salaries fell below the midpoint which may indicate the County faced challenges with progressing employee' salaries in recent years.



EXHIBIT 3K
COUNTY - ABOVE AND BELOW MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
BAR					
2	8	8	100.0%	0	0.0%
3	20	18	90.0%	2	10.0%
4	16	12	75.0%	4	25.0%
5	19	19	100.0%	0	0.0%
6	34	32	94.1%	2	5.9%
7	26	23	88.5%	3	11.5%
8	31	30	96.8%	1	3.2%
9	21	19	90.5%	2	9.5%
10	23	21	91.3%	2	8.7%
11	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
12	14	12	85.7%	2	14.3%
13	10	10	100.0%	0	0.0%
14	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
16	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
18	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
50	10	10	100.0%	0	0.0%
51	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
EXS					
22	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
25	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
28	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
29	10	6	60.0%	4	40.0%
FBR					
11	55	48	87.3%	7	12.7%
13	30	30	100.0%	0	0.0%
16	13	8	61.5%	5	38.5%
17	22	17	77.3%	5	22.7%
18	39	37	94.9%	2	5.1%
20	16	13	81.3%	3	18.8%
21	17	17	100.0%	0	0.0%
FRB					
11	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
13	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
14	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
16	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
17	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
18	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%



EXHIBIT 3K (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - ABOVE AND BELOW MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
FMB					
21	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
MFU					
23	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
NBR					
9	34	30	88.2%	4	11.8%
10	13	10	76.9%	3	23.1%
11	10	10	100.0%	0	0.0%
12	25	24	96.0%	1	4.0%
13	32	28	87.5%	4	12.5%
14	38	32	84.2%	6	15.8%
15	10	7	70.0%	3	30.0%
16	15	15	100.0%	0	0.0%
17	34	30	88.2%	4	11.8%
18	17	14	82.4%	3	17.6%
19	7	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
20	41	38	92.7%	3	7.3%
21	12	10	83.3%	2	16.7%
22	15	10	66.7%	5	33.3%
23	11	10	90.9%	1	9.1%
24	14	8	57.1%	6	42.9%
25	6	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
26	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Total	806	707	87.7%	99	12.3%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by BOCC as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3L provides the breakdown of employees above and below midpoint by pay grade for the Library District. In the Library District's plans, 143 employee' salaries (84.1 percent) were below midpoint and only 27 employees (15.9 percent) had salaries above the grade midpoint. This analysis shows that there was a large portion of employee' salaries below the midpoint, indicating there have been challenges in progressing employee' salaries through the ranges. The data for the PG plan is not shown in this exhibit as salary progression for this classification of employee, Library Page, differed from the other plans and was not relevant for the purpose of this analysis.

EXHIBIT 3L
LIBRARY DISTRICT - ABOVE AND BELOW MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
BAR					
5	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
7	36	33	91.7%	3	8.3%
8	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
10	37	32	86.5%	5	13.5%
11	6	6	100.0%	0	0.0%
12	7	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
13	7	5	71.4%	2	28.6%
14	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
15	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
16	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
17	29	25	86.2%	4	13.8%
19	7	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
NBR					
17	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
18	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
19	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
20	10	7	70.0%	3	30.0%
22	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
24	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
LAW					
27	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Total	170	143	84.1%	27	15.9%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Library District Office as of June 2015.



The breakdown of employee' salaries that fell above and below midpoint by pay grade for the Property Appraiser's Office is provided in **Exhibit 3M**. Overall, there is a fairly even split of employee' salaries above and below the midpoint, with 29 employee' salaries below (58.0 percent) and 21 (42.0 percent) above midpoint. It appears from this brief analysis that this Office has been able to progress employee' salaries somewhat regularly.

EXHIBIT 3M
PROPERTY APPRAISER - ABOVE AND BELOW MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Range Minimum	Range Midpoint	Range Maximum	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
\$ 25,506.00	\$ 31,907.00	\$ 38,288.00	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
\$ 26,802.00	\$ 35,502.00	\$ 40,203.00	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 28,142.00	\$ 35,178.00	\$ 42,213.00	9	3	33.3%	6	66.7%
\$ 32,578.00	\$ 40,722.00	\$ 48,867.00	7	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
\$ 34,207.00	\$ 42,578.00	\$ 51,310.00	6	1	16.7%	5	83.3%
\$ 35,917.00	\$ 44,896.00	\$ 53,876.00	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
\$ 39,599.00	\$ 49,498.00	\$ 59,398.00	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
\$ 41,579.00	\$ 51,973.00	\$ 62,368.00	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
\$ 45,840.00	\$ 57,300.00	\$ 68,671.00	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 58,505.00	\$ 73,132.00	\$ 87,756.00	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
\$ 67,727.00	\$ 84,659.00	\$ 101,591.00	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
\$ 78,403.00	\$ 98,003.00	\$ 117,604.00	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Total			50	29	58.0%	21	42.0%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by PA Office as of June 2015.



Exhibit 3N provides the breakdown of employees above and below midpoint by pay grade for the Sheriff's Office. There were 670 employees' salaries (82.5 percent) below midpoint and 142 employees' salaries (17.5 percent) above midpoint. Utilizing the above and below midpoint analysis, there seems to be larger portion of employees' salaries below the midpoint.

EXHIBIT 3N
SHERIFF - ABOVE AND BELOW MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
Civilian					
16	72	63	87.5%	9	12.5%
17	27	27	100.0%	0	0.0%
22	48	38	79.2%	10	20.8%
26	30	25	83.3%	5	16.7%
32	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
38	24	21	87.5%	3	12.5%
40	26	24	92.3%	2	7.7%
44	23	21	91.3%	2	8.7%
48	14	13	92.9%	1	7.1%
50	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
54	11	9	81.8%	2	18.2%
55	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
58	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
59	11	8	72.7%	3	27.3%
61	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
62	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Sworn & Certified					
DD1	56	56	100.0%	0	0.0%
DD2	16	16	100.0%	0	0.0%
DD3	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
DO1	81	69	85.2%	12	14.8%
DO2	34	34	100.0%	0	0.0%
DO3	20	20	100.0%	0	0.0%
45	200	154	77.0%	46	23.0%
56	27	13	48.1%	14	51.9%
57	37	20	54.1%	17	45.9%
60	26	16	61.5%	10	38.5%
63	7	5	71.4%	2	28.6%
64	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
65	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Total	812	670	82.5%	142	17.5%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Sheriff's Office as of June 2015.



The breakdown of employee' salaries that fell above and below midpoint by pay grade for the Supervisor of Elections Office is provided in **Exhibit 30**. There were six (66.7 percent) employee' salaries below midpoint and three (33.3 percent) above midpoint. While there does seem to be an uneven split of employee' salaries below and above midpoint, the small size of the organization makes this analysis tenuous.

EXHIBIT 30
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS - ABOVE AND BELOW MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE

Grade	Employees	# < Mid	% < Mid	# > Mid	% > Mid
ELO					
4	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
6	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
13	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
ELN					
16	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
20	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Total	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by SOE Office as of June 2015.

3.3 SALARY QUARTILE AND TENURE ANALYSIS

This section provides an analysis of the distribution of employee' salaries across pay grades and the time, i.e. tenure of those employees who have been employed by each organization. Examining employee salary placement by grade quartile provides insight into the clustering of employee salaries in each pay grade. For this analysis, employee' salaries were slotted within one of four equal distributions of each grade. The first quartile (0-25) represents the lowest 25.0 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 25.0 percent of the pay range. This analytical method provided an opportunity to assess where employee' salaries were in the pay range. **Exhibits 3P, 3Q, 3R, 3S, and 3T** provide the quartile analysis for each organization reviewed in this study.

The quartile analysis for the County pay plans are provided in **Exhibit 3P**. Of the 806 employee salaries, 577 (71.6 percent) fell within the first quartile; 130 employee salaries (13.1 percent) fell within the second; 61 (7.6 percent) within the third; and 38 (4.7 percent) in the fourth. There was a large group of employee' salaries within the first quartile of the pay plans. This indicates that employee' salaries may not be progressing sufficiently through the pay ranges.



EXHIBIT 3P
COUNTY PAY PLANS - SALARY QUARTILE AND TENURE ANALYSIS

GRADE	Total Employees	Average Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure
BAR										
2	8	6.1	8	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	20	10.4	14	6.7	4	13.2	-	-	2.0	30.9
4	16	8.0	9	6.7	3	10.3	3	0.7	1.0	33.5
5	19	6.5	17	5.7	2	13.0	-	-	-	-
6	34	6.5	28	4.5	4	13.7	2	19.7	-	-
7	26	10.4	20	7.5	3	12.8	1	21.0	2.0	30.6
8	31	8.9	27	6.7	3	21.9	-	-	1.0	28.2
9	21	9.2	15	5.9	4	10.3	-	-	2.0	31.4
10	23	9.4	18	6.4	3	18.6	1	21.9	1.0	23.8
11	1	25.8	-	-	1	25.8	-	-	-	-
12	14	11.6	9	6.8	3	15.1	1	31.9	1.0	23.3
13	10	5.3	10	5.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	2	2.3	1	2.6	1	2.1	-	-	-	-
16	2	9.1	1	1.6	1	16.7	-	-	-	-
18	2	21.5	-	-	2	21.5	-	-	-	-
50	10	7.1	9	5.4	1	22.5	-	-	-	-
51	3	23.6	1	14.2	2	28.3	-	-	-	-
EXS										
22	4	7.7	3	6.6	-	-	-	-	1.0	11.1
25	1	21.4	-	-	1	21.4	-	-	-	-
28	5	9.4	2	7.4	1	0.9	1	1.7	1.0	29.6
29	10	8.8	3	6.7	3	11.8	3	10.3	1.0	0.9
FBR										
11	55	6.9	46	4.7	2	18.7	2	18.9	5.0	17.3
13	30	5.2	28	4.9	2	10.2	-	-	-	-
16	13	18.4	8	14.3	-	-	5	25.0	-	-
17	22	16.1	14	12.3	3	19.6	2	23.2	3.0	25.8
18	39	9.1	35	7.6	2	19.6	2	24.9	-	-
20	16	21.4	7	15.6	6	24.4	3	28.7	-	-
21	17	15.4	14	13.9	3	22.5	-	-	-	-
FRB										
11	1	21.1	-	-	-	-	1	21.1	-	-
13	1	14.7	1	14.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	1	13.5	1	13.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	1	25.3	-	-	1	25.3	-	-	-	-
17	1	25.6	-	-	-	-	1	25.6	-	-
18	1	5.9	1	5.9	-	-	-	-	-	-

EXHIBIT 3P (CONTINUED)
COUNTY PAY PLANS - SALARY QUARTILE AND TENURE ANALYSIS

GRADE	Total Employees	Average Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure
FMB										
21	4	13.7	4	13.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
MFU										
23	5	22.8	1	16.2	3	22.9	1	28.8	-	-
NBR										
9	34	10.4	24	7.1	6	12.7	1	21.1	3.0	28.8
10	13	15.3	9	8.3	1	14.9	1	18.0	2.0	45.3
11	10	7.9	6	4.4	4	13.2	-	-	-	-
12	25	9.4	19	4.8	5	21.3	1	38.6	-	-
13	32	7.5	19	3.2	9	11.2	3	15.3	1.0	31.9
14	38	11.4	25	7.0	7	14.6	6	25.8	-	-
15	10	12.1	6	11.7	1	14.1	2	4.5	1.0	28.5
16	15	10.2	13	9.1	2	17.3	-	-	-	-
17	34	11.9	26	7.9	4	24.4	1	33.7	3.0	23.5
18	17	7.7	13	5.5	1	8.5	2	25.3	1.0	0.8
19	7	14.5	5	10.2	1	21.7	1	28.7	-	-
20	41	12.9	30	10.9	8	17.0	3	22.0	-	-
21	12	11.7	7	9.5	3	8.9	1	7.7	1.0	38.9
22	15	17.3	7	9.0	3	18.0	4	24.8	1.0	42.6
23	11	16.2	4	14.3	6	14.2	1	36.0	-	-
24	14	18.4	5	16.8	3	15.0	4	18.9	2.0	26.3
25	6	16.2	3	12.0	1	15.4	-	-	2.0	23
26	3	7.6	1	20.2	1	0.4	1	2.3	-	-
Overall Total	806		577		130		61		38	
Overall Average		10.7		7.4		16.1		20.6		26.0

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by BOCC as of June 2015.

Exhibit 3Q displays the quartile and average tenure information for employee salaries for the Library District pay plans. **Exhibit 3Q** includes a breakdown of the number of employees per pay grade, the average tenure per grade, the location (by quartile) of salaries within each grade, and the average number of years worked in the organization per quartile within each grade. All employees assigned in the PG temporary pay plan had salaries at the grade minimum; therefore they were excluded from the exhibit. Of the 170 employee salaries in the Library District's permanent plans, 123 (72.4 percent) fell within the first quartile; 20 (11.8 percent) within the second; 12 (7.1 percent) within the third; and 15 (8.8 percent) in the fourth. While the second, third, and fourth quartiles have a similar number of employee' salaries falling within each one, the first quartile has a large majority of employee salaries within it which may indicate there has been some challenges in progressing employee' salaries.

EXHIBIT 3Q
LIBRARY DISTRICT PAY PLANS - SALARY QUARTILE AND TENURE ANALYSIS

GRADE	Total Employees	Average Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure
BAR										
5	3	6.6	3	6.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	36	13.1	29	10.5	4	19.6	1	21.8	2	32.8
8	1	4.4	1	4.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	37	10.6	29	7.4	3	18.7	2	20.0	3	27.4
11	6	7.2	6	7.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	7	24.7	1	4.4	2	23.4	2	23.2	2	37.7
13	7	8.6	5	5.2	-	-	2	17.1	-	-
14	1	15.6	-	-	1	15.6	-	-	-	-
15	3	10.7	2	3.8	-	-	-	-	1	24.5
16	5	14.4	3	6.6	1	17.8	-	-	1	34.3
17	29	10.8	22	7.0	3	14.9	2	25.0	2	32.1
19	7	11.3	5	8.7	1	17.0	1	19.0	-	-
NBR										
17	3	8.3	2	3.3	-	-	1	18.4	-	-
18	1	23.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	23.8
19	1	22.2	-	-	1	22.2	-	-	-	-
20	10	15.4	6	8.9	1	9.8	1	17.4	2	36.7
22	5	9.3	4	7.0	1	18.6	-	-	-	-
24	6	12.6	5	7.3	-	-	-	-	1	39.3
LAW										
27	2	4.8	-	-	2	4.8	-	-	-	-
Overall Total	170		123		20		12		15	
Overall Average		10.8		6.8		16.8		20.6		32.2

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Library District Office as of June 2015.

Exhibit 3R includes a breakdown of the number of Property Appraiser's Office employee salaries per pay grade, the average tenure per grade, the location (by quartile) of employee' salaries within each grade, and the average number of years worked per quartile within each grade. There are 8 employee salaries (16.0 percent) within the first quartile; 21 (42.0 percent) within the second; 8 (16.0 percent) within the third; and 13 (26.0 percent) in the fourth.

EXHIBIT 3R
PROPERTY APPRAISER SALARY RANGES - SALARY QUARTILE AND TENURE ANALYSIS

Range Minimum	Range Midpoint	Range Maximum	Total Employees	Average Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
					# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure
\$ 25,506.00	\$ 31,907.00	\$ 38,288.00	2	13.3	-	-	-	-	1	14.3	1	12.3
\$ 26,802.00	\$ 35,502.00	\$ 40,203.00	1	0.6	1	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 28,142.00	\$ 35,178.00	\$ 42,213.00	9	8.6	-	-	3	1.2	2	4.2	4	16.3
\$ 32,578.00	\$ 40,722.00	\$ 48,867.00	7	18.0	2	11.4	4	18.8	-	-	1	27.8
\$ 34,207.00	\$ 42,578.00	\$ 51,310.00	6	21.0	-	-	1	8.1	1	29.8	4	22.1
\$ 35,917.00	\$ 44,896.00	\$ 53,876.00	5	11.7	1	8.5	3	13.9	1	8.1	-	-
\$ 39,599.00	\$ 49,498.00	\$ 59,398.00	2	23.2	-	-	1	19.8	-	-	1	26.7
\$ 41,579.00	\$ 51,973.00	\$ 62,368.00	6	11.7	-	-	5	12.3	1	8.5	-	-
\$ 45,840.00	\$ 57,300.00	\$ 68,671.00	1	3.2	1	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 58,505.00	\$ 73,132.00	\$ 87,756.00	3	11.7	1	15.0	-	-	-	-	2	10.0
\$ 67,727.00	\$ 84,659.00	\$ 101,591.00	5	9.2	2	11.9	3	7.5	-	-	-	-
\$ 78,403.00	\$ 98,003.00	\$ 117,604.00	3	22.9	-	-	1	30.7	2	19.0	-	-
Overall Total			50		8		21		8		13	
Overall Average				13.7		9.3		12.5		13.4		18.5

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by PA Office as of June 2015.

Exhibit 3S includes a breakdown of the number of employees per pay grade, the average tenure per grade, the location (by quartile) of salaries within each grade, and the average number of years worked per quartile within each grade for the Sheriff's Office pay plans. Of the 812 employees' salaries, 502 (61.8 percent) fell within the first quartile; 168 (20.7 percent) within the second; 83 (10.2 percent) within the third; and 59 (7.3 percent) in the fourth. The first quartile had a large majority of employees' salaries that fell within it.

EXHIBIT 3S
SHERIFF PAY PLANS - SALARY QUARTILE AND TENURE ANALYSIS

GRADE	Total Employees	Average Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure
Civilian										
16	72	7.1	49	3.8	14	11.3	7	16.7	2	25.3
17	27	3.8	25	3.5	2	8.8	-	-	-	-
22	48	10.2	27	5.0	11	14.0	7	19.6	3	20.6
26	30	9.8	22	7.1	3	10.9	3	19.8	2	22.2
32	4	10.6	3	6.9	1	21.8	-	-	-	-
38	24	8.7	15	4.6	6	10.7	2	22.1	1	32.9
40	26	9.4	19	7.2	5	12.4	2	22.6	-	-
44	23	11.5	16	9.5	5	12.7	2	24.2	-	-
48	14	12.4	11	11.1	2	12.5	-	-	1	26.3
50	4	13.2	2	9.3	2	17.1	-	-	-	-
54	11	13.8	5	5.1	4	17.0	-	-	2	29.3
55	1	7.3	-	-	1	7.3	-	-	-	-
58	2	9.9	-	-	2	9.9	-	-	-	-
59	11	17.0	5	13.1	3	26.1	2	17.9	1	7.8
61	2	18.8	-	-	-	-	2	18.8	-	-
62	2	16.3	1	3.6	-	-	1	29.0	-	-
Sworn & Certified										
DD1	56	2.7	50	2.2	6	6.6	-	-	-	-
DD2	16	8.3	15	8.1	1	10.7	-	-	-	-
DD3	3	14.1	3	14.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
DO1	81	5.6	44	4.1	25	5.4	9	11.1	3	13.6
DO2	34	9.0	31	8.7	3	12.4	-	-	-	-
DO3	20	17.3	19	16.9	1	24.6	-	-	-	-
45	200	9.6	96	5.0	58	10.8	32	15.6	14	22.0
56	27	15.6	10	9.2	3	17.0	7	17.9	7	21.7
57	37	18.0	13	13.1	7	17.1	4	17.2	13	23.7
60	26	19.9	13	17.2	3	18.6	1	19.2	9	24.2
63	7	24.3	5	23.1	-	-	1	31.3	1	22.8
64	3	16.1	3	16.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	1	2.7	-	-	-	-	1	2.7	-	-
Overall Total	812		502		168		83		59	
Overall Average		9.7		6.6		11.4		16.9		22.6

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by Sheriff's Office as of June 2015.

Exhibit 3T includes a breakdown of the number of Supervisor of Elections Office employee’ salaries per pay grade, the average tenure per grade, the location (by quartile) of employee’ salaries within each grade, and the average number of years worked per quartile within each grade. There were four employee’ salaries (44.4 percent) within the first quartile; two (22.2 percent) within the second; two (22.2 percent) within the third; and one (11.1 percent) in the fourth.

**EXHIBIT 3T
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS PAY PLANS - SALARY QUARTILE AND TENURE ANALYSIS**

GRADE	Total Employees	Average Tenure	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		4th Quartile	
			# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure	# Employees	Avg Tenure
ELO										
4	1	10.0	1	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	2	10.3	-	-	1	8.4	1	12.2	-	-
13	2	8.7	1	9.8	1	7.5	-	-	-	-
ELN										
16	2	22.3	-	-	-	-	1	21.9	1	22.6
20	2	7.7	2	7.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Overall Total	9		4		2		2		1	
Overall Average		12.0		9.3		12.5		13.4		18.5

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions from data provided by SOE Office as of June 2015.

3.4 SUMMARY

The County and the Constitutional Offices had structured pay plans which provided distinct pay ranges for types of employees and classifications. The design of these, whether open range or step, provided a clear structure by which employees could expect salaries to progress.

The County, Library District, and Sheriff's Offices had large groups of employees with salaries below the respective grade midpoints, with many in the first quartile. The Property Appraiser's and Supervisor of Elections Offices had a more even distribution of employee' salaries across the salary ranges. However, the relatively small number of employees in the Supervisor of Elections Office did not provide enough data to properly analyze any concerns of pay compression.

The information gained from the review of the current conditions was used in conjunction with the market analysis data and internal equity review to develop recommendations for a classification and compensation systems that would best align with each organization's compensation philosophy and associated pay practices going forward. These recommendations are provided in **Chapter 5** of this report.



Chapter 4 – Market Summary

This chapter provides a market analysis in which the organizations' existing salary structures (ranges) were compared to those of identified peer organizations. The data from the targeted market peers were used to evaluate the overall competitiveness of each organization's salary structure at the time of this study. It is important to note that the market comparisons contained herein do not translate at the individual employee level and are instead used to provide overall analyses. The utilized methodology is not intended to evaluate particular salaries offered to individuals because individual compensation is usually determined through a combination of factors, which could include: the demand for a particular job, a candidate's prior experience, or an individual's negotiation skills during the hiring process.

Furthermore, it should be noted that market comparisons are best thought of as a snapshot of current market conditions. In other words, market conditions change, and in some cases change quickly; so while market surveys are useful for making updates to the organizations' salary structures, they must be done at regular intervals to remain current with market peers and salary trends. Comparisons of the salary structures at the time this study began to both public and private sector organizations are provided below.

4.1 PUBLIC SECTOR SALARY SURVEY RESULTS

Evergreen Solutions collected pay range information from public sector peers in the competitive market utilizing a survey tool. Development of this tool included selecting benchmark classifications for the County and each Constitutional Office. The desired outcome of benchmarking was to select a cross-section of each organization's classifications, so that the surveyed positions made up a subset of all work areas and levels of the salary structures. The classification title, a description of assigned duties, and the education and experience requirements were provided in the survey tool for each benchmarked classification.

The peers were selected by Evergreen Solutions with concurrence from each organization's study team. Several factors were utilized when developing this peer list, including geographic proximity to the County, organization size, and the relative population size being served by the organization.

All data collected were adjusted for cost of living using a national cost of living index factor which allowed salary dollars from organizations outside of the immediate area to be adjusted for the cost of living relative to the Gainesville, FL area. **Exhibit 4A** provides the list of 22 market peers from which data were collected.



**EXHIBIT 4A
MARKET PEERS**

Peer Data Collected
Alachua County School Board
Brevard County
Charlotte County Sheriff's Office
Citrus County Supervisor of Elections
City of Gainesville
City of Lake City
City of Ocala
City of Tampa
City of Trenton
Clay County Property Appraiser
Clay County Supervisor of Elections
Collier County
Collier County Sheriff's Office
Collier County Supervisor of Elections
Columbia County
Duval County
Duval County Supervisor of Elections
Escambia County
Escambia County Property Appraiser
Escambia County Supervisor of Elections
Gilchrist County Property Appraiser
Hernando County Sheriff's Office
Lake County
Leon County
Leon County Supervisor of Elections
Manatee County Sheriff's Office
Marion County Sheriff Office
Marion County Supervisor of Elections
Monroe County Sheriff's Office
Orange County
Orange County Library System
Osceola County
Pasco County
Pinellas County
Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections
Polk County
Polk County Sheriff's Office
Santa Rosa County
Sarasota County
Seminole County
Seminole County Property Appraiser
St. Johns County
St. Johns County Supervisor of Elections
State of Florida
Tallahassee Police Department
Tampa Police Department
University of Florida

Concurrently, discussions were held with each organization to understand and develop its compensation philosophy. As part of these discussions and development of philosophies, it was determined that all wanted to have a salary structure that would place them in a competitive position with their market peers. The first step then, was to compare the existing salary ranges for the benchmark classifications to the 50th percentile of the collected peer data. **Exhibits 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E, and 4F** provide for each organization a summary of the results of this data. The exhibits contain the following information:

- Each classification that was benchmarked.
- The market range minimum, midpoint, and maximum for each benchmark classification. The survey range minimum indicates the 50th percentile of the minimum peer salary data for each classification provided by the peer organizations. The survey range midpoint provides the 50th percentile of the midpoint of the peer respondents for each classification surveyed. As well, the survey range maximum provides the 50th percentile of the maximum of the survey participants for each classification surveyed.
- The percent differentials are shown for survey range minimum, midpoint, and maximum. The differentials specify how the organizations' current salary ranges compared to the market 50th percentile for each benchmark classification. A positive differential indicates it was above market for that classification at the range minimum, midpoint, or maximum. A negative differential indicates the organization's salary range was below market for that classification. In the final row of the exhibit, the average percent differentials for the range minimum, midpoint, and maximum are provided. This was arrived at by averaging all of the classifications' differentials.
- The second column from the right provides the average range width for each classification surveyed, which is determined by the average minimum and average maximum salaries of the respondents. The average range spread for all of the classifications is provided in the final row of the exhibit.
- The total number of survey responses for each classification. This information is provided in the final column, and the average number of responses for all of the classifications is provided in the final row.



EXHIBIT 4B
COUNTY - SALARY SURVEY DATA SUMMARY

Organization	Benchmark Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
		50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff		
County	ACCOUNTING CLERK	\$ 26,711.00	-7.6%	\$ 34,852.19	-12.4%	\$ 43,111.99	-15.8%	65.6%	20
County	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	\$ 31,337.40	16.5%	\$ 42,479.52	11.3%	\$ 51,811.59	11.1%	71.5%	22
County	ANIMAL SERVICES DIRECTOR	\$ 67,534.95	-7.4%	\$ 87,863.00	-7.4%	\$ 115,434.10	-14.6%	71.9%	10
County	ANIMAL SERVICES OFFICER	\$ 27,907.98	8.5%	\$ 37,620.81	-3.3%	\$ 48,157.86	-1.8%	74.9%	11
County	ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY	\$ 65,654.93	23.4%	\$ 94,696.52	18.1%	\$ 115,762.81	20.5%	79.1%	12
County	ASSISTANT COUNTY MANAGER	\$ 84,121.91	1.8%	\$ 117,454.74	-1.6%	\$ 147,906.32	-1.6%	88.2%	10
County	BUILDING INSPECTOR I	\$ 33,940.00	9.5%	\$ 45,312.92	7.1%	\$ 55,875.25	6.9%	74.3%	14
County	BUILDING MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR	\$ 40,604.11	-2.8%	\$ 54,119.41	-7.3%	\$ 68,112.30	-11.0%	80.3%	14
County	BUILDING MECHANIC	\$ 25,621.10	20.2%	\$ 37,308.45	8.9%	\$ 48,370.38	2.9%	76.7%	12
County	CASE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR	\$ 44,118.49	9.1%	\$ 59,984.95	3.2%	\$ 75,851.42	-0.6%	70.7%	3
County	CHIEF OF FIRE RESCUE	\$ 82,995.37	3.2%	\$ 97,930.78	15.3%	\$ 126,294.85	13.3%	69.5%	11
County	CIVIL ENGINEER I	\$ 48,699.22	4.8%	\$ 63,009.26	5.3%	\$ 78,500.57	4.2%	76.5%	14
County	CLAIMS ADJUSTER	\$ 40,510.53	12.2%	\$ 54,644.26	7.2%	\$ 67,853.01	5.3%	73.1%	6
County	CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	\$ 32,792.28	7.9%	\$ 42,911.54	5.5%	\$ 52,071.83	5.7%	64.0%	15
County	COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES DIRECTOR	\$ 82,026.86	-0.8%	\$ 105,385.56	2.3%	\$ 131,598.57	2.0%	75.8%	7
County	CORRECTIONAL OFFICER	\$ 31,781.82	1.1%	\$ 44,374.89	-8.3%	\$ 57,981.64	-16.4%	82.2%	5
County	COUNTY ENGINEER	\$ 73,948.16		\$ 97,785.10		\$ 125,565.44		72.6%	12
County	COURT OFFICER	\$ 33,313.88	15.7%	\$ 48,413.08	4.0%	\$ 60,927.33	0.7%	67.1%	4
County	CRISIS CENTER DIRECTOR	\$ 64,523.38	-8.1%	\$ 87,034.25	-12.1%	\$ 109,545.12	-14.5%	76.5%	3
County	CUSTODIAN	\$ 20,016.77	5.8%	\$ 25,058.12	5.7%	\$ 31,356.66	1.6%	66.1%	15
County	DEPUTY COUNTY MANAGER	\$ 99,185.64		\$ 119,543.48		\$ 150,212.07		60.8%	8
County	DIRECTOR EMERGENCY MGMT	\$ 75,020.43	-13.3%	\$ 99,729.45	-15.8%	\$ 126,848.41	-19.6%	77.2%	7
County	DRIVER/PARAMEDIC 56	\$ 45,091.78	-2.2%	\$ 60,541.19	-5.6%	\$ 70,261.59	0.4%	62.0%	5
County	DRUG COUNSELOR	\$ 37,804.28	-0.8%	\$ 49,207.57	-2.8%	\$ 61,200.93	-5.0%	52.6%	5
County	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIRECTOR	\$ 81,317.65	0.1%	\$ 107,288.94	0.5%	\$ 138,036.27	-2.8%	73.5%	7
County	EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ANALYST	\$ 35,142.44	27.6%	\$ 47,840.20	22.8%	\$ 60,537.95	19.7%	71.2%	4
County	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III	\$ 28,724.00	0.9%	\$ 35,611.61	3.6%	\$ 44,511.05	0.9%	62.7%	15
County	FACILITY MAINTENANCE COORDINATOR	\$ 37,543.29	18.6%	\$ 54,062.07	8.2%	\$ 71,359.56	0.4%	87.5%	7
County	FACILITY MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR	\$ 69,062.16	15.1%	\$ 88,623.17	17.8%	\$ 108,184.19	19.5%	68.9%	9
County	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ANALYST	\$ 42,412.82	12.7%	\$ 56,867.85	8.3%	\$ 69,907.16	7.3%	72.3%	13
County	FIRE MARSHAL	\$ 49,925.21	7.3%	\$ 62,406.18	10.9%	\$ 78,507.34	9.0%	53.1%	6
County	FIREFIGHTER/EMT 56	\$ 32,624.64	-0.8%	\$ 41,040.64	0.5%	\$ 51,064.84	-1.8%	56.9%	12
County	FLEET MANAGER	\$ 56,082.11	10.8%	\$ 80,068.58	2.1%	\$ 100,771.55	-0.1%	71.4%	9
County	FLEET SUPERVISOR	\$ 41,556.03	-10.8%	\$ 54,062.07	15.2%	\$ 67,157.96	25.4%	67.8%	7
County	FLEET TECHNICIAN	\$ 30,733.34	9.1%	\$ 39,442.67	31.4%	\$ 47,926.08	41.0%	72.0%	15
County	GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS) ANALYST	\$ 39,212.67	10.5%	\$ 52,190.30	6.7%	\$ 66,021.80	3.0%	64.0%	14
County	GRANTS/CONTRACTOR ADMINISTRATOR	\$ 47,518.80	7.1%	\$ 60,813.62	8.6%	\$ 76,692.48	6.6%	66.5%	11
County	GROWTH MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR	\$ 87,664.81	-2.3%	\$ 119,327.87	-3.2%	\$ 143,763.06	1.3%	72.6%	5
County	HR DIRECTOR	\$ 73,953.04	-6.1%	\$ 105,295.05	-16.1%	\$ 132,488.89	-18.6%	66.9%	13
County	HR GENERALIST	\$ 34,438.85	8.2%	\$ 44,837.21	6.4%	\$ 62,168.10	-6.7%	82.5%	11
County	INFORMATION SERVICES/TELECOM DIRECTOR	\$ 82,026.86	4.3%	\$ 105,878.59	8.5%	\$ 129,601.58	11.0%	56.5%	9
County	LABORER II	\$ 22,413.62	-0.2%	\$ 29,225.27	-4.5%	\$ 35,185.03	-4.8%	64.0%	10
County	LEGAL SECRETARY	\$ 31,809.40	6.0%	\$ 41,985.19	0.9%	\$ 53,789.17	-5.7%	77.3%	12
County	MAINTENANCE WORKER	\$ 21,700.78	7.9%	\$ 30,521.74	-3.6%	\$ 36,891.90	-4.4%	72.8%	18
County	NETWORK MANAGER	\$ 55,329.74	16.4%	\$ 72,706.76	15.6%	\$ 101,324.69	4.5%	70.0%	10
County	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET DIRECTOR	\$ 75,020.43	7.8%	\$ 102,564.23	4.9%	\$ 133,522.21	0.6%	74.7%	9
County	PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER	\$ 22,999.45	12.0%	\$ 29,241.01	10.5%	\$ 36,802.99	6.1%	59.7%	13
County	PARKS SUPERVISOR	\$ 39,129.61	-28.3%	\$ 48,782.95	-25.4%	\$ 60,021.02	-26.9%	79.6%	14
County	PROBATION OFFICER	\$ 33,039.82	7.2%	\$ 44,488.25	0.3%	\$ 55,995.61	-4.5%	73.8%	6
County	PROGRAM COORDINATOR	\$ 39,403.07	-16.5%	\$ 52,625.60	-24.2%	\$ 66,228.94	-30.1%	67.4%	7
County	PROGRAMMER/ANALYST	\$ 42,649.44	7.5%	\$ 56,928.25	3.3%	\$ 71,139.39	0.7%	63.0%	10
County	PURCHASING AGENT	\$ 34,036.36	9.3%	\$ 47,356.92	1.1%	\$ 61,110.84	-4.9%	79.5%	12
County	RESCUE LIEUTENANT 56	\$ 48,713.87	-4.9%	\$ 55,053.33	8.8%	\$ 61,392.79	17.4%	35.6%	9
County	RISK MANAGER	\$ 65,634.32	-4.4%	\$ 81,449.33	0.4%	\$ 103,544.01	-2.8%	62.8%	12
County	ROAD SUPERINTENDENT	\$ 43,596.75	27.0%	\$ 57,481.24	26.0%	\$ 74,314.84	22.3%	71.4%	7
County	SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST	\$ 45,397.56	1.6%	\$ 57,527.89	2.3%	\$ 71,485.46	0.2%	68.2%	11
County	SENIOR SUPPORT TECH	\$ 41,138.26	-15.5%	\$ 52,998.56	-16.7%	\$ 66,385.33	-20.2%	70.0%	10
County	SOCIAL SERVICES COORDINATOR	\$ 32,957.92	-2.6%	\$ 47,485.45	-18.0%	\$ 63,395.67	-31.1%	86.2%	4
County	SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAM DIRECTOR	\$ 67,129.95	-18.4%	\$ 84,655.73	-14.8%	\$ 109,603.05	-20.7%	61.9%	5
County	SOLID WASTE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER	\$ 62,568.98	-4.8%	\$ 83,959.21	-8.1%	\$ 105,487.66	-10.3%	63.4%	7
County	SR OFFICE ASSISTANT	\$ 25,000.69	-0.7%	\$ 34,593.98	-11.5%	\$ 43,543.01	-17.0%	71.3%	10
County	STAFF ASSISTANT	\$ 28,334.95	-3.0%	\$ 36,368.15	-3.7%	\$ 48,348.24	-13.4%	73.2%	10
County	SURVEY TECHNICIAN	\$ 27,447.30	22.9%	\$ 35,623.73	21.6%	\$ 43,699.50	20.9%	69.5%	12
County	SYSTEMS ANALYST	\$ 45,704.21	15.1%	\$ 61,192.65	12.6%	\$ 78,582.97	8.9%	62.1%	11
County	TELECOMM TECH	\$ 34,534.33	12.6%	\$ 45,564.23	11.3%	\$ 50,850.77	19.5%	72.5%	10
County	TRAINING MANAGER	\$ 49,751.20	-7.9%	\$ 66,047.58	-12.2%	\$ 82,343.96	-14.9%	64.8%	8
County	WAREHOUSE MANAGER	\$ 33,571.60	-10.0%	\$ 46,940.32	-20.7%	\$ 55,875.25	-18.2%	72.7%	6
County	ZONING ADMINISTRATOR	\$ 59,365.62	0.6%	\$ 77,798.82	-0.2%	\$ 93,342.75	2.4%	66.3%	9
Overall Average			3.7%		1.7%		-0.6%	69.8%	9.9

**EXHIBIT 4C
LIBRARY DISTRICT - SALARY SURVEY DATA SUMMARY**

Organization	Benchmark Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
		50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff		
Library District	ADMIN SERVICES DIVISION DIRECTOR	\$ 69,950.30	-3.1%	\$ 95,563.07	-8.3%	\$ 119,142.22	-9.7%	66.4%	5
Library District	FACILITY/SAFETY SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR	\$ 47,944.80	29.4%	\$ 63,623.76	27.9%	\$ 79,302.71	27.0%	72.6%	4
Library District	LIBRARIAN I	\$ 34,433.04	17.4%	\$ 46,875.37	13.5%	\$ 61,112.62	8.3%	85.2%	7
Library District	LIBRARY ASSISTANT	\$ 23,575.76	7.8%	\$ 33,413.04	-2.5%	\$ 41,036.16	-3.5%	82.5%	9
Library District	NETWORK TECHNICIAN	\$ 39,022.26	1.7%	\$ 52,625.60	-4.0%	\$ 66,228.94	-7.7%	75.6%	5
Library District	SENIOR BUILDING MECHANIC	\$ 27,794.12	26.5%	\$ 35,784.93	25.7%	\$ 43,775.74	25.3%	56.9%	5
Overall Average			13.3%		8.7%		6.6%	73.2%	5.8

**EXHIBIT 4D
PROPERTY APPRAISER - SALARY SURVEY DATA SUMMARY**

Organization	Benchmark Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
		50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff		
Property Appraiser's Office	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST	\$ 32,081.51	-14.0%	\$ 44,698.25	-27.1%	\$ 58,390.57	-38.3%	74.5%	6
Property Appraiser's Office	APPRAISAL CONSULTANT II	\$ 37,975.80	-16.6%	\$ 49,104.94	-20.6%	\$ 61,195.84	-25.2%	65.9%	5
Property Appraiser's Office	APPRAISER I	\$ 31,951.05	-13.5%	\$ 41,605.40	-18.3%	\$ 52,395.14	-24.1%	59.2%	6
Property Appraiser's Office	APPRAISER III	\$ 36,144.00	13.1%	\$ 48,787.30	6.1%	\$ 61,430.59	1.5%	67.6%	6
Property Appraiser's Office	DIRECTOR OF APPRAISAL SERVICES	\$ 78,155.09	-15.4%	\$ 98,780.49	-16.7%	\$ 124,407.65	-22.5%	60.1%	4
Property Appraiser's Office	DIRECTOR OF GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS	\$ 57,298.05	15.4%	\$ 77,334.53	8.7%	\$ 96,949.95	4.6%	66.8%	7
Property Appraiser's Office	DIRECTOR OF REAL PROPERTY VALUATION	\$ 65,753.94	2.9%	\$ 88,565.84	-4.6%	\$ 111,762.39	-10.0%	69.6%	5
Property Appraiser's Office	DIRECTOR OF TANGIBLE PROPERTY VALUATION	\$ 55,185.91	18.5%	\$ 74,313.46	12.2%	\$ 93,632.94	7.8%	75.7%	4
Property Appraiser's Office	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CADASTRE, GIS AND IT	\$ 75,737.94	3.4%	\$ 101,271.81	-3.3%	\$ 126,805.69	-7.8%	67.1%	4
Property Appraiser's Office	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF TAX ROLL ADMINISTRATION	\$ 63,311.10	19.2%	\$ 85,534.34	12.7%	\$ 110,980.91	5.6%	55.6%	4
Property Appraiser's Office	GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS) ANALYST II	\$ 39,574.59	-15.7%	\$ 53,409.77	-24.9%	\$ 67,157.96	-30.9%	66.7%	11
Property Appraiser's Office	PERSONNEL SPECIALIST	\$ 34,942.89	-	\$ 46,498.34	-	\$ 59,413.53	-	72.2%	9
Overall Average			-0.2%		-6.9%		-12.7%	66.7%	5.9

EXHIBIT 4E
SHERIFF - SALARY SURVEY DATA SUMMARY

Organization	Benchmark Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
		50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff		
Sheriff's Office	ACCOUNTING & BUDGET MANAGER	\$ 54,508.07	-25.9%	\$ 72,120.26	-28.2%	\$ 91,885.00	-32.8%	71.3%	12
Sheriff's Office	ADMIN SRVCS/HUMAN RESOURCES SPECIALIST	\$ 30,642.11	0.8%	\$ 41,739.94	-4.0%	\$ 52,357.82	-6.0%	72.9%	11
Sheriff's Office	ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATOR	\$ 34,381.58	-4.9%	\$ 44,744.11	-5.0%	\$ 58,035.95	-10.7%	68.7%	9
Sheriff's Office	AVIATION MECHANIC	\$ 37,551.82	7.8%	\$ 49,053.32	7.3%	\$ 60,554.81	7.0%	55.8%	6
Sheriff's Office	CAPTAIN	\$ 82,944.19	-0.7%	\$ 91,530.42	1.2%	\$ 107,579.43	-4.5%	45.9%	12
Sheriff's Office	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	\$ 81,660.79	-14.5%	\$ 102,960.00	-11.1%	\$ 130,784.84	-14.7%	61.0%	9
Sheriff's Office	COMPUTER AIDED DISPATCH (CAD) SPECIALIST	\$ 27,247.26	33.1%	\$ 35,454.47	33.0%	\$ 44,755.62	31.3%	72.3%	6
Sheriff's Office	CONTRACT & GRANT ADMINISTRATOR - SHERIFF	\$ 47,442.42	1.9%	\$ 58,970.78	6.1%	\$ 71,219.11	7.8%	55.5%	6
Sheriff's Office	CRIME ANALYST	\$ 29,468.25	15.1%	\$ 44,361.07	1.7%	\$ 55,826.86	-0.6%	69.6%	13
Sheriff's Office	CRIME SCENE INVESTIGATOR	\$ 34,036.36	7.5%	\$ 44,166.12	7.7%	\$ 53,950.66	8.3%	68.3%	14
Sheriff's Office	CRIME SCENE LATENT PRINT EXAMINER	\$ 40,198.25	16.8%	\$ 50,547.19	19.5%	\$ 60,870.29	21.2%	60.4%	8
Sheriff's Office	DETECTIVE	\$ 42,933.19	-12.7%	\$ 55,543.49	-12.2%	\$ 67,634.76	-11.0%	56.3%	8
Sheriff's Office	DETECTIVE LIEUTENANT	\$ 70,441.57	-8.6%	\$ 80,267.31	-7.3%	\$ 90,707.47	-7.1%	31.5%	12
Sheriff's Office	DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	\$ 71,156.69	0.3%	\$ 88,798.96	4.2%	\$ 112,795.23	1.1%	69.5%	12
Sheriff's Office	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO CHIEF DEPUTY	\$ 30,284.32	25.7%	\$ 43,452.31	17.9%	\$ 53,356.95	18.1%	85.6%	6
Sheriff's Office	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO SHERIFF	\$ 30,281.64	44.8%	\$ 45,669.85	36.0%	\$ 60,186.65	31.4%	75.2%	8
Sheriff's Office	FLEET SERVICES MANAGER	\$ 56,289.54	-2.5%	\$ 73,367.71	-2.9%	\$ 89,308.45	-1.8%	57.0%	10
Sheriff's Office	GENERAL TELECOMMUNICATOR	\$ 29,948.77	3.0%	\$ 39,924.07	0.5%	\$ 50,256.12	-1.8%	74.0%	12
Sheriff's Office	HELP DESK COORDINATOR	\$ 34,662.54	0.2%	\$ 47,956.72	-6.3%	\$ 69,614.86	-25.4%	72.5%	6
Sheriff's Office	HR BENEFIT COORDINATOR	\$ 38,421.00	-10.7%	\$ 48,323.20	-7.1%	\$ 59,049.13	-6.4%	62.8%	9
Sheriff's Office	HR BUREAU CHIEF	\$ 53,736.96	8.5%	\$ 75,652.51	0.9%	\$ 97,298.54	-3.6%	84.5%	8
Sheriff's Office	HR EMPLOYMENT MANAGER	\$ 52,153.22	-20.5%	\$ 68,596.44	-22.0%	\$ 85,680.42	-23.8%	63.1%	8
Sheriff's Office	HUMAN RESOURCES SPECIALIST	\$ 31,247.16	-1.2%	\$ 42,082.62	-4.9%	\$ 54,159.66	-9.7%	67.1%	10
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	\$ 31,645.84	-9.7%	\$ 42,425.30	-13.2%	\$ 52,004.40	-12.8%	62.9%	7
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/BOOKING CRIMINAL JUSTICE TECHNICIAN	\$ 29,629.93	-15.1%	\$ 38,501.64	-15.1%	\$ 47,027.36	-14.2%	57.5%	5
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/BUREAU CHIEF	\$ 77,148.12	-31.3%	\$ 88,525.55	-15.9%	\$ 94,233.76	-0.3%	42.0%	3
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/CLASSIFICATION CASEWORKER	\$ 36,038.92	2.1%	\$ 43,437.82	9.2%	\$ 50,836.72	13.6%	59.6%	3
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/DETENTION DEPUTY	\$ 41,627.81	6.7%	\$ 50,446.35	11.4%	\$ 59,038.82	14.8%	53.4%	5
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/DETENTION LIEUTENANT	\$ 67,652.96	-4.3%	\$ 76,834.54	-2.7%	\$ 82,874.37	2.1%	31.4%	8
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/DETENTION OFFICER	\$ 39,368.58	2.9%	\$ 48,772.56	-8.7%	\$ 58,176.55	-18.3%	51.6%	8
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/DETENTION SERGEANT	\$ 52,099.07	-6.2%	\$ 62,373.67	-6.7%	\$ 68,684.53	-1.2%	31.2%	8
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/DIRECTOR	\$ 95,177.83	1.7%	\$ 119,488.51	-9.8%	\$ 149,090.56	-23.3%	52.1%	5
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/FACILITY GROUND MAINTENANCE	\$ 22,723.94	21.2%	\$ 30,972.16	17.3%	\$ 41,254.18	10.5%	74.8%	5
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/HR RISK MANAGER	\$ 52,104.65	-50.1%	\$ 69,616.48	-54.3%	\$ 81,024.17	-46.0%	55.4%	4
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/NETWORK SUPPORT SPECIALIST	\$ 46,132.16	4.6%	\$ 59,415.79	5.4%	\$ 73,127.37	5.4%	65.8%	7
Sheriff's Office	JAIL/TECHNICAL SUPPORT SPECIALIST	\$ 34,934.79	5.1%	\$ 46,693.41	2.4%	\$ 58,834.39	0.0%	69.6%	7
Sheriff's Office	NETWORK ADMINISTRATOR	\$ 50,360.16	14.3%	\$ 67,677.63	11.4%	\$ 79,418.02	15.5%	60.5%	11
Sheriff's Office	OFFICE OF SHERIFF/CHIEF DEPUTY	\$ 95,189.23	17.5%	\$ 122,621.56	5.4%	\$ 140,863.16	2.2%	67.0%	13
Sheriff's Office	OFFICE OF SHERIFF/GENERAL COUNSEL	\$ 79,989.51	2.9%	\$ 101,251.90	5.4%	\$ 136,268.69	-3.4%	75.0%	10
Sheriff's Office	OPERATIONS MAJOR	\$ 77,505.92	19.9%	\$ 102,562.86	5.8%	\$ 118,374.10	2.1%	63.5%	10
Sheriff's Office	PATROL/CAPTAIN	\$ 83,694.49	-1.6%	\$ 93,099.29	-0.5%	\$ 105,799.59	-2.8%	53.6%	13
Sheriff's Office	PATROL/DEPUTY	\$ 41,004.93	-7.6%	\$ 50,955.39	-2.9%	\$ 60,782.20	0.2%	59.7%	12
Sheriff's Office	PATROL/LIEUTENANT	\$ 70,127.55	-8.1%	\$ 80,267.31	-7.3%	\$ 91,385.89	-7.9%	37.9%	14
Sheriff's Office	PATROL/SERGEANT	\$ 54,780.19	-6.4%	\$ 66,029.22	-10.6%	\$ 73,892.53	-8.9%	41.1%	15
Sheriff's Office	PC SUPPORT SPECIALIST I	\$ 34,151.23	1.6%	\$ 44,488.25	1.4%	\$ 56,317.68	-1.5%	75.1%	13
Sheriff's Office	RADIO COORDINATOR	\$ 32,792.28	-13.7%	\$ 51,913.91	-38.6%	\$ 72,338.54	-56.9%	97.4%	5
Sheriff's Office	RADIO TECHNICIAN	\$ 30,650.32	11.7%	\$ 43,008.06	4.7%	\$ 54,997.56	0.9%	83.3%	6
Sheriff's Office	RMS SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR	\$ 45,012.35	6.9%	\$ 62,094.37	1.1%	\$ 79,176.40	-2.4%	66.1%	5
Sheriff's Office	SHIFT SUPERVISOR	\$ 40,111.18	1.6%	\$ 51,144.30	3.4%	\$ 64,896.00	0.4%	75.5%	9
Sheriff's Office	SUPPORT SVCS/ MAJOR	\$ 76,836.09	20.6%	\$ 100,144.39	8.0%	\$ 117,462.62	2.9%	78.0%	7
Sheriff's Office	TELECOMMUNICATOR	\$ 28,130.23	-3.0%	\$ 35,599.62	-0.3%	\$ 43,925.18	-0.6%	64.4%	10
Sheriff's Office	VICTIM ADVOCATE	\$ 33,822.45	2.6%	\$ 47,808.79	-6.0%	\$ 60,008.27	-8.1%	80.0%	9
Overall Average			1.0%		-1.4%		-3.3%	63.2%	8.7

EXHIBIT 4F
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS - SALARY SURVEY DATA SUMMARY

Organization	Benchmark Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp
		50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff	50th Percentile	% Diff		
Supervisor of Elections	ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS	\$ 87,164.74	-61.9%	\$ 97,686.76	-39.5%	\$ 127,365.81	-47.7%	73.1%	5
Supervisor of Elections	ELECTIONS CLERK	\$ 24,482.48	-3.9%	\$ 33,096.91	-14.4%	\$ 43,412.35	-26.5%	73.8%	8
Supervisor of Elections	ELECTIONS INFORMATION SPECIALIST	\$ 50,725.49	-35.2%	\$ 64,933.25	-35.6%	\$ 75,504.78	-29.6%	52.5%	4
Supervisor of Elections	SENIOR ELECTIONS CLERK	\$ 26,593.19	-1.8%	\$ 37,365.56	-16.4%	\$ 52,608.90	-38.3%	75.8%	6
Overall Average			-25.7%		-26.5%		-35.5%	68.8%	5.8

Market Minimums

A starting point of the market analysis was to compare the peer 50th percentile market minimum for each benchmark classification to the organization's range minimums. Market minimums are generally considered as an entry level salary for employees who meet the minimum qualifications of a classification. Those employees with salaries at or near the range minimums are unlikely to have mastered the job and probably have not acquired the skills and experience necessary to be fully proficient in their classification. For ease of understanding the collected data for the County and the Constitutional Offices, the following summarizes the most general observations:

As **Exhibit 4B** illustrates, the County's benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 3.7 percent ahead of the desired market position at the minimum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4C** illustrates, the Library District's benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 13.3 percent ahead of the desired market position at the minimum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4D** illustrates, the Property Appraiser's benchmark classifications were on average, approximately 0.2 percent behind the desired market position at the minimum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4E** illustrates, the Sheriff's Office benchmark classifications were on average, approximately 1.0 percent ahead of the desired market position at the minimum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4F** illustrates, the Supervisor of Elections Office's benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 25.7 percent behind the desired market position at the minimum of the respective salary ranges.

Market Midpoints

This section explored the comparison between the 50th percentile of the peer midpoints and the midpoints for benchmarked classifications for the organizations. Market midpoints are important to consider because they are commonly recognized as the salary point at which employees have achieved full proficiency, and are performing satisfactorily in their

classification. As such, midpoint is often considered as the salary point at which a fully proficient employee could expect their salary to be placed. Again, for ease of understanding the collected data for all organizations, the following summarizes the most general observations:

As **Exhibit 4B** illustrates, the County’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 1.7 percent ahead of the desired market position at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4C** illustrates, the Library District’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 8.7 percent ahead of the desired market position at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4D** illustrates, the Property Appraiser’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 6.9 percent behind the desired market position at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4E** illustrates, the Sheriff’s Office benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 1.4 behind the desired market position at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4F** illustrates, the Supervisor of Elections Office’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 26.5 percent behind the desired market position at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges.

Market Maximums

In this section, the 50th percentile of the peer salary range maximums were compared to the range maximums for each organization’s 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 incumbents. Additionally, being competitive at the maximum allows organizations to attract highly qualified employees for in-demand classifications. For ease of understanding the collected data for the organizations, the following summarizes the most general observations:

As **Exhibit 4B** illustrates, the County’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 0.6 percent behind the desired market position at the maximum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4C** illustrates, the Library District’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 6.6 percent ahead of the desired market position at the maximum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4D** illustrates, the Property Appraiser’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 12.7 percent behind the desired market position at the maximum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4E** illustrates, the Sheriff’s Office benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 3.3 behind the desired market position at the maximum of the respective salary ranges.

As **Exhibit 4F** illustrates, the Supervisor of Elections Office’s benchmark classifications were, on average, approximately 35.5 percent behind the desired market position at the maximum of the respective salary ranges.

4.2 PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET DATA

Several of the benchmarked positions at the County, Library District and Sheriff’s Office could be found in the private sector. To supplement the public sector market data for these positions, private sector salary information for September, 2015 from the Economic Research Institute (ERI) was analyzed. **Exhibits 4G, 4H, and 4I** summarize the ERI private sector salary data for government support service industries similar operating budgets as these organizations. The selected local region for the data was the City of Gainesville, FL. While salary data from the private sector are useful in determining characteristics of the market as a whole, there are inherent differences between private and public sector classifications which make it difficult to draw conclusions about public sector salary ranges entirely from private sector data. Only those classifications with skills that were more easily transferable to the private sector are included these exhibits. While not factored in specifically, private sector market data was considered when making pay grade assignments which are discussed in **Chapter 5** of this report.

EXHIBIT 4G COUNTY - PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET DATA

Constitutional Office	Classification	ERI Minimum	% Diff	ERI Midpoint	% Diff	ERI Maximum	% Diff	Survey Avg Range
County	ACCOUNTING CLERK	\$ 24,416.00	1.6%	\$ 33,781.00	-8.9%	\$ 44,089.00	-18.4%	80.6%
County	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	\$ 25,368.00	32.4%	\$ 35,740.00	25.4%	\$ 48,742.00	16.3%	92.1%
County	CIVIL ENGINEER I	\$ 41,590.00	18.7%	\$ 57,162.00	14.1%	\$ 78,405.00	4.3%	88.5%
County	CLAIMS ADJUSTER	\$ 34,441.00	25.3%	\$ 43,178.00	26.7%	\$ 54,814.00	23.5%	59.2%
County	CUSTODIAN	\$ 19,496.00	8.3%	\$ 24,579.00	7.5%	\$ 31,625.00	0.8%	62.2%
County	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III	\$ 30,310.00	-4.6%	\$ 40,567.00	-9.8%	\$ 53,682.00	-19.5%	77.1%
County	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ANALYST	\$ 45,435.00	6.4%	\$ 58,605.00	5.5%	\$ 76,409.00	-1.3%	68.2%
County	FLEET TECHNICIAN	\$ 27,104.00	19.9%	\$ 38,371.00	33.3%	\$ 52,045.00	35.9%	92.0%
County	HR DIRECTOR	\$ 74,181.00	-6.4%	\$ 104,260.00	-15.0%	\$ 154,886.00	-38.7%	108.8%
County	HR GENERALIST	\$ 40,030.00	-6.7%	\$ 49,332.00	-3.0%	\$ 62,372.00	-7.0%	55.8%
County	INFORMATION SERVICES/TELECOM DIRECTOR	\$ 76,910.00	10.3%	\$ 105,868.00	8.5%	\$ 149,596.00	-2.7%	94.5%
County	LABORER II	\$ 22,038.00	1.5%	\$ 30,260.00	-8.2%	\$ 39,817.00	-18.6%	80.7%
County	LEGAL SECRETARY	\$ 34,458.00	-1.9%	\$ 45,462.00	-7.3%	\$ 59,821.00	-17.5%	73.6%
County	MAINTENANCE WORKER	\$ 27,073.00	-14.9%	\$ 38,385.00	-30.3%	\$ 51,035.00	-44.4%	88.5%
County	NETWORK MANAGER	\$ 69,159.00	-4.5%	\$ 82,382.00	4.3%	\$ 100,513.00	5.2%	45.3%
County	PROGRAMMER/ANALYST	\$ 44,196.00	4.2%	\$ 61,193.00	-3.9%	\$ 83,879.00	-17.1%	89.8%
County	PURCHASING AGENT	\$ 36,764.00	2.0%	\$ 48,245.00	-0.7%	\$ 63,689.00	-9.3%	73.2%
County	RISK MANAGER	\$ 57,514.00	8.5%	\$ 76,763.00	6.1%	\$ 103,067.00	-2.3%	79.2%
County	STAFF ASSISTANT	\$ 25,368.00	7.8%	\$ 35,740.00	-1.9%	\$ 48,742.00	-14.3%	92.1%
County	SURVEY TECHNICIAN	\$ 34,823.00	2.2%	\$ 44,045.00	3.0%	\$ 56,264.00	-1.9%	61.6%
County	SYSTEMS ANALYST	\$ 42,407.00	21.2%	\$ 54,447.00	22.3%	\$ 70,816.00	17.9%	67.0%
County	TELECOMM TECH	\$ 36,547.00	7.5%	\$ 47,903.00	6.7%	\$ 63,150.00	0.1%	72.8%
County	TRAINING MANAGER	\$ 53,300.00	-15.6%	\$ 71,305.00	-21.1%	\$ 96,035.00	-34.1%	80.2%
County	WAREHOUSE MANAGER	\$ 41,112.00	-34.8%	\$ 55,363.00	-42.3%	\$ 70,694.00	-49.5%	72.0%
Overall Average			3.7%		0.4%		-8.0%	77.3%

**EXHIBIT 4H
LIBRARY DISTRICT- PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET DATA**

Constitutional Office	Classification	ERI Minimum	% Diff	ERI Midpoint	% Diff	ERI Maximum	% Diff	Survey Avg Range
Library District	ADMIN SERVICES DIVISION DIRECTOR	\$ 67,534.00	0.5%	\$ 90,207.00	-2.2%	\$ 127,058.00	-17.0%	88.1%
Library District	LIBRARIAN I	\$ 36,795.00	11.7%	\$ 48,220.00	11.0%	\$ 63,214.00	5.2%	71.8%
Library District	LIBRARY ASSISTANT	\$ 21,784.00	14.8%	\$ 28,583.00	12.4%	\$ 36,923.00	6.9%	69.5%
Library District	NETWORK TECHNICIAN	\$ 38,024.00	4.2%	\$ 50,470.00	0.2%	\$ 66,439.00	-8.0%	74.7%
Overall Average			7.8%		5.3%		-3.3%	76.0%

**EXHIBIT 4I
SHERIFF - PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET DATA**

Constitutional Office	Classification	ERI Minimum	% Diff	ERI Midpoint	% Diff	ERI Maximum	% Diff	Survey Avg Range
Sheriff's Office	ACCOUNTING & BUDGET MANAGER	\$ 57,956.00	-33.9%	\$ 78,218.00	-39.1%	\$ 105,036.00	-51.8%	81.2%
Sheriff's Office	AVIATION MECHANIC	\$ 43,219.00	-6.1%	\$ 57,649.00	-8.9%	\$ 77,896.00	-19.6%	80.2%
Sheriff's Office	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	\$ 74,391.00	-4.3%	\$ 97,227.00	-4.9%	\$ 160,478.00	-40.7%	115.7%
Sheriff's Office	CONTRACT & GRANT ADMINISTRATOR - SHERIFF	\$ 38,429.00	20.5%	\$ 51,230.00	18.4%	\$ 68,553.00	11.3%	78.4%
Sheriff's Office	DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	\$ 83,162.00	-16.6%	\$ 99,464.00	-7.3%	\$ 118,153.00	-3.6%	42.1%
Sheriff's Office	HELP DESK COORDINATOR	\$ 29,754.00	14.3%	\$ 38,866.00	13.8%	\$ 50,112.00	9.7%	68.4%
Sheriff's Office	HR BENEFIT COORDINATOR	\$ 38,398.00	-10.6%	\$ 52,639.00	-16.7%	\$ 71,118.00	-28.1%	85.2%
Sheriff's Office	HR BUREAU CHIEF	\$ 68,480.00	-16.5%	\$ 81,941.00	-7.3%	\$ 130,669.00	-39.1%	90.8%
Sheriff's Office	HR EMPLOYMENT MANAGER	\$ 45,934.00	-6.1%	\$ 60,781.00	-8.1%	\$ 80,078.00	-15.7%	74.3%
Sheriff's Office	HUMAN RESOURCES SPECIALIST	\$ 40,030.00	-29.6%	\$ 49,332.00	-22.9%	\$ 62,372.00	-26.3%	55.8%
Sheriff's Office	NETWORK ADMINISTRATOR	\$ 45,228.00	23.0%	\$ 61,343.00	19.7%	\$ 82,879.00	11.8%	83.2%
Sheriff's Office	PC SUPPORT SPECIALIST I	\$ 31,978.00	7.9%	\$ 41,969.00	7.0%	\$ 54,042.00	2.6%	69.0%
Sheriff's Office	RADIO TECHNICIAN	\$ 35,808.00	-3.1%	\$ 46,374.00	-2.8%	\$ 60,300.00	-8.6%	68.4%
Overall Average			-4.7%		-4.5%		-15.2%	76.4%

In summary, while private sector salary were useful in determining characteristics of the market as a whole, the differences between private and public sector classifications make it difficult to compare public sector salary ranges to those in the private sector. Instead, Evergreen Solutions considered private sector market data when making the recommendations discussed later in this report.

4.3 SUMMARY

It should again be noted again that the standing of the County's and the Constitutional Offices' benchmarked classifications' pay ranges compared to the desired market position is not a definitive assessment of an individual employee's salary being equally above or below market. These comparisons of the salary data do however, speak to each organization's general ability to recruit and retain talent over time. If a salary range minimum is

significantly lower than the market would offer, the organization could find itself losing out to their market peers when they seek to fill a position. It is equally true that range maximums lower than the market maximums may serve as a disincentive for experienced and tenured employees to remain employed.

This analysis provided a comparison, at the time the study began, of each organization's pay ranges to the collected peer data at a market competitive position. Some organizations had classifications with ranges that were ahead of the market while some were well behind. To improve each organization's position in the market, each classification was examined utilizing a balance of these survey results (external equity) and the point factor analysis (internal equity) to develop unique pay structures and pay range recommendations. All study findings and recommendations are discussed in **Chapter 5** of this report.



Chapter 5 – Recommendations

The analysis of County's and Constitutional Offices' compensation and classification systems revealed several areas of opportunities for improvement. During the course of the study, several of the organizations made updates to their salary structures and provided salary increases to employees. Evergreen Solutions updated the employee data and took these changes into account when making recommendations to these systems. Focus continued to be placed on developing more competitive compensation plans, and sound classification structures consistent with each organization's compensation philosophy.

Utilizing each compensation philosophy as a guide, specific recommendations for the compensation and classification systems were developed. These recommendations, as well as the findings that led to each, are discussed below.

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 in order 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, outdated job descriptions, and inconsistent titles across departments. Recommendations are then made to remedy the identified concerns based on human resources best practices.

In the analyses of the organizations' classification systems, Evergreen Solutions 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 Office's classifications. The MIT process provided supervisors an opportunity to provide specific recommendations regarding the pay or classification of positions in their areas. Evergreen Solutions reviewed and utilized the data provided in the JATs and MITs as a basis for the classification recommendations below.

FINDING:

Overall, each organization had relatively few classifications (job titles) that needed to be adjusted to better reflect the tasks assigned to the position.



RECOMMENDATION 1: Revise the titles of some organizations' classifications and establish new titles for positions based on the work being performed by those employees.

Exhibits 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, and 5E summarize Evergreen Solutions' recommended changes to the classification system for each organization. The foundation for these recommendations was the work performed by employees in these classifications as described in their JATs, as well as best practices in the human resources field.



EXHIBIT 5A
COUNTY - PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Current Class Title	Recommended Class Title
ACCOUNTING CLERK	Accounting Technician
AGENDA COORD	Administrative Services Coordinator
ANIMAL SHELTER OFFICER	Animal Shelter Assistant, Senior
ASST CO ATTORNEY	Assistant County Attorney, Senior
ASST CO ATTORNEY I	Assistant County Attorney
ASST CO MANAGER	Assistant County Manager for Public Safety & Community Services
BUILDING MECHANIC	Building Maintenance Specialist
CLAIMS ADJUSTER	Worker's Compensation Coordinator
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYS SPEC	Systems Specialist
CRISIS CTR PROJECT COORD	Crisis Center Counseling Coordinator
CRISIS CTR TRAINER	Crisis Center Trainer
DEPT NETWORK ANALYST	Department Information Services Analyst
DRUG COUNSELOR	Substance Counselor
FACIL MAINT COORD	Facility Maintenance Coordinator
GRAPHICS DESIGNER	Public Information Specialist
HAZ MATERIAL ATTEND	Hazardous Material Technician
HOUSEHOLD HAZ WASTE COORD	Hazardous Waste Supervisor
HR SUPERVISOR	Human Resources Manager
INFO SVCS/TELECOM DIR	Information Services Director
LABORER I	Laborer
LABORER II	Laborer
LITIGATION ATTORNEY	Assistant County Attorney, Senior
New Title	Animal Services Coordinator
New Title	County Attorney, Deputy
New Title	Emergency Systems Specialist
New Title	EMS Operations Manager
New Title	Fiscal Coordinator
New Title	Materials Recovery Manager
New Title	Office Assistant
New Title	Park Assistant, Senior
New Title	Program Analyst
New Title	Program Supervisor
OMB DIRECTOR	Assistant County Manager for Budget and Fiscal Services



**EXHIBIT 5A (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES**

Current Class Title	Recommended Class Title
OPER & CUST SUP MGR	Client Services Supervisor
PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER	Park Assistant
PARTS MANAGER	Fleet Management Coordinator
PKS/OPEN SPACE SUPT	Park Operations Manager
PROGRAM/INTAKE SPECIALST	Administrative Specialist
PROJECT LEADER	Information Systems Project Leader
PUBLIC INFO SPEC	Public Information Specialist, Senior
RISK MANAGER	Risk and Employee Benefits Manager
RISK MGT GENERALIST	Risk and Employee Benefits Specialist
SR ACCOUNTING CLERK	Accounting Clerk
SR CODE/DEV SERV SPEC	Code/Development Services Coordinator
SR DRUG COUNSELOR	Drug Counselor
SR EO SPEC/INVEST	Equal Opportunity Specialist
SR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ANALYST	Budget and Fiscal Services Manager
SR HR ANALYST	Human Resources Analyst
SR SUPPORT TECH	Information Systems Senior Support Technician
SUPPORT TECH	Information Systems Support Technician
TRAINING MANAGER	Training and Development Manager
WEIGHMASTER	Scalehouse Operator

**EXHIBIT 5B
LIBRARY DISTRICT - PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES**

Current Class Title	Recommended Class Title
ASST TO THE DIRECTOR	Assistant to the Library Director
FAC/SAF SVCS ADMIN	Facilities and Safety Services Administrator, Senior



EXHIBIT 5C
PROPERTY APPRAISER - PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Current Class Title	Recommended Class Title
GIS Analyst II	GIS Specialist
GIS Analyst III	GIS Specialist
New Title	Personnel Specialist
Purchasing & Payroll Specialist	Administrative Specialist
Senior Deed Specialist	Deed Specialist
Senior GIS Programmer Analyst	GIS Programmer Analyst



EXHIBIT 5D
SHERIFF – PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Current Class Title	Recommended Class Title
ADMIN SV/PROP FACIL UNIT SUPV	Administrative Services Supervisor
ADMIN SVCS/ASST EVIDENCE CUSTO	Evidence Custodian
ADMIN SVCS/BUILDING MAINT CUST	Building Maintenance Technician
ADMIN SVCS/HR EMPLOYMENT MGR	Employment Manager
ADMIN SVCS/PROP BUREAU CHIEF	Administrative Support Bureau Chief
CCC/BUREAU CHIEF	Communications Bureau Chief
CCC/CAD ADMINISTRATOR	Computer Aided Dispatch Administrator
CCC/COMM SUPP BUR/CAD SPECIALI	Computer Aided Dispatch Specialist
CCC/COMMUNICATIONS COMMANDER	Communications Commander
CCC/DIVISION MANAGER	Technical Services Division Manager
CCC/HELP DESK COORDINATOR	Help Desk Assistant
CCC/PT INTERMEDIATE TELECOMMUN	Intermediate Telecommunicator
CCC/PT TELECOMMUNICATOR	Telecommunicator
CCC/RECORDS/AUDIO SPECIALIST	Audio Records Specialist
CCC/RECORDS/PT AUDIO SPECIALIS	Audio Records Specialist
CCC/SHIFT SUPERVISOR	Communications Shift Supervisor
CCC/SHIFT TRAIN OFF-GENERAL TC	Telecommunications Training Officer
CCC/SSU/QUAL MGMT SPEC-ADV TC	Quality Management Specialist
CCC/SSU/QUALITY MANAGER	Communications Quality Manager
CCC/SSU/QUALITY MGMT SUPERV	Telecommunications Quality Management Supervisor
CCC/SSU/TRAIN SPEC-MASTER TC	Telecommunications Training Specialist
CCC/TELECOM TEMP TRAINEE	Telecommunicator
CCC/TEMP GENERAL TELECOMMUNICA	General Telecommunicator
CCC/TRAIN SPEC- ADVANCE TC	Advanced Telecommunicator
CCC/TRAIN SPEC-MASTER TC	Master Telecommunicator
CID/CAPTAIN	Detective Captain
CID/DETECTIVE/FIREARMS INTELL	Detective
CID/DETECTIVE/RDSTF AGENT	Detective
CID/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DEPUTY	Detective
CID/DTF/SUPPORT SPECIALIST	Drug Task Force Specialist
CIVIL/CIVIL TECHNICIANS	Civil Support Technician
CRIME SCENE LATENT PRINT EXAM	Fingerprint Examiner
FARU/FARU SUPERVISOR	Alarm Supervisor
FLEET/FLEET RADIO TECHNICIAN	Emergency Equipment Technician
FLEET/RADIO COORDINATOR	Fleet Specialist
ITB/PC SUPPORT SPECIALIST I	PC Support Specialist
JAIL/ADM DETENTION SERGEANT	Detention Sergeant
JAIL/BOOKING CRIM JUST TECH	Booking Support Technician
JAIL/BOOKING TRAINING SUPERVIS	Booking Support Lobby Supervisor
JAIL/CAPTAIN/SECURITY OPER.	Detention Captain
JAIL/CAPTAIN/SUPPORT SERVICES	Detention Support Captain
JAIL/CID/CIB/CRIM INTEL CASEWO	Jail Intelligence Caseworker
JAIL/CONTRACT MONITOR/ADMIN	Jail Health Care Contract Monitor
JAIL/DET DEPUTY LT/ SUPP SVCS	Detention Lieutenant



EXHIBIT 5D (CONTINUED)
SHERIFF – PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Current Class Title	Recommended Class Title
JAIL/DET DEPUTY LT/SECURITY	Detention Lieutenant
JAIL/DET DEPUTY SERGEANT/TRANS	Detention Transportation Sergeant
JAIL/DET DEPUTY SGT/SECURITY	Detention Sergeant
JAIL/DETENTION DEPUTY - 3	Detention Deputy II
JAIL/DETENTION DEPUTY TRANSPOR	Detention Deputy
JAIL/DETENTION DEPUTY TRANSPOR - 1	Detention Deputy
JAIL/DETENTION DEPUTY TRANSPOR - 2	Detention Deputy
JAIL/DETENTION DEPUTY/FACILITI	Detention Officer
JAIL/DETENTION LT/SUPPORT SVCS	Detention Lieutenant
JAIL/DETENTION OFFICER - 2	Detention Officer
JAIL/DETENTION OFFICER - 3	Detention Officer II
JAIL/DETENTION OFFICER/FACILIT	Detention Officer
JAIL/DETENTION OFFICER/FACILIT - 2	Detention Officer
JAIL/DETENTION OFFICER/TRANSPO	Detention Officer
JAIL/DETENTION OFFICER/TRANSPO - 2	Detention Officer
JAIL/DETENTION SGT/FACILITY	Detention Sergeant
JAIL/DETENTION SGT/SUPPORT SVC	Detention Sergeant
JAIL/DIRECTOR	Major Department of the Jail
JAIL/HR RISK MANAGER	Risk Coordinator
JAIL/ITU NETWORK SUPPORT SPEC	Network Support Specialist
JAIL/PROF STDS/LT INSPECTOR	Inspector
JAIL/PROGRAM MANAGER	Jail Programs Coordinator
JAIL/TRAINING DETENTION DEPUTY - 2	Detention Deputy
JAIL/TRAINING SGT	Detention Training Sergeant
New Title	Radio Shop Supervisor
OOS/ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	Administrative Specialist
OOS/OPS/LT. INSPECTOR	Inspector
PATROL SUPPORT/JRB/DEPUTY	Patrol Deputy
PATROL SUPPORT/JRB/LIEUTENANT	Patrol Lieutenant
PATROL SUPPORT/JRB/SERGEANT	Patrol Sergeant
PATROL/DEP SHERIFF TEMP TRAINE	Patrol Deputy
PATROL/JRB/TEEN COURT COORD I	Teen Court Supervisor
PATROL/RURAL SERVICE DEPUTY	Patrol Deputy
PATROL/SUPP DIV/ADMIN LT	Patrol Support Lieutenant
PATROL/SUPP DIV/AVIATION MECH	Patrol Support Aviation Mechanic
PATROL/SUPP DIV/CAPTAIN	Patrol Support Captain
PATROL/SUPP DIV/FST	Patrol Support Field Service Technician
PATROL/SUPP DIV/PILOT DEPUT	Pilot
PERMANENT P/T PATROL DEPUTY	Patrol Deputy
PERMANENT P/T TRAINING DEPUTY	Patrol Deputy
PIO/CRIME PREVENTION DEPUTY	Patrol Deputy
RECORDS/SHIFT SUPERVISOR	Records Supervisor
SR LATENT PRNT EXAMINER/FORENS	Latent Fingerprint Examiner
WARRANTS/DEPUTY	Warrants Investigator
WARRANTS/PRISONER TRANS DEPUTY	Warrants Transportation Deputy



EXHIBIT 5E
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS – PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Current Class Title	Recommended Class Title
ELECT ADMINISTRATIVE ASST	Administrative Assistant
ELECT FISCAL ASSISTANT	Fiscal Assistant

5.2 COMPENSATION SYSTEM

The compensation analysis consisted of performing an external market assessment. During this assessment, the organizations' salary structures (pay ranges) for selected benchmark classifications were compared to their desired market position. The full results of this assessment were presented in **Chapter 4**.

FINDING:

Each organization's salary ranges were behind the desired market position for many of the benchmarked classifications indicating a need for revision to those pay ranges to remain competitive. The pay ranges, as well, in some instances did not have consistent range spreads and did not meet the desire of the organizations to have improved pay structures.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Create a new pay structures for each organization that reflects the desired market position and best practices; slot all classifications into the updated pay structure based on external and internal equity; and transition employee' salaries into the structure.

Exhibit 5F, 5G, 5H, 5I, and 5J show the proposed pay structure for each organization. Each was developed with the desired market and design structure in mind.



EXHIBIT 5F
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY STRUCTURE

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Salary Range
BOCC 101	\$ 24,960.00	\$ 32,448.00	\$ 39,936.00	60.0%
BOCC 102	\$ 27,174.49	\$ 35,326.94	\$ 43,479.39	60.0%
BOCC 103	\$ 28,723.61	\$ 37,340.59	\$ 45,957.57	60.0%
BOCC 104	\$ 30,361.31	\$ 39,469.60	\$ 48,577.89	60.0%
BOCC 105	\$ 32,091.71	\$ 41,719.12	\$ 51,346.53	60.0%
BOCC 106	\$ 33,920.99	\$ 44,097.39	\$ 54,273.79	60.0%
BOCC 107	\$ 35,854.30	\$ 46,610.59	\$ 57,366.88	60.0%
BOCC 108	\$ 37,897.82	\$ 49,266.96	\$ 60,636.10	60.0%
BOCC 109	\$ 40,057.73	\$ 52,075.77	\$ 64,092.78	60.0%
BOCC 110	\$ 42,341.24	\$ 55,044.23	\$ 67,746.19	60.0%
BOCC 111	\$ 44,754.53	\$ 58,181.61	\$ 71,607.66	60.0%
BOCC 112	\$ 47,305.84	\$ 61,498.21	\$ 75,689.55	60.0%
BOCC 113	\$ 50,002.38	\$ 65,003.30	\$ 80,004.22	60.0%
BOCC 114	\$ 52,852.39	\$ 68,708.21	\$ 84,564.03	60.0%
BOCC 115	\$ 55,865.14	\$ 72,625.30	\$ 89,384.43	60.0%
BOCC 116	\$ 59,049.90	\$ 76,764.87	\$ 94,479.84	60.0%
BOCC 117	\$ 62,415.94	\$ 81,141.34	\$ 99,865.71	60.0%
BOCC 118	\$ 65,973.56	\$ 85,766.04	\$ 105,557.49	60.0%
BOCC 119	\$ 69,734.09	\$ 90,654.42	\$ 111,574.75	60.0%
BOCC 120	\$ 73,708.86	\$ 95,821.93	\$ 117,933.97	60.0%
BOCC 121	\$ 77,910.23	\$ 101,284.02	\$ 124,656.78	60.0%
BOCC 122	\$ 82,351.59	\$ 107,057.17	\$ 131,762.75	60.0%
BOCC 123	\$ 87,045.30	\$ 113,158.89	\$ 139,272.48	60.0%
BOCC 124	\$ 92,006.81	\$ 119,608.75	\$ 147,210.69	60.0%
BOCC 125	\$ 97,251.57	\$ 126,427.35	\$ 155,602.10	60.0%
BOCC 126	\$ 102,795.03	\$ 133,634.26	\$ 164,472.46	60.0%



**EXHIBIT 5G
LIBRARY DISTRICT - PROPOSED PAY STRUCTURE**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Salary Range
L 201	\$ 25,708.80	\$ 33,421.44	\$ 41,134.08	60.0%
L 202	\$ 27,765.71	\$ 36,095.32	\$ 44,424.93	60.0%
L 203	\$ 29,987.42	\$ 38,983.44	\$ 47,979.46	60.0%
L 204	\$ 32,386.29	\$ 42,102.28	\$ 51,818.27	60.0%
L 205	\$ 34,329.90	\$ 44,628.87	\$ 54,927.84	60.0%
L 206	\$ 36,389.90	\$ 47,306.87	\$ 58,223.84	60.0%
L 207	\$ 40,028.89	\$ 52,037.66	\$ 64,046.43	60.0%
L 208	\$ 43,031.34	\$ 55,941.36	\$ 68,850.35	60.0%
L 209	\$ 47,119.41	\$ 61,255.13	\$ 75,390.85	60.0%
L 210	\$ 49,946.76	\$ 64,931.20	\$ 79,914.61	60.0%
L 211	\$ 54,941.23	\$ 71,424.32	\$ 87,906.38	60.0%
L 212	\$ 60,435.25	\$ 78,566.34	\$ 96,696.40	60.0%
L 213	\$ 64,968.28	\$ 84,458.97	\$ 103,949.66	60.0%
L 214	\$ 69,841.21	\$ 90,793.47	\$ 111,745.73	60.0%
L 215	\$ 76,825.64	\$ 99,873.95	\$ 122,921.23	60.0%
PAGE	\$ 17,980.73	\$ 19,778.64	\$ 21,576.53	20.0%

**EXHIBIT 5H
PROPERTY APPRAISER - PROPOSED PAY STRUCTURE**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Salary Range
PA 301	\$ 26,500.00	\$ 34,450.00	\$ 42,400.00	60.0%
PA 302	\$ 28,620.00	\$ 37,206.00	\$ 45,792.00	60.0%
PA 303	\$ 30,910.00	\$ 40,183.00	\$ 49,456.00	60.0%
PA 304	\$ 33,383.00	\$ 43,398.00	\$ 53,413.00	60.0%
PA 305	\$ 36,054.00	\$ 46,870.00	\$ 57,686.00	60.0%
PA 306	\$ 38,938.00	\$ 50,620.00	\$ 62,301.00	60.0%
PA 307	\$ 42,053.00	\$ 54,669.00	\$ 67,285.00	60.0%
PA 308	\$ 45,417.00	\$ 59,042.00	\$ 72,667.00	60.0%
PA 309	\$ 49,732.00	\$ 64,652.00	\$ 79,571.00	60.0%
PA 310	\$ 54,457.00	\$ 70,794.00	\$ 87,131.00	60.0%
PA 311	\$ 58,541.00	\$ 76,104.00	\$ 93,666.00	60.0%
PA 312	\$ 62,932.00	\$ 81,812.00	\$ 100,691.00	60.0%
PA 313	\$ 67,652.00	\$ 87,948.00	\$ 108,243.00	60.0%
PA 314	\$ 72,726.00	\$ 94,544.00	\$ 116,362.00	60.0%
PA 315	\$ 78,180.00	\$ 101,634.00	\$ 125,088.00	60.0%



EXHIBIT 5I
SHERIFF - PROPOSED PAY STRUCTURE

Grade	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10	Step 11
C&S 501	\$ 38,500.00	\$ 39,330.00	\$ 40,178.00	\$ 41,044.00	\$ 41,929.00	\$ 42,833.00	\$ 43,756.00	\$ 44,699.00	\$ 45,662.00	\$ 46,646.00	\$ 47,651.00
C&S 502	\$ 42,000.00	\$ 42,905.00	\$ 43,830.00	\$ 44,775.00	\$ 45,740.00	\$ 46,726.00	\$ 47,733.00	\$ 48,762.00	\$ 49,813.00	\$ 50,887.00	\$ 51,984.00
C&S 503	\$ 45,600.00	\$ 46,583.00	\$ 47,587.00	\$ 48,613.00	\$ 49,661.00	\$ 50,731.00	\$ 51,825.00	\$ 52,942.00	\$ 54,083.00	\$ 55,249.00	\$ 56,440.00
		Step 12	Step 13	Step 14	Step 15	Step 16	Step 17	Step 18	Step 19	Step 20	Range Spread
		\$ 48,678.00	\$ 49,727.00	\$ 50,799.00	\$ 51,894.00	\$ 53,013.00	\$ 54,156.00	\$ 55,323.00	\$ 56,515.00	\$ 57,733.00	50.0%
		\$ 53,105.00	\$ 54,250.00	\$ 55,419.00	\$ 56,614.00	\$ 57,834.00	\$ 59,081.00	\$ 60,354.00	\$ 61,655.00	\$ 62,984.00	50.0%
		\$ 57,657.00	\$ 58,900.00	\$ 60,170.00	\$ 61,467.00	\$ 62,792.00	\$ 64,145.00	\$ 65,528.00	\$ 66,940.00	\$ 68,383.00	50.0%
Grade	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10	Range Spread
C&S 504	\$ 54,100.00	\$ 55,723.00	\$ 57,395.00	\$ 59,117.00	\$ 60,891.00	\$ 62,718.00	\$ 64,600.00	\$ 66,538.00	\$ 68,534.00	\$ 70,590.00	30.5%
C&S 505	\$ 68,200.00	\$ 70,246.00	\$ 72,353.00	\$ 74,524.00	\$ 76,760.00	\$ 79,063.00	\$ 81,435.00	\$ 83,878.00	\$ 86,394.00	\$ 88,986.00	30.5%
C&S 506	\$ 82,500.00	\$ 84,975.00	\$ 87,524.00	\$ 90,150.00	\$ 92,855.00	\$ 95,641.00	\$ 98,510.00	\$ 101,465.00	\$ 104,509.00	\$ 107,644.00	30.5%
C&S 507	\$ 95,000.00	\$ 97,850.00	\$ 100,786.00	\$ 103,810.00	\$ 106,924.00	\$ 110,132.00	\$ 113,436.00	\$ 116,839.00	\$ 120,344.00	\$ 123,954.00	30.5%
C&S 508	\$ 113,000.00	\$ 116,390.00	\$ 119,882.00	\$ 123,478.00	\$ 127,182.00	\$ 130,997.00	\$ 134,927.00	\$ 138,975.00	\$ 143,144.00	\$ 147,438.00	30.5%



EXHIBIT 5I (CONTINUED)
SHERIFF - PROPOSED PAY STRUCTURE

Grade	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10	Step 11
Civilian 401	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 26,651.00	\$ 27,319.00	\$ 28,003.00	\$ 28,704.00	\$ 29,423.00	\$ 30,160.00	\$ 30,916.00	\$ 31,690.00	\$ 32,484.00	\$ 33,298.00
Civilian 402	\$ 27,794.00	\$ 28,490.00	\$ 29,204.00	\$ 29,936.00	\$ 30,686.00	\$ 31,455.00	\$ 32,243.00	\$ 33,051.00	\$ 33,879.00	\$ 34,728.00	\$ 35,598.00
Civilian 403	\$ 29,601.00	\$ 30,343.00	\$ 31,103.00	\$ 31,882.00	\$ 32,681.00	\$ 33,500.00	\$ 34,339.00	\$ 35,199.00	\$ 36,081.00	\$ 36,985.00	\$ 37,911.00
Civilian 404	\$ 31,525.00	\$ 32,315.00	\$ 33,124.00	\$ 33,954.00	\$ 34,805.00	\$ 35,677.00	\$ 36,571.00	\$ 37,487.00	\$ 38,426.00	\$ 39,389.00	\$ 40,376.00
Civilian 405	\$ 33,574.00	\$ 34,415.00	\$ 35,277.00	\$ 36,161.00	\$ 37,067.00	\$ 37,996.00	\$ 38,948.00	\$ 39,924.00	\$ 40,924.00	\$ 41,949.00	\$ 43,000.00
Civilian 406	\$ 35,756.00	\$ 36,652.00	\$ 37,570.00	\$ 38,511.00	\$ 39,476.00	\$ 40,465.00	\$ 41,479.00	\$ 42,518.00	\$ 43,583.00	\$ 44,675.00	\$ 45,794.00
Civilian 407	\$ 38,080.00	\$ 39,034.00	\$ 40,012.00	\$ 41,014.00	\$ 42,041.00	\$ 43,094.00	\$ 44,174.00	\$ 45,281.00	\$ 46,415.00	\$ 47,578.00	\$ 48,770.00
Civilian 408	\$ 40,555.00	\$ 41,571.00	\$ 42,612.00	\$ 43,679.00	\$ 44,773.00	\$ 45,895.00	\$ 47,045.00	\$ 48,223.00	\$ 49,431.00	\$ 50,669.00	\$ 51,938.00
Civilian 409	\$ 43,191.00	\$ 44,273.00	\$ 45,382.00	\$ 46,519.00	\$ 47,684.00	\$ 48,878.00	\$ 50,102.00	\$ 51,357.00	\$ 52,643.00	\$ 53,962.00	\$ 55,314.00
Civilian 410	\$ 45,998.00	\$ 47,150.00	\$ 48,331.00	\$ 49,542.00	\$ 50,783.00	\$ 52,055.00	\$ 53,359.00	\$ 54,696.00	\$ 56,066.00	\$ 57,470.00	\$ 58,910.00
Civilian 411	\$ 48,988.00	\$ 50,215.00	\$ 51,473.00	\$ 52,762.00	\$ 54,084.00	\$ 55,439.00	\$ 56,828.00	\$ 58,252.00	\$ 59,711.00	\$ 61,207.00	\$ 62,740.00
Civilian 412	\$ 52,172.00	\$ 53,479.00	\$ 54,819.00	\$ 56,192.00	\$ 57,600.00	\$ 59,043.00	\$ 60,522.00	\$ 62,038.00	\$ 63,592.00	\$ 65,185.00	\$ 66,818.00
Civilian 413	\$ 55,563.00	\$ 56,955.00	\$ 58,382.00	\$ 59,844.00	\$ 61,343.00	\$ 62,880.00	\$ 64,455.00	\$ 66,070.00	\$ 67,725.00	\$ 69,422.00	\$ 71,161.00
Civilian 414	\$ 59,175.00	\$ 60,657.00	\$ 62,176.00	\$ 63,734.00	\$ 65,331.00	\$ 66,968.00	\$ 68,646.00	\$ 70,366.00	\$ 72,129.00	\$ 73,936.00	\$ 75,788.00
Civilian 415	\$ 63,021.00	\$ 64,600.00	\$ 66,218.00	\$ 67,877.00	\$ 69,577.00	\$ 71,320.00	\$ 73,107.00	\$ 74,938.00	\$ 76,815.00	\$ 78,739.00	\$ 80,711.00
Civilian 416	\$ 67,117.00	\$ 68,798.00	\$ 70,521.00	\$ 72,288.00	\$ 74,099.00	\$ 75,955.00	\$ 77,858.00	\$ 79,808.00	\$ 81,807.00	\$ 83,856.00	\$ 85,957.00
Civilian 417	\$ 71,480.00	\$ 73,271.00	\$ 75,106.00	\$ 76,987.00	\$ 78,916.00	\$ 80,893.00	\$ 82,919.00	\$ 84,996.00	\$ 87,125.00	\$ 89,307.00	\$ 91,544.00
Civilian 418	\$ 76,126.00	\$ 78,033.00	\$ 79,988.00	\$ 81,992.00	\$ 84,046.00	\$ 86,151.00	\$ 88,309.00	\$ 90,521.00	\$ 92,789.00	\$ 95,113.00	\$ 97,496.00
Civilian 419	\$ 81,074.00	\$ 83,105.00	\$ 85,187.00	\$ 87,321.00	\$ 89,508.00	\$ 91,750.00	\$ 94,048.00	\$ 96,404.00	\$ 98,819.00	\$ 101,294.00	\$ 103,831.00
Civilian 420	\$ 86,344.00	\$ 88,507.00	\$ 90,724.00	\$ 92,997.00	\$ 95,327.00	\$ 97,715.00	\$ 100,163.00	\$ 102,672.00	\$ 105,244.00	\$ 107,880.00	\$ 110,582.00
	Step 12	Step 13	Step 14	Step 15	Step 16	Step 17	Step 18	Step 19	Step 20	Range Spread	
	\$ 34,132.00	\$ 34,987.00	\$ 35,863.00	\$ 36,761.00	\$ 37,682.00	\$ 38,626.00	\$ 39,594.00	\$ 40,586.00	\$ 41,603.00	60.0%	
	\$ 36,490.00	\$ 37,404.00	\$ 38,341.00	\$ 39,301.00	\$ 40,285.00	\$ 41,294.00	\$ 42,328.00	\$ 43,388.00	\$ 44,475.00	60.0%	
	\$ 38,861.00	\$ 39,834.00	\$ 40,832.00	\$ 41,855.00	\$ 42,903.00	\$ 43,978.00	\$ 45,080.00	\$ 46,209.00	\$ 47,367.00	60.0%	
	\$ 41,387.00	\$ 42,424.00	\$ 43,487.00	\$ 44,576.00	\$ 45,693.00	\$ 46,838.00	\$ 48,011.00	\$ 49,214.00	\$ 50,447.00	60.0%	
	\$ 44,077.00	\$ 45,181.00	\$ 46,313.00	\$ 47,473.00	\$ 48,662.00	\$ 49,881.00	\$ 51,131.00	\$ 52,412.00	\$ 53,725.00	60.0%	
	\$ 46,941.00	\$ 48,117.00	\$ 49,322.00	\$ 50,558.00	\$ 51,824.00	\$ 53,122.00	\$ 54,453.00	\$ 55,817.00	\$ 57,215.00	60.0%	
	\$ 49,992.00	\$ 51,244.00	\$ 52,528.00	\$ 53,844.00	\$ 55,193.00	\$ 56,576.00	\$ 57,993.00	\$ 59,446.00	\$ 60,935.00	60.0%	
	\$ 53,239.00	\$ 54,573.00	\$ 55,940.00	\$ 57,341.00	\$ 58,777.00	\$ 60,249.00	\$ 61,758.00	\$ 63,305.00	\$ 64,891.00	60.0%	
	\$ 56,700.00	\$ 58,120.00	\$ 59,576.00	\$ 61,068.00	\$ 62,598.00	\$ 64,166.00	\$ 65,773.00	\$ 67,421.00	\$ 69,110.00	60.0%	
	\$ 60,386.00	\$ 61,899.00	\$ 63,450.00	\$ 65,039.00	\$ 66,668.00	\$ 68,338.00	\$ 70,050.00	\$ 71,805.00	\$ 73,604.00	60.0%	
	\$ 64,312.00	\$ 65,923.00	\$ 67,574.00	\$ 69,267.00	\$ 71,002.00	\$ 72,781.00	\$ 74,604.00	\$ 76,473.00	\$ 78,389.00	60.0%	
	\$ 68,492.00	\$ 70,208.00	\$ 71,967.00	\$ 73,770.00	\$ 75,618.00	\$ 77,512.00	\$ 79,454.00	\$ 81,444.00	\$ 83,484.00	60.0%	
	\$ 72,944.00	\$ 74,771.00	\$ 76,644.00	\$ 78,564.00	\$ 80,532.00	\$ 82,549.00	\$ 84,617.00	\$ 86,737.00	\$ 88,910.00	60.0%	
	\$ 77,686.00	\$ 79,632.00	\$ 81,627.00	\$ 83,672.00	\$ 85,768.00	\$ 87,916.00	\$ 90,118.00	\$ 92,375.00	\$ 94,689.00	60.0%	
	\$ 82,733.00	\$ 84,805.00	\$ 86,929.00	\$ 89,107.00	\$ 91,339.00	\$ 93,627.00	\$ 95,972.00	\$ 98,376.00	\$ 100,840.00	60.0%	
	\$ 88,110.00	\$ 90,317.00	\$ 92,579.00	\$ 94,898.00	\$ 97,275.00	\$ 99,712.00	\$ 102,210.00	\$ 104,770.00	\$ 107,394.00	60.0%	
	\$ 93,837.00	\$ 96,188.00	\$ 98,598.00	\$ 101,068.00	\$ 103,600.00	\$ 106,195.00	\$ 108,855.00	\$ 111,582.00	\$ 114,377.00	60.0%	
	\$ 99,938.00	\$ 102,441.00	\$ 105,007.00	\$ 107,637.00	\$ 110,333.00	\$ 113,097.00	\$ 115,930.00	\$ 118,834.00	\$ 121,811.00	60.0%	
	\$ 106,432.00	\$ 109,098.00	\$ 111,831.00	\$ 114,632.00	\$ 117,504.00	\$ 120,447.00	\$ 123,464.00	\$ 126,557.00	\$ 129,727.00	60.0%	
	\$ 113,352.00	\$ 116,191.00	\$ 119,102.00	\$ 122,086.00	\$ 125,144.00	\$ 128,279.00	\$ 131,492.00	\$ 134,786.00	\$ 138,162.00	60.0%	



EXHIBIT 5J
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS - PROPOSED PAY STRUCTURE

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Salary Range
SOE 601	\$ 26,500.00	\$ 34,450.00	\$ 42,400.00	60.0%
SOE 602	\$ 29,680.00	\$ 38,584.00	\$ 47,488.00	60.0%
SOE 603	\$ 33,242.00	\$ 43,215.00	\$ 53,187.00	60.0%
SOE 604	\$ 37,231.00	\$ 48,401.00	\$ 59,570.00	60.0%
SOE 605	\$ 40,209.00	\$ 52,272.00	\$ 64,334.00	60.0%
SOE 606	\$ 44,230.00	\$ 57,499.00	\$ 70,768.00	60.0%
SOE 607	\$ 48,653.00	\$ 63,249.00	\$ 77,845.00	60.0%
SOE 608	\$ 53,518.00	\$ 69,574.00	\$ 85,629.00	60.0%
SOE 609	\$ 58,870.00	\$ 76,531.00	\$ 94,192.00	60.0%
SOE 610	\$ 64,757.00	\$ 84,184.00	\$ 103,611.00	60.0%
SOE 611	\$ 71,233.00	\$ 92,603.00	\$ 113,973.00	60.0%
SOE 612	\$ 78,356.00	\$ 101,863.00	\$ 125,370.00	60.0%

After developing the new pay structures, Evergreen Solutions slotted each proposed classification into the appropriate pay range in each recommended 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. As well, consideration was given to the fact that some of the organizations had revised pay structures since the market data were compared.

The internal assessment took into consideration the type of work being performed by employees in each classification. Specifically, a composite compensatory factor score was assigned to each of the organization's classifications that quantified it based on five compensatory factors: leadership, decision making, working conditions, complexity, relationships. The level for each factor was determined based on responses to the JAT, and an understanding of the work performed. The resulting recommended pay grades for each of the organization's classifications are shown in **Exhibits 5K, 5L, 5M, 5N, and 5O**. It should be noted that the recommended classification titles are utilized in the exhibit.



**EXHIBIT 5K
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY GRADES**

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Accounting Technician Animal Shelter Assistant Custodian Equipment Operator/Transfer Station Hazardous Material Technician Laborer Landscape Maintenance Worker Maintenance Worker Office Assistant Scalehouse Operator Solid Waste Attendant Stock Clerk	BOCC 101	\$ 24,960.00	\$ 32,448.00	\$ 39,936.00
Animal Services Coordinator Animal Technician Equipment Operator I Office Assistant, Senior Park Assistant Parts Coordinator Records Technician Traffic Maintenance Technician I	BOCC 102	\$ 27,174.49	\$ 35,326.94	\$ 43,479.39
Animal Shelter Assistant, Senior Code/Development Services Specialist Customer Service Representative Equipment Operator II Medical Billing Technician Staff Assistant Survey Aide Traffic Maintenance Technician II	BOCC 103	\$ 28,723.61	\$ 37,340.59	\$ 45,957.57
Accounting Clerk Drug Test Technician Equipment Operator III Facility Readiness Specialist Fleet Management Coordinator Maintenance Supervisor I Park Assistant, Senior Planning Assistant Solid Waste Operator	BOCC 104	\$ 30,361.31	\$ 39,469.60	\$ 48,577.89



EXHIBIT 5K (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
911 Specialist				
Administrative Specialist				
Animal Services Officer				
Assessment Technician				
Building Maintenance Specialist				
Code/Development Services Coordinator				
Drug Counselor Aide				
Executive Staff Assistant	BOCC 105	\$ 32,091.71	\$ 41,719.12	\$ 51,346.53
Human Resources Technician				
Information Systems Support Technician				
Medical Billing Specialist				
Program Specialist				
Staff Assistant, Senior				
Veteran's Services Claim Counselor				
Waste Alternatives Specialist				
Administrative Coordinator				
Community Services Compliance Specialist				
Community Services Field Compliance Specialist				
Computer Operator				
Contract and Project Coordinator				
Corrections Officer				
Crisis Center Coordinator				
EMT/Driver 40	BOCC 106	\$ 33,920.99	\$ 44,097.39	\$ 54,273.79
Facilities Supervisor				
Legal Secretary				
Maintenance Supervisor II				
Park Supervisor				
Public Information Specialist				
Traffic Maintenance Supervisor				
Veteran's Services Claim Counselor, Senior				
Code Enforcement Officer				
Communications Specialist				
Community Services Compliance Specialist, Senior				
Engineering Technician				
Environmental Specialist				
Firefighter/EMT 40				
Firefighter/EMT 56	BOCC 107	\$ 35,854.30	\$ 46,610.59	\$ 57,366.88
Fiscal Assistant				
Right of Way Specialist				
Social Services Coordinator				
Warehouse Manager				
Waste Collections Inspector				



EXHIBIT 5K (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Administrative Assistant				
Administrative Services Coordinator				
Animal Investigations Officer				
Executive Legal Secretary				
Fire Inspector				
Fleet Technician				
Human Resources Generalist				
Paralegal				
Paramedic/Driver 56	BOCC 108	\$ 37,897.82	\$ 49,266.96	\$ 60,636.10
Pretrial Officer				
Probation Officer				
Program Coordinator				
Public Education Program Coordinator				
Public Information Specialist, Senior				
Purchasing Agent				
Risk and Employee Benefits Specialist				
Survey Technician				
Tourist Program Coordinator				
AutoCAD Technician				
Budget Analyst				
Construction Inspector				
Corrections Counselor				
Court Officer				
Emergency Management Program Coordinator				
Employee Benefits Coordinator				
Engineering Technician, Senior				
Fiscal Assistant, Senior				
Fiscal Coordinator				
Forester/Landscape Inspector				
GIS Specialist	BOCC 109	\$ 40,057.73	\$ 52,075.77	\$ 64,092.78
Horticulturist				
Information Systems Senior Support Technician				
Maintenance Supervisor III				
Plans Reviewer/Inspector				
Programmer				
Safety/Loss Control Specialist				
Social Services Coordinator, Senior				
Substance Counselor				
Telecommunications Technician				
Victim Advocate Counselor				
Wellness Coordinator				



EXHIBIT 5K (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Animal Services Supervisor	BOCC 110	\$ 42,341.24	\$ 55,044.23	\$ 67,746.19
Building Inspector I				
Building Maintenance Supervisor				
Construction Inspector, Senior				
Equal Opportunity Specialist				
Executive Coordinator				
Firefighter/PAR 56				
Medical Billing Supervisor				
Production Coordinator/Producer				
Project Coordinator				
Assistant Transfer Station Manager	BOCC 111	\$ 44,754.53	\$ 58,181.61	\$ 71,607.66
Building Inspector II				
Clinical Forensic Social Worker				
Collections Center Operations Supervisor				
Crisis Center Counseling Coordinator				
Critical Care Paramedic 40				
Driver/Operator 40				
Drug Counselor				
Fleet Supervisor				
GIS Analyst				
Plans Examiner I	BOCC 112	\$ 47,305.84	\$ 61,498.21	\$ 75,689.55
Pretrial Release Assessment Specialist				
Program Manager				
Recycling Program Coordinator				
Tourist Sales/Marketing Coordinator				
Victim Advocate Counselor, Senior				
Victim Advocate Therapist				
Administrative Assistant, Senior				
Assistant Road Superintendent				
Building Inspector III				
Department Program Analyst				
Driver/Operator 56				
Electronic Monitoring Officer				
EMS Operations Manager				
Energy Management Supervisor				
Environmental Specialist, Senior				
Facility Maintenance Coordinator				
Human Resources Analyst				
Planner				
Plans Examiner II				
Program Analyst				
Programmer/Analyst				
Survey Technician, Senior				
Web Design Specialist				
Worker's Compensation Coordinator				



EXHIBIT 5K (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Building Inspector IV				
Capital Projects Coordinator				
Case Management Coordinator				
Driver/Operator/PAR 56				
Emergency Systems Specialist				
EMS Lieutenant 40				
Equal Opportunity Analyst				
Materials Recovery Manager	BOCC 113	\$ 50,002.38	\$ 65,003.30	\$ 80,004.22
Network Specialist				
Park Operations Manager				
Plans Examiner III				
Programmer/Analyst, Senior				
Systems Specialist				
Training and Development Manager				
Waste Alternatives Manager				
Civil Engineer I				
Construction Inspections Superintendent				
County Surveyor				
Employee Relations Manager				
Grants/Contracts Administrator	BOCC 114	\$ 52,852.39	\$ 68,708.21	\$ 84,564.03
Hazardous Waste Supervisor				
Plans Examiner IV				
Purchasing Supervisor				
Rescue Lieutenant 40				
Rescue Lieutenant 56				
Administrative Support Manager				
Assistant Director Emergency Management				
Clinical Supervisor				
Community Services Supervisor				
Crisis Center Trainer				
Day Reporting Supervisor				
Department Information Services Analyst				
Drug Court Supervisor				
Financial Management Analyst				
Fire Marshall				
Lieutenant 56				
Management Analyst				
Network Security Analyst	BOCC 115	\$ 55,865.14	\$ 72,625.30	\$ 89,384.43
Network Systems Analyst				
Petroleum Contracts Manager				
Planner, Senior				
Pretrial Services Supervisor				
Probation Supervisor				
Program Supervisor				
Systems Analyst				
Telecommunications Analyst				
Transfer Station Manager				
Transportation Planner				
Veteran's Services Director				
Waste Collections Manager				
Work Release Supervisor				



EXHIBIT 5K (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Captain/Training Civil Engineer II Housing Program Manager Human Resources Manager Information Systems Project Leader Lieutenant/Paramedic Office of Victim Services Director	BOCC 116	\$ 59,049.90	\$ 76,764.87	\$ 94,479.84
Administrative Support Manager, Senior Assistant County Attorney Assistant to County Manager Budget and Fiscal Services Manager Building Official Bureau Chief/Communications Client Services Supervisor Development Review Manager Economic Development Coordinator Professional Geologist Road Superintendent Social Services Program Director Strategic Initiatives Manager Systems Programmer Telecommunications Supervisor Transportation Planning Manager Zoning Administrator	BOCC 117	\$ 62,415.94	\$ 81,141.34	\$ 99,865.71
Applications Supervisor Civil Engineer III Communications and Legislative Affairs Director Crisis Center Director District Chief 56 Environmental Professional Engineer Equal Opportunity Manager Fleet Manager Network Supervisor Purchasing Manager Risk and Employee Benefits Manager Solid Waste Professional Engineer Web Services Supervisor	BOCC 118	\$ 65,973.56	\$ 85,766.04	\$ 105,557.49
Animal Services Director Applications Manager Assistant Chief Community Support Services Assistant Director Emergency Management Director Environmental Program Supervisor IT Security & Telecommunications Manager Network Manager Principal Planner Public Works Development Program Manager Strategic Performance Manager Tourist Development Director	BOCC 119	\$ 69,734.09	\$ 90,654.42	\$ 111,574.75



**EXHIBIT 5K (CONTINUED)
COUNTY - PROPOSED PAY GRADES**

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Assistant Director Administrative Support Assistant Director/Court Services Assistant Director/Growth Management Environmental Program Manager	BOCC 120	\$ 73,708.86	\$ 95,821.93	\$ 117,933.97
Assistant Director/Information Services Assistant Public Works Director/Waste Deputy Chief of Fire Rescue County Engineer Human Resources Director	BOCC 121	\$ 77,910.23	\$ 101,284.02	\$ 124,656.78
Community Support Services Director Court Services Director Environmental Protection Director Facilities Management Director Solid Waste & Resource Recreation Director	BOCC 122	\$ 82,351.59	\$ 107,057.17	\$ 131,762.75
Assistant County Attorney, Senior Chief of Fire Rescue Growth Management Director Information Services Director Public Works Director	BOCC 123	\$ 87,045.30	\$ 113,158.89	\$ 139,272.48
Assistant County Manager for Budget and Fiscal Services Assistant County Manager for Public & Administrative Services Assistant County Manager for Public Safety & Community Services County Attorney, Deputy Deputy County Manager	BOCC 124	\$ 92,006.81	\$ 119,608.75	\$ 147,210.69
	BOCC 125	\$ 97,251.57	\$ 126,427.35	\$ 155,602.10
	BOCC 126	\$ 102,795.03	\$ 133,634.26	\$ 164,472.46



EXHIBIT 5L
LIBRARY DISTRICT - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Clerk Messenger Library Assistant	L 201	\$25,708.80	\$33,421.44	\$ 41,134.08
Staff Assistant I Library Specialist	L 202	\$27,765.71	\$36,095.32	\$ 44,424.93
Outreach Library Specialist Library Services Supervisor	L 203	\$29,987.42	\$38,983.44	\$ 47,979.46
Support Technician Building Mechanic	L 204	\$32,386.29	\$42,102.28	\$ 51,818.27
Graphics Designer Senior Library Specialist	L 205	\$34,329.90	\$44,628.87	\$ 54,927.84
Volunteer Programs Specialist Senior Computer Operator	L 206	\$36,389.90	\$47,306.87	\$ 58,223.84
Applications Software Specialist Fiscal Assistant	L 207	\$40,028.89	\$52,037.66	\$ 64,046.43
Network Technician Senior Building Mechanic	L 208	\$43,031.34	\$55,941.36	\$ 68,850.35
Administrative Assistant Librarian I	L 209	\$47,119.41	\$61,255.13	\$ 75,390.85
Literacy Coordinator Application & Support Supervisor	L 210	\$49,946.76	\$64,931.20	\$ 79,914.61
Assistant to the Library Director Library Supervisor	L 211	\$54,941.23	\$71,424.32	\$ 87,906.38
Network Supervisor Library Manager	L 212	\$60,435.25	\$78,566.34	\$ 96,696.40
Senior Library Manager Administrative Services Administrator	L 213	\$64,968.28	\$84,458.97	\$103,949.66
Automated Services Administrator Financial Services Administrator	L 214	\$69,841.21	\$90,793.47	\$111,745.73
Public Services Administrator Technical Services Administrator	PAGE	\$17,980.73	\$19,778.64	\$ 21,576.53
Facilities and Safety Services Administrator, Senior Administrative Services Division Director				
Public Services Division Director Library Page				



EXHIBIT 5M
PROPERTY APPRAISER - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Appraiser Assistant I	PA 301	\$ 26,500.00	\$ 34,450.00	\$ 42,400.00
Appraisal Consultant I	PA 302	\$ 28,620.00	\$ 37,206.00	\$ 45,792.00
Appraiser Assistant II				
Appraiser I	PA 303	\$ 30,910.00	\$ 40,183.00	\$ 49,456.00
Administrative Analyst	PA 304	\$ 33,383.00	\$ 43,398.00	\$ 53,413.00
Administrative Specialist				
Appraiser Assistant III				
Deed Specialist				
Executive Secretary				
Personnel Specialist	PA 305	\$ 36,054.00	\$ 46,870.00	\$ 57,686.00
Appraisal Consultant II				
Appraiser II	PA 306	\$ 38,938.00	\$ 50,620.00	\$ 62,301.00
Appraisal Consultant III				
GIS Specialist	PA 307	\$ 42,053.00	\$ 54,669.00	\$ 67,285.00
Appraiser III	PA 308	\$ 45,417.00	\$ 59,042.00	\$ 72,667.00
Network Analyst	PA 311	\$ 58,541.00	\$ 76,104.00	\$ 93,666.00
Database Administrator				
GIS Programmer Analyst	PA 313	\$ 67,652.00	\$ 87,948.00	\$ 108,243.00
Director of GIS				
Director of IT				
Director of Real Property				
Director of Tangible Personal Property	PA 314	\$ 72,726.00	\$ 94,544.00	\$ 116,362.00
Director of Appraisal Services				
Assistant Property Appraiser	PA 315	\$ 78,180.00	\$ 101,634.00	\$ 125,088.00
Chief Deputy				
Executive Director of Cadastre, GIS & IT				



EXHIBIT 5N
SHERIFF - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum (Minimum Step)	Proposed Midpoint (Calculated Midpoint)	Proposed Maximum (Highest Step)
Detention Deputy	C&S 501	\$ 38,500.00	\$ 48,116.50	\$ 57,733.00
Detention Officer				
Detention Training Officer				
Background Investigator	C&S 502	\$ 42,000.00	\$ 52,492.00	\$ 62,984.00
Civil Deputy				
Court Security Deputy				
Crime Analysis Deputy				
Crime Prevention Deputy				
Detective				
Digital and Video Forensic Deputy				
Drug Task Force Deputy				
K-9 Deputy				
Patrol Deputy				
Pilot				
Sexual Predator Deputy				
Warrants Investigator				
Warrants Transportation Deputy				
Detention Deputy II	C&S 503	\$ 45,600.00	\$ 56,991.50	\$ 68,383.00
Detention Officer II				
Civil Sergeant	C&S 504	\$ 54,100.00	\$ 62,345.00	\$ 70,590.00
Court Security Sergeant				
Crime Scene Sergeant				
Detective Sergeant				
Detention Sergeant				
Detention Training Sergeant				
Detention Transportation Sergeant				
Drug Task Force Sergeant				
K-9 Sergeant				
Patrol Sergeant				
Training Sergeant				
Warrants Sergeant				
Accreditation Supervisor	C&S 505	\$ 68,200.00	\$ 78,593.00	\$ 88,986.00
Civil Lieutenant				
Court Security Lieutenant				
Detective Lieutenant				
Detention Lieutenant				
Drug Task Force Lieutenant				
Inspector				
Patrol Lieutenant				
Patrol Support Lieutenant				
Training Lieutenant				
Warrants Lieutenant				
Chief Inspector	C&S 506	\$ 82,500.00	\$ 95,072.00	\$ 107,644.00
Detective Captain				
Detention Captain				
Detention Support Captain				
Judicial Services & Training Captain				
Patrol Captain				
Patrol Support Captain				
Major Department of the Jail	C&S 507	\$ 95,000.00	\$ 109,477.00	\$ 123,954.00
Operations Major				
Support Services Major				
Chief Deputy	C&S 508	\$ 113,000.00	\$ 130,219.00	\$ 147,438.00



EXHIBIT 5N (CONTINUED)
SHERIFF - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum (Minimum Step)	Proposed Midpoint (Calculated Midpoint)	Proposed Maximum (Highest Step)
Records Mail Courier	Civilian 401	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 33,801.50	\$ 41,603.00
Audio Records Specialist	Civilian 402	\$ 27,794.00	\$ 36,134.50	\$ 44,475.00
Records Criminal Justice Technician Telecommunicator				
Alarm Specialist	Civilian 403	\$ 29,601.00	\$ 38,484.00	\$ 47,367.00
Booking Support Technician				
Building Maintenance Technician				
Civil Court Liaison				
Civil FST				
Civil Support Technician				
Evidence Custodian				
Intermediate Telecommunicator				
Jail Facility Maintenance Technician				
Patrol Support Field Service Technician				
Program Assistant	Civilian 404	\$ 31,525.00	\$ 40,986.00	\$ 50,447.00
Warrants Technician				
Accreditation Specialist				
Administrative Assistant				
Court Security				
DMS Policy Specialist				
General Telecommunicator				
Property Custodian				
Training Support Specialist	Civilian 405	\$ 33,574.00	\$ 43,649.50	\$ 53,725.00
Fleet Specialist				
Human Resources Specialist				
Telecommunications Training Officer	Civilian 406	\$ 35,756.00	\$ 46,485.50	\$ 57,215.00
Account Receivables Specialist				
Accounts Payable Specialist				
Administrative Specialist				
Advanced Telecommunicator				
Crime Analyst				
Emergency Equipment Technician				
Help Desk Assistant				
Payroll Specialist				
PC Support Specialist				
Purchasing Agent				
Victim Advocate				



**EXHIBIT 5N (CONTINUED)
SHERIFF - PROPOSED PAY GRADES**

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum (Minimum Step)	Proposed Midpoint (Calculated Midpoint)	Proposed Maximum (Highest Step)
Accounting Supervisor				
Alarm Supervisor				
Chaplain				
Crime Scene Investigator				
Drug Task Force Specialist				
Fleet Master Technician				
Human Resources Analyst				
Jail Classification Caseworker				
Jail Diversion Coordinator				
Jail Intelligence Caseworker	Civilian 407	\$ 38,080.00	\$ 49,507.50	\$ 60,935.00
Jail Programs Coordinator				
Jail Release Coordinator				
Master Telecommunicator				
Patrol Support Extra Duty Coordinator				
Patrol Support FST Traffic Coordinator				
Quality Management Specialist				
Radio Technician				
Technical Support Specialist				
Telecommunications Training Specialist				
Administrative Services Supervisor				
Benefits Coordinator				
Computer Aided Dispatch Specialist	Civilian 408	\$ 40,555.00	\$ 52,723.00	\$ 64,891.00
Patrol Support Aviation Mechanic				
Risk Coordinator				
Teen Court Case Manager				
Booking Support Lobby Supervisor				
Booking Support Shift Supervisor				
Civil Supervisor				
Communications Shift Supervisor				
Evidence Supervisor				
Executive Assistant to Chief Deputy	Civilian 409	\$ 43,191.00	\$ 56,150.50	\$ 69,110.00
Jail Classification Supervisor				
Radio Shop Supervisor				
Records Supervisor				
Records Training Supervisor				
Teen Court Supervisor				
Telecommunications Quality Management Supervisor				
Communications Quality Manager	Civilian 410	\$ 45,998.00	\$ 59,801.00	\$ 73,604.00
Cold Case Detective				
Computer Aided Dispatch Administrator				
Contract and Grant Administrator				
Fingerprint Examiner				
GIS Specialist				
Jail Health Care Contract Monitor	Civilian 411	\$ 48,988.00	\$ 63,688.50	\$ 78,389.00
Latent Fingerprint Examiner				
Network Support Specialist				
PIO Crime Prevention Specialist				
RMS System Administrator				



EXHIBIT 5N (CONTINUED)
SHERIFF - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum (Minimum Step)	Proposed Midpoint (Calculated Midpoint)	Proposed Maximum (Highest Step)
Accounting and Budget Manager Employment Manager	Civilian 412	\$ 52,172.00	\$ 67,828.00	\$ 83,484.00
Communications Commander Executive Assistant to Sheriff Fleet Manager	Civilian 413	\$ 55,563.00	\$ 72,236.50	\$ 88,910.00
Network Administrator	Civilian 414	\$ 59,175.00	\$ 76,932.00	\$ 94,689.00
Administrative Support Bureau Chief Booking Support Bureau Chief Communications Bureau Chief Communications Support Bureau Chief Inmate Support Bureau Chief Records Bureau Chief Trauma and Intervention Bureau Chief	Civilian 415	\$ 63,021.00	\$ 81,930.50	\$ 100,840.00
Chief Financial Officer HR Director Information Technology Director	Civilian 419	\$ 81,074.00	\$ 105,400.50	\$ 129,727.00
General Counsel Technical Services Division Manager	Civilian 420	\$ 86,344.00	\$ 112,253.00	\$ 138,162.00
School Crossing Guard	No Assigned Pay Grade	\$ 51,503.30	\$ 55,295.34	\$ 59,087.39

EXHIBIT 5O
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS - PROPOSED PAY GRADES

Recommended Class Title	Proposed Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum
Elections Clerk	SOE 601	\$ 26,500.00	\$ 34,450.00	\$ 42,400.00
Senior Elections Clerk	SOE 602	\$ 29,680.00	\$ 38,584.00	\$ 47,488.00
Fiscal Assistant	SOE 603	\$ 33,242.00	\$ 43,215.00	\$ 53,187.00
Administrative Assistant Elections Information Specialist	SOE 605	\$ 40,209.00	\$ 52,272.00	\$ 64,334.00
Elections Operations Director Elections Outreach Director	SOE 607	\$ 48,653.00	\$ 63,249.00	\$ 77,845.00
Assistant Supervisor of Elections Elections Chief Deputy Supervisor	SOE 610	\$ 64,757.00	\$ 84,184.00	\$ 103,611.00

After assigning pay grades to classifications, recommendations were made regarding how to implement the compensation structure. Options for transitioning employee' salaries into each new pay plan were developed and costs were estimated. This was done by utilizing equitable methods of calculating salaries in the new pay plans and determining whether



adjustments were necessary to individual employee salaries to bring them to their calculated salary. Presented below is the method that would be necessary to implement the structures. At the time of this report, the organizations were considering if additional options proposed could be implemented as well. These were provided under separate cover to the County and the Constitutional Offices.

Bring Employees' Salaries to New Minimums

In this method, if an employee's current salary was below his or her classification's grade minimum, an adjustment was proposed to raise the individual's salary to the minimum. If the employee's current salary was already above his or her grade minimum, no adjustment was recommended.

Utilizing this approach, salary adjustments were recommended for 228 **County** employees, with an approximate annualized cost of **\$409,082**. The approximate cost is for salary adjustments only and does not include associated cost for employee benefits.

Utilizing the same approach, salary adjustments were recommended for 11 **Library District** employees, with an approximate annualized cost of **\$4,453**. The approximate cost is for salary adjustments only and does not include associated cost for employee benefits.

Utilizing the same approach, there were no recommended salary adjustments for the **Property Appraiser's Office**.

Utilizing the same approach, salary adjustments were recommended for 335 **Sheriff's Office** employees, with an approximate annualized cost of **\$749,294**. The approximate cost is for salary adjustments only and does not include associated cost for employee benefits.

Utilizing the same approach, salary adjustments were recommended for three **Supervisor of Elections Office** employees, with an approximate annualized cost of **\$14,540**. The approximate cost is for salary adjustments only and does not include associated cost for employee benefits.

5.3 COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION

The recommended compensation and classification systems will need periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided to improve the competitiveness of the classification and compensation structures 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 and classification systems becomes dated and less competitive.

RECOMMENDATION 3: 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 adjustments to pay grade assignments if necessary.



While it is unlikely that the pay plans will need to be adjusted for several years, a small number of classifications' pay grades may need to be reassigned more frequently. If one or more classifications are exhibiting high turnover or are having difficulty with recruitment, the organization should collect salary range data from peer organizations to determine whether an adjustment is needed for the pay grade of the classification(s). If increasing a classification's pay grade based on market data does not help with the recruitment and/or retention issues, it may be necessary for the organization to offer incentives to attract employees to the position and/or to encourage employees to remain in the position.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every three to five years.

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 for the organizations. 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 and the Constitutional Offices in a poor position for recruiting and retaining quality employees.

While the previous two recommendations are intended to maintain the competitiveness over time of particular classifications and the classification and compensation structure as a whole, it is also necessary to review and if necessary establish guidelines for determining equitable pay practices for employees.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Review and revise, as appropriate, guidelines for progression of employee salaries through the pay plan, including procedures for determining salaries of newly hired employees and employees who have been promoted, or transferred to a different classification or department.

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 each organization to have established guidelines for each of these situations, and to ensure that they are followed consistently for all employees. Specific recommendations were reviewed with each organization. Evergreen Solutions can provide additional pay policy recommendations following each organizations conclusive decisions in this regard.

5.4 SUMMARY

The recommendations in this chapter establish a competitive pay plan, externally and internally equitable classification titles and pay grade assignments for each organization. While the upkeep of these recommended systems will require work, the County and the Constitutional Offices will find that having a competitive compensation and classification system that supports strong recruitment and employee retention is well worth this commitment.

