

**CHILDREN'S TRUST
OF
ALACHUA COUNTY**

**COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION
STUDY**

**DRAFT FINAL REPORT
FOR REVIEW**

9 JULY 2020

THE MERCER GROUP, INC.

COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION STUDY

DRAFT FINAL REPORT FOR REVIEW

I. BACKGROUND

The Children's Trust of Alachua County engaged the services of the Mercer Group, Inc. to conduct a classification and compensation study in order to develop a position pay grade structure coupled with a market based pay range structure to ensure that the Trust will be competitive within the market in which it is competing for employees.

II. METHODOLOGY

The Mercer Group, Inc. methodology for this classification and compensation study employed a combination of specific internal and external data which places the salary schedule into parity with the market and each position into parity with all other positions. From this internal and external data, pay levels are determined, positions are classified and placed into the salary schedule, and ongoing methods of maintaining the system are developed.

Detailed descriptions of the methodologies are described below.

A. Compensation/Market Survey Methodology

The Compensation/Market Survey is a data-collection process which ensures a fair and equitable comparison of the pay structure.

The core of this process is the comparison of the Trust's proposed pay plan with the pay plans of comparable organizations. The primary objective of the market survey and analysis is to determine how the compensation levels for the Trust's job classes compare to that of similar employers with whom the Trust must compete for employees.

The results of the market survey were used to construct a pay plan that will ensure the ability of the Trust to recruit and retain qualified employees and to provide an effective basis for managing salary costs.

Market Survey Employer Selection

The employers selected for the market survey were defined as accurately as possible the "Labor Market" within which the Trust competes. Organizations were selected using the following criteria:

Geographic Proximity - Comparison organizations located within a reasonable commuting distance were selected. Selecting employers in relatively close geographic proximity ensures that the market will reflect the area's cost of living, growth rate and other demographic characteristics.

Nature of Services Provided – Organizations were selected which provide a similar range of services, these organizations are most likely to compete with each other for employees, likely to have comparable jobs, and are likely to have similar organizational structures.

Each of these factors was taken into consideration in the identification of an appropriate labor market for the Trust.

The organizations from which data was obtained are:

- **ALACHUA (CITY)**
- **ALACHUA COUNTY**
- **COLUMBIA COUNTY**
- **GAINESVILLE**
- **MARION COUNTY**
- **OCALA**

Survey Benchmark Position Selection

The second step in preparing for the market survey is the identification and selection of Benchmark positions. The Benchmark positions are positions contained in the Trust's classification system for which adequate market matches can be found. Benchmark positions provide a reference point for developing salary recommendations for all non-Benchmark positions.

Benchmark positions are those which meet the following criteria:

- Well-defined positions presumed to exist within the local government organizations which are to be surveyed;
- Encompass a variety of skill levels within the organization;
- Reasonably well known and understood positions which are clearly and concisely described; and,
- Represent a variety of pay levels within the organization.

We found it appropriate and practicable to use all nine of the currently anticipated positions for the Trust.

The Benchmark positions selected for the comparison survey are listed below:

- **COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER**
- **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATOR**
- **CONTRACT MANAGER**
- **DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS**
- **EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT**
- **FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER**
- **FISCAL ASSISTANT**
- **PROGRAM MANAGER**
- **RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND EVALUATION MANAGER**

By combining the market survey data with the point factor system described below, both external equity and internal salary relationships (internal equity) are reflected in the resulting salary setting process.

B. Classification Methodology

The classification process began with a discussion of the existing and proposed positions essential for the operation of the Trust.

Position description questionnaires were completed followed by discussions with management to ensure a thorough understanding of each position. That understanding is critical, as it becomes the basis for the rating of each position using the Factor Evaluation System.

The Mercer Group, Inc. Factor Evaluation System (FES) is used to provide a numerical rating for all positions within the Trust that were included in the study.

Factor evaluation systems provide a method of classifying positions based on the work performed. The systems generally are easy to understand and apply and can be used to classify and re-classify both permanent and part-time positions.

In developing the factor system used by the Mercer Group, Inc. the following principles were applied:

- Important elements of each job should be measured by consistent factors.
- The factors must be explainable and clearly defined.
- Factors should relate to observable and measurable aspects of the job.
- Factors should relate to the business of the organization, i.e. local government.
- The number of factors should be limited for administrative ease but should reflect all aspects of the positions rated.

The factors used to identify the minimum requirements of each Trust position in the Mercer FES are:

Factor 1 - Knowledge Required:

Assigns points based on skills, knowledge, and educational level required by the job.

Factor 2 - Supervisory Controls:

Points are assigned based on the nature and extent of direct supervision required over the position.

Factor 3 - Supervision Exercised:

Measures the amount of supervision or management exercised by the position.

Factor 4 - Guidelines:

Measures the nature of existing guidelines and the judgment needed to apply them.

Factor 5 - Complexity:

Measures the nature, number, variety and intricacy of tasks, steps or processes in the work performed by the position.

Factor 6 - Scope and Effect:

Measures the nature of the work and its effect both inside and outside the organization.

Factor 7 - Personal Contacts:

Measures contacts with co-workers, the public and others required in performing the duties of the position.

Factor 8 - Purpose of Contacts:

Measures the level of informational exchange in the personal contacts identified in Factor 7.

Factor 9 - Physical Demands:

Includes physical characteristics and abilities needed as well as the level of exertion required in performing the duties of the position.

Factor 10 - Work Environment:

Considers the risks and discomforts in the physical surroundings.

Every position included in the study for the Trust was rated using this system. Those ratings were then used to determine where each position fits in the salary schedule of the Pay Plan. This process provided for internal equity of the positions.

III. EXHIBITS

Through analysis a list of comparable organizations was chosen to be surveyed regarding the minimum and maximum salary offered for similar positions as those of the Trust. The Mercer Group, Inc. collected information from 6 comparable organizations (as listed on page 3, above). This information in conjunction with the factoring was the basis for the recommended pay plan, below.

No individual employee's pay is determined by this survey data, nor is it accurate to compare an employee's actual salary with individual or aggregate salary information obtained for a particular Benchmark position.

| RECOMMENDED PAY PLAN | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Grade</u> | <u>Minimum</u> | <u>Midpoint</u> | <u>Maximum</u> |
| 56 | \$30,451.31 | \$38,615.15 | \$46,778.99 |
| 57 | \$31,897.74 | \$40,449.37 | \$49,001.00 |
| 58 | \$33,412.89 | \$42,370.71 | \$51,328.54 |
| 59 | \$35,000.00 | \$44,383.33 | \$53,766.65 |
| 60 | \$36,662.50 | \$46,491.54 | \$56,320.57 |
| 61 | \$38,403.97 | \$48,699.88 | \$58,995.79 |
| 62 | \$40,228.16 | \$51,013.13 | \$61,798.10 |
| 63 | \$42,139.00 | \$53,436.26 | \$64,733.51 |
| 64 | \$44,140.60 | \$55,974.48 | \$67,808.35 |
| 65 | \$46,237.28 | \$58,633.27 | \$71,029.25 |
| 66 | \$48,433.55 | \$61,418.35 | \$74,403.14 |
| 67 | \$50,734.14 | \$64,335.71 | \$77,937.28 |
| 68 | \$53,144.01 | \$67,391.66 | \$81,639.30 |
| 69 | \$55,668.35 | \$70,592.76 | \$85,517.16 |
| 70 | \$58,312.60 | \$73,945.92 | \$89,579.23 |
| 71 | \$61,082.45 | \$77,458.35 | \$93,834.25 |
| 72 | \$63,983.87 | \$81,137.63 | \$98,291.38 |
| 73 | \$67,023.10 | \$84,991.66 | \$102,960.22 |
| 74 | \$70,206.70 | \$89,028.77 | \$107,850.83 |
| 75 | \$73,541.52 | \$93,257.64 | \$112,973.75 |
| 76 | \$77,034.74 | \$97,687.37 | \$118,340.00 |
| 77 | \$80,693.89 | \$102,327.52 | \$123,961.15 |

Once all positions were analyzed and factored and the pay plan was developed, the positions were grouped into pay grades as informed by total factor scores and market analysis.

RECOMMENDED POSITION TITLES BY PAY GRADE

| GRADE | MINIMUM | MIDPOINT | MAXIMUM |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 56 | \$30,451.31 | \$38,615.15 | \$46,778.99 |
| 57 | \$31,897.74 | \$40,449.37 | \$49,001.00 |
| 58 | \$33,412.89 | \$42,370.71 | \$51,328.54 |
| 59 | \$35,000.00 | \$44,383.33 | \$53,766.65 |
| 60 | \$36,662.50 | \$46,491.54 | \$56,320.57 |
| 61 | \$38,403.97 | \$48,699.88 | \$58,995.79 |
| FISCAL ASSISTANT | | | |
| 62 | \$40,228.16 | \$51,013.13 | \$61,798.10 |
| EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT | | | |
| 63 | \$42,139.00 | \$53,436.26 | \$64,733.51 |
| 64 | \$44,140.60 | \$55,974.48 | \$67,808.35 |
| 65 | \$46,237.28 | \$58,633.27 | \$71,029.25 |
| 66 | \$48,433.55 | \$61,418.35 | \$74,403.14 |
| 67 | \$50,734.14 | \$64,335.71 | \$77,937.28 |
| 68 | \$53,144.01 | \$67,391.66 | \$81,639.30 |
| CONTRACT MANAGER | | | |
| 69 | \$55,668.35 | \$70,592.76 | \$85,517.16 |
| 70 | \$58,312.60 | \$73,945.92 | \$89,579.23 |
| PROGRAM MANAGER - PRITZKER COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATOR | | | |
| 71 | \$61,082.45 | \$77,458.35 | \$93,834.25 |
| 72 | \$63,983.87 | \$81,137.63 | \$98,291.38 |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <u>73</u> | <u>\$67,023.10</u> | <u>\$84,991.66</u> | <u>\$102,960.22</u> |
| FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND EVALUATION MANAGER | | | |
| <u>74</u> | <u>\$70,206.70</u> | <u>\$89,028.77</u> | <u>\$107,850.83</u> |
| <u>75</u> | <u>\$73,541.52</u> | <u>\$93,257.64</u> | <u>\$112,973.75</u> |
| DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS | | | |
| <u>76</u> | <u>\$77,034.74</u> | <u>\$97,687.37</u> | <u>\$118,340.00</u> |
| <u>77</u> | <u>\$80,693.89</u> | <u>\$102,327.52</u> | <u>\$123,961.15</u> |

IV. SPECIAL PROVISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Mercer Group, Inc., offers the following provisions and recommendations:

A. Hiring Offer

We recommend allowing the hiring of applicants who exceed the minimum qualifications for the position under recruitment at up to the Mid-point of the salary grade as determined and approved by the Executive Director.

B. Annual Market Adjustment

We recommend the Trust make an annual adjustment to the Pay Plan as well as employee salaries based on an analysis of the Consumer Price Index or other indices most reflective of the true cost of living for the Alachua County area.

C. Reclassification

When a new position is created or there is a need for a reclassification of an existing position, a Position Questionnaire (as used in the Study) should be completed. The Position questionnaire should then be evaluated using the Factor Evaluation System to determine the Pay Grade, thus continuing to maintain the internal equity of the position array across the pay plan.