

# Classification and Compensation Study for Jackson County, Missouri

## FINAL REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC

February 6, 2020

## Chapter 1 – Introduction

In May 2019, Evergreen Solutions was retained by Jackson County to conduct a Classification and Compensation Study. This study is primarily designed to focus on internal and external equity of both the structure by which employees are compensated as well as the way positions relate and compare to one another across the county.

Internal equity relates to the fairness of an organization's compensation practices among its current employees. Specifically, by reviewing the skills, capabilities, and duties of each position, it can be determined whether similar positions are being compensated in a similar manner within the organization. The classification component of this study is aimed at resolving any inconsistencies related to job requirements and providing some clarity to the plan in place.

External equity deals with the differences between how a county's classifications are valued and what compensation is available in the market place for the same skills, capabilities, and duties.

As part of the study, Evergreen Solutions was tasked with:

- collecting and reviewing current environmental data present in Jackson County;
- reviewing job descriptions and obtaining job analysis questionnaires from employees;
- conducting market salary and benefits surveys;
- providing feedback to Jackson County regarding current market competitiveness;
- conducting a classification analysis to assess internal equity and the efficiency of the current classification plan;
- developing strategic positioning recommendations using market data and best practices;
- developing compensation structure and implementation cost recommendations for Jackson County; and
- developing and submitting draft and final reports summarizing findings and recommendations.



## 1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY

Evergreen Solutions combines qualitative as well as quantitative data analysis to produce an equitable solution in order to maximize the fairness and competitiveness of an organization's compensation structure and practices. Project activities include:

- conducting a project kick-off meeting;
- conducting orientation sessions with employees;
- facilitating employee focus group sessions with employees;
- conducting salary and benefits surveys;
- developing recommendations for compensation management;
- revising job descriptions and FLSA;
- developing detailed implementation recommendations; and
- crafting the draft and final reports.

### **Kickoff Meeting**

The kickoff meeting provides an opportunity to discuss the history of the organization, finalize the work plan, and begin the data collection process. Data collection of relevant background material (including existing pay plans, organization charts, policies, procedures, training materials, job descriptions, and other pertinent material) is part of this process.

### **Orientation Sessions and Focus Groups**

The orientation sessions are designed to brief employees and supervisors on the purpose and major processes of the study. These sessions are intended to address any questions and resolve any misconceptions about the study and relevant tasks. During focus groups, employees are asked about their experience with Jackson County and to identify any concerns they have about compensation or classification. This information provides some basic perceptual background as well as a starting point for the research process.

### **Salary and Benefits Surveys**

The external market is defined as identified peers that have similar characteristics, demographics, and service offerings as the target organization. Benchmark positions were identified and included a large cross-section of classified positions in the County. Once the target and benchmark information was finalized, a survey tool was created to solicit salary information from each of the peer organizations. A benefits survey was also conducted. When the results were received, the data were analyzed, cleaned, and entered to provide aggregate findings.



## Job Questionnaire and Regression

Although market data are imperative for determining pay grade value for job titles, it is not the only factor that contributes to recommended placement. In addition to collecting market data, job questionnaire data were used to slot positions. Evergreen's Job Assessment Tool (JAT) is administered to all employees during the study, and is available to all employees for a four-week period to allow ample participation. The JAT provided a score for each County job title. This score is used to determine hierarchy and value of all job titles based on each ones complexities.

Paired with market data through regression analysis, JAT scores normalize market classification values within the context of the County's existing hierarchy and value of positions. The process of regression analysis essentially determines the market dollar value associated with every JAT point. At the most basic level, multiplying each classification's JAT score by this market dollar value produces a predicted midpoint value which provides the best estimate for each position's midpoint value. This process can result in both positive and negative gaps between the raw market value of a position and its recommended placement; and in some cases the variance is significant. This analysis provides direction for preliminarily slotting positions only.

Additional adjustments are generally made to account for positions with high turnover—to maintain existing hierarchy, as appropriate, and to account for the County's understanding and knowledge of each position which cannot be captured using the JAT or through market data.

## Solution Creation – Salary Schedule and Transition Costing

Solution creation follows agreement on the structure of the compensation and classification system. During this phase, desired range spreads (distance from minimum to maximum) and midpoint progressions (distance from the midpoint of one pay grade to the next) are established. In addition, job titles are determined that best reflect the roles and responsibilities of each position. With the pay tables and job titles established, jobs can be slotted into the proposed pay grade structure using market data and feedback from Human Resources staff in Jackson County.

As part of the study, the County identifies its desired market position and compensation philosophy. Subsequently, the pay plan and job slotting within the system can be adjusted to account for this desired position in the market.

The final step in the creation of the solution is to identify the costs associated with each step of the analysis. The data from the job slotting are applied to the individual incumbents in the organization. This allows the County to view the total costs associated with the structural changes. Information is then provided to the County on various ways to implement the proposed structure and possible adjustments that can be made to address any remaining issues.



## 1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report includes the following six chapters:

- Chapter 1 – Introduction
- Chapter 2 – Summary of Employee Outreach
- Chapter 3 - Assessment of Current Conditions
- Chapter 4 – Market Survey Summary
- Chapter 5 – Benefits Survey Summary
- Chapter 6 – Recommendations



## Chapter 2 - Summary of Employee Outreach

On June 17-19, 2019, the Evergreen Solutions Team conducted a series of 11 orientation sessions and 25 focus group sessions with Jackson County, MO (County) employees representing a cross section of departments and classifications as well as management levels.

The Evergreen Solutions Team conducted the 11 employee orientations at locations throughout Jackson County. The orientation sessions were attended by about 200 employees. Orientation sessions were voluntary for all employees and generally lasted 45-50 minutes. They included a brief overview of the study and a detailed walk-through of the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) process which all employees were asked to complete online. In addition, Jackson County placed a video of one of the orientation sessions on the County's website for employees who were unable to attend; the video link was also emailed to all staff.

Over this three-day period, approximately 300 individuals attended one of the 25 scheduled focus group sessions. The objective of the focus groups was to collect feedback on strengths and weaknesses of the current compensation and benefit plans directly from the employees. Focus groups lasted for approximately 45-60 minutes.

The remainder of this chapter summarizes the comments made by focus group participants. It is important to note that the views shared in this summary are not necessarily supported by Evergreen Solutions nor Jackson County. Evergreen, however, used this information as a basis for further investigation throughout the course of the study. In all instances, Evergreen has removed any information that may identify the commenter.

Comments and feedback have been organized into the following five sections:

- 2.1 General Feedback
- 2.2 Compensation
- 2.3 Classification
- 2.4 Benefits
- 2.5 Summary

### 2.1 GENERAL FEEDBACK

Although the purpose of the focus group sessions was to discuss compensation, classification, and benefits, the first two questions asked by Evergreen consultants generally received feedback related to issues beyond these two topics. In some cases, even questions related specifically to compensation and classification yielded feedback outside of these

domains. This section provides feedback received unrelated to compensation and classification, per se, but important to framing the context in which this study is occurring.

Important factors frequently shared by employees as reasons for coming to work for and/or remaining with Jackson County included:

- **Medical Benefits** – Medical expenses were often expressed in focus groups as a reason for deciding where to apply for work. Employees stated that quality medical insurance is vital for their family’s well-being. Most respondents stated that a good benefits package is equal in importance to a good starting salary.
- **Workforce Operations** – Most employees stated that they enjoy their co-workers and appreciate each other’s work output. They also said that their supervisors are usually receptive for ideas to improve their working environment and feel their supervisors appreciate their daily work effort.
- **Work Time** – The County’s compensation time off is helpful for family issues that arise unexpectedly along with planning for children’s activities; this is considered a very important benefit to employees.
- **Military Experience** – Many employees in law enforcement classifications are thankful that the County appreciated their former military service and credited them for their military experience when negotiating their starting salary.
- **Retirement Package** – The retirement package is vital for retaining employees and hiring quality people. Employees are very aware that they are living longer and it is important to plan far in advance for their retirement years.
- **Tuition Assistance** – Many employees have used or are currently using the County’s Tuition Assistance Program. Most of them are using the additional education to improve their possibility for advancement, while others used this benefit for personal achievement.
- **Advancement Opportunities** – Law enforcement staff stated there is a good program in place for advancement. They know that training programs and years in rank are the requirements for career progression along with timely and quality work output.

The most common concerns expressed in focus groups are cited below:

- **COLA Increases** – The retirement package offered is not adjusted often enough to account for the increases in cost of living. There should be a requirement that every one or two years, a study of the local area cost of living expenses be conducted and corresponding changes be factored into determining future retirement accounts.
- **Low Salaries** – Salaries are not competitive with surrounding cities and counties. Employees know there is a migration of County residents to cities like Blue Springs and Lee Summit. This is causing a decrease in the tax base which reduces available funding for raises and career advancements. Employees indicated that action is



needed to correct this situation to retain the current base of quality County employees.

- **Insufficient Training Programs** – Some employees stated that there is a lack of regular scheduled training being available for employees for career advancement and personal improvement.

## 2.2 COMPENSATION

Specific comments shared by employees related to the County's compensation practices, policies, and procedures included the following:

- Jackson County has a local area reputation for consistently lower compensation. Some yearly wages are below the national poverty level. There are Jackson County employees who apply for food stamps. Not only does this encourage current employees to seek other employment or a second job, but it affects the ability to recruit quality candidates for open positions.
- Starting salaries should place emphasis on the candidate's years of experience. Most employees agreed that even though education is important, more credit should be granted for actual experience in the related field.
- There is a need for more flexibility to choose Overtime or Compensation time. Many focus group participants agreed there should be a more flexible system in place for workers to choose between being paid Overtime or taking Compensation time. There are peak seasons for some employees (such as Marina workers in Summer and Road Clearing Crews in the Winter) and last minute demands to work Overtime causes frustration and interrupts scheduled family activities.
- If starting salary is raised to seek quality applicants, then other levels of salaries should be raised equally. Salary compression (entry-level salaries moving closer to tenured employees in similar positions) was viewed negatively.
- Many positions require training classes to earn a specific Certificate. This additional training often relates to additional responsibilities and a vast majority of employees felt this should include a salary increase. There should be pay increases, even minimal, when a new certification and required training are achieved.
- There should be extra compensation for Hazardous Duty jobs (such as Law Enforcement, Jail Staff, Bio-chemical/Waste Handlers, and those required to make home visits).
- Longevity pay could be implemented as an additional benefit.
- "Across the board" percentage increases, though appreciated, cause friction because the higher salaried employees receive a larger dollar amount than others. Most employees would rather have an equal dollar amount for distribution purposes.





- Many employees indicated that the County is a training school. Several positions (such as Deputy Officer I, Public Health Specialist, Operator I, Attorneys, and various Jail Staff) obtain one or two of years of experience and then move to another local area employer at a higher salary. For example, a Deputy Officer with four to eight years of employment with Jackson County earns less than a new hire as a Resource Officer in the school districts of Blue Springs, Lee Summit, or in other counties.
- Merit pay needs to be examined. According to County employees, it is not applied consistently and fairly. Merit increases should be based on an individual's contribution not solely based on years on the job. This would act as an incentive to perform quality work in a timely manner. In addition, the merit-based evaluation system is over six years old and needs to be re-examined.
- IT staff stressed that all IT positions are paid lower than other counties and cities. Also, they would like to be compared to the private sector.
- The turnover rate is extremely high. Exit interviews need to be conducted to see if this is primarily due to low salaries or are employees leaving for other reasons (lack of promotional opportunities, no merit pay, etc.)

### 2.3 CLASSIFICATION

General comments provided by employees related to classification included the following:

- Focus group participants stated that the continual increase in workload is requiring employees to perform tasks listed under several classifications. This reduces the quality of work performed because they have not received proper training, and this can cause major safety concerns. For example, a Mechanic I is often required to work as an Operator I on the road away from the repair shop.
- Most job classifications need additional levels/tiers for career advancement. Many employees stated that they were at the highest level after only a few years and, unless some changes were made, they would consider different employment. Some examples include Operator I-4; Investigator 1 and 2; Public Health Specialist 1-4; Corrections Officer, etc.
- There is a need for separate classifications for those working in Special Units (i.e., Bomb squad, SWAT).
- Inmate Services staff indicated that additional titles of Case Manager, Floor Supervisor and Screeners are needed.
- Many groups expressed frustration when their respective areas are short staffed. The process of advancement or hiring should be completed before a known vacancy occurs to provide continuity within that area.



- Some employees stated that their job descriptions are out of date and if they were revised, then it would be evident that they are not classified properly.
- Internally, if a position is reclassified or an employee is promoted, there is a cap of 5 percent on the salary increase. The same cap is not applied if someone is hired from outside of the County.

## 2.4 **BENEFITS**

General comments provided by employees related to benefits included the following:

- Most employees feel that Jackson County provides average/good health benefits. This is an important factor for employee retention and recruitment for open positions.
- Employees appreciate the County's family leave program. One specific item discussed was the maternity leave for mother/partner.
- Law Enforcement Officers can take their patrol cars home which helps the officers financially. It also benefits Jackson County by having more vehicles on the street for additional time each day. This benefit provides positive public relations with their communities.
- Several employees stated that the Tuition Assistance Program offered by the County is a great benefit. Many people use this benefit for personal growth and others feel the additional education is very beneficial for their career growth.
- In addition, there should be more Life-Coping classes/instructors available especially in the current environment of more stress and violence. Some employees think there should be an on-staff Counselor readily available.
- The Wellness Program was praised by several employees.

### 2.4.1 **Healthcare**

- There are adequate health care options with six choices. However, focus group participants indicated that the plans often change each year and are difficult to understand.
- The medical premiums are high, forcing some lower paid workers to take the risk of no insurance coverage due to cost. Could there be a supplemental fund available for these employees with lower income?
- Health premiums increase substantially when retiring and this is causing more people to work longer.



- Vision and dental insurance programs received mixed reviews by focus group participants. Dental insurance premiums are high. The out-of-pocket expenses seem to be increasing yearly.

#### **2.4.2 Retirement**

- The second most discussed topic after salaries concerned the retirement compensation calculation method. It is currently a percentage determined by multiplying 1.5 times the years of employment times the base salary. This multiplier should be raised to at least 2.0 for future calculations.
- Many employees have researched other government agencies in Missouri and other states. They would like Jackson County to offer a benefit like the Drop Program offered elsewhere. This Drop program allows the option for employees to increase the amount of money in their retirement account during their last five years of employment.
- Some Law Enforcement Officers really feel they should be able to retire at an earlier age like other state's Highway Patrol Officers. Many fear that because of the increased physical and emotional job-related stress, they will have a lower quality retirement unless they could retire sooner.

#### **2.4.3 Other Benefits**

- The focus group participants also encourage the County to retain the educational benefit and expand it, if possible.
- Some long-term employees stated that longevity pay should be considered as an additional benefit.
- The County does not have a paid time off (PTO) program and many participants felt that one should be established.
- All employees said they really appreciate the County's policy of having 11 paid holidays each year along with an additional day off for their birthday. Even though this does not put extra money in their pockets, it does provide the opportunity for quality time with their families.

### **2.5 SUMMARY**

Employee focus group feedback reported above represents common issues that typically exist in many organizations and not just Jackson County. Although the feedback reflected above generally highlights concerns and issues, it should be noted that the overall feedback during the outreach efforts was very positive about the County. Employees consistently commented on the 'family atmosphere' and the overall feeling of support at all levels of the organization. As with any organization, however, employees perceive weaknesses in certain areas related to the current compensation and classification system. In today's working



environment with multiple years of reduced funding and in many cases significantly increased expectations and requirements, employee job descriptions and classifications require consistent timely review and revision to allow the County to remain competitive and foster its compensation philosophy.

Most of the participants in the focus groups expressed that they really like their jobs, their co-workers and their supervisors. They feel appreciated and valued. Most of them are planning to stay with Jackson County even though they are at the highest level in their job classification and at or near their maximum salary. Several discussed that similar jobs in neighboring towns and counties pay more, but they currently prefer to stay here.



## Chapter 3 – Assessment of Current Conditions

**Chapter 3** provides an overall assessment of the classification and compensation system in place in Jackson County. Data included here reflect the demographics in place when the study started and should be considered a snapshot in time. These data provide the baseline for analysis through the course of this study, but are not sufficient cause for recommendations in isolation. By reviewing employee data, Evergreen Solutions gained a better understanding of the structures and salary plans in place, and identified issues for both further review and potential revision.

### **3.1 ANALYSIS OF SALARY SCHEDULES**

The study was conducted for all 1,056 full-time County employees, excluding courts. There are currently seven separate salary schedules:

- Chapter 2 Government;
- Communications;
- Corrections;
- General;
- Park Ranger;
- Sheriff; and
- Trades.

**Exhibits 3A** through **3G** display the salary schedules for each employee group, summarized for ease of comparison. The exhibits provide each pay grade on the schedule; the value of each salary range at minimum, midpoint, and maximum; the range spread (the difference between the minimum and maximum salary levels for each pay grade) for each salary range; the midpoint progression (the difference between the midpoints of pay grades) between grades; the number of filled unique classification titles by salary range; and the number of employees per salary range.

The Chapter 2 Government salary schedule is broken into six separate sub-schedules which are reserved for Division, Legislative, Prosecuting Attorney, Public Administrator, Sheriff, and other miscellaneous employees. All 83 job titles in the schedule are found in Pay Grade G99 and are displayed in **Exhibit 3A**. The schedule is currently comprised of 159 employees, although 12 employees occupy job titles which are not represented in the exhibit.

**Exhibit 3B** displays the six pay grades comprising the Communications salary schedule which is reserved for the 12 employees represented by the Communications Workers of America (CWA) union. The schedule does not feature pay ranges, but instead a flat hourly rate for each pay grade; these rates have been annualized for ease of comparison with other schedules.



**EXHIBIT 3A  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
CHAPTER 2 GOVERNMENT**

Classification Title	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
<b>Schedule I - Divisions</b>					
Administrative Assistant to Division Chief	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	0
Assistant to Department Director	\$65,000.00	\$75,775.00	\$86,550.00	33.2%	0
Department Director	\$75,000.00	\$92,760.00	\$110,520.00	47.4%	11
Division Chief (including Deputy)	\$87,800.00	\$116,277.00	\$144,754.00	64.9%	4
Executive Assistant to Division Chief	\$29,580.00	\$39,790.00	\$50,000.00	69.0%	1
Executive Senior Advisor	\$70,000.00	\$87,500.00	\$105,000.00	50.0%	0
Secretary to Dept Director or Division Chief	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	0
Senior Advisor	\$55,000.00	\$65,000.00	\$75,000.00	36.4%	0
<b>Schedule II - Miscellaneous Positions</b>					
Administrative Assistant	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	1
Assistant County Counselor	\$50,000.00	\$66,875.00	\$83,750.00	67.5%	2
Assistant to County Executive	\$37,776.00	\$51,388.00	\$65,000.00	72.1%	2
Budget Officer	\$53,726.00	\$71,177.50	\$88,629.00	65.0%	1
Chief Deputy County Counselor	\$92,000.00	\$117,500.00	\$143,000.00	55.4%	1
Chief Deputy County Counselor - Litigation	\$92,000.00	\$117,500.00	\$143,000.00	55.4%	1
Chief Investigator	\$41,075.00	\$54,425.00	\$67,775.00	65.0%	2
Chief Medical Examiner	\$230,000.00	\$277,500.00	\$325,000.00	41.3%	0
Communications / E-Government Coord./PIO	\$46,410.00	\$61,500.00	\$76,590.00	65.0%	1
Complaint Officer	\$29,580.00	\$41,790.00	\$54,000.00	82.6%	1
County Counselor	\$87,800.00	\$117,777.00	\$147,754.00	68.3%	1
Deputy Chief Medical Examiner	\$210,000.00	\$240,000.00	\$270,000.00	28.6%	0
Deputy County Counselor	\$68,000.00	\$88,500.00	\$109,000.00	60.3%	2
Deputy Medical Examiner	\$200,000.00	\$230,000.00	\$260,000.00	30.0%	3
Director of OHRCC	\$41,075.00	\$54,412.50	\$67,750.00	64.9%	1
Executive Assistant	\$29,580.00	\$39,790.00	\$50,000.00	69.0%	1
Exec Assistant/Secretary to County Counselor	\$29,580.00	\$42,290.00	\$55,000.00	85.9%	1
Investigator	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	2
Investigator/Paralegal	\$26,410.00	\$36,133.00	\$45,856.00	73.6%	2
Investigator II	\$29,580.00	\$37,718.00	\$45,856.00	55.0%	10
Litigation Investigator/Paralegal	\$26,410.00	\$36,133.00	\$45,856.00	73.6%	1
Micro Tech Support Tech (Drug Task Force)	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	0
Municipal Court Administrator	\$39,873.00	\$50,824.50	\$61,776.00	54.9%	0
Narcotics Investigative Spec (Drug Task Force)	\$41,075.00	\$54,412.50	\$67,750.00	64.9%	1
Officer in Charge (Drug Task Force)	\$52,450.00	\$69,500.00	\$86,550.00	65.0%	1
Operations Administrator (Drug Task Force)	\$39,873.00	\$50,824.50	\$61,776.00	54.9%	1
Secretary to Medical Examiner	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	0
Senior Assistant County Counselor	\$60,000.00	\$77,500.00	\$95,000.00	58.3%	0
Senior Deputy County Counselor	\$80,000.00	\$102,500.00	\$125,000.00	56.3%	0
Senior Investigator / Paralegal	\$33,000.00	\$44,000.00	\$55,000.00	66.7%	0
Senior Litigation Investigator / Paralegal	\$33,000.00	\$44,000.00	\$55,000.00	66.7%	0



**EXHIBIT 3A (Continued)**  
**SALARY SCHEDULE**  
**CHAPTER 2 GOVERNMENT**

Classification Title	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
<b>Schedule III - Legislature</b>					
Administrative / Executive Assistant	\$29,580.00	\$37,718.00	\$45,856.00	55.0%	1
Assistant Auditor	\$37,776.00	\$48,163.00	\$58,550.00	55.0%	1
Audit Assistant	\$33,430.00	\$42,625.00	\$51,820.00	55.0%	1
Budget & Financial Analyst	\$87,800.00	\$117,777.00	\$147,754.00	68.3%	0
Chief Compliance Review Officer	\$52,450.00	\$69,500.00	\$86,550.00	65.0%	0
Chief Deputy Auditor	\$52,450.00	\$70,125.00	\$87,800.00	67.4%	1
Clerk of the Legislature	\$87,800.00	\$117,777.00	\$147,754.00	68.3%	1
Clerk Typist	\$21,480.00	\$26,850.00	\$32,220.00	50.0%	0
Compliance Review Officer	\$41,075.00	\$54,425.00	\$67,775.00	65.0%	2
County Auditor	\$87,800.00	\$117,777.00	\$147,754.00	68.3%	1
Deputy County Clerk	\$41,075.00	\$54,425.00	\$67,775.00	65.0%	0
Housing Resource Director	\$52,450.00	\$69,500.00	\$86,550.00	65.0%	0
Legislative Secretary	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	1
Notary Clerk	\$23,580.00	\$30,068.00	\$36,556.00	55.0%	0
Public Liaison	\$52,450.00	\$69,500.00	\$86,550.00	65.0%	0
Secretary	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	0
Secretary to Auditor	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	0
Senior Administrative / Executive Assistant	\$33,430.00	\$42,625.00	\$51,820.00	55.0%	1
Senior Assistant Auditor	\$41,075.00	\$54,425.00	\$67,775.00	65.0%	1
Special Projects Analyst	\$87,800.00	\$117,777.00	\$147,754.00	68.3%	0
<b>Schedule IV - Prosecuting Attorney</b>					
Advisor to the Prosecuting Attorney	\$29,580.00	\$41,790.00	\$54,000.00	82.6%	0
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney	\$50,000.00	\$82,500.00	\$115,000.00	130.0%	11
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney I	\$50,000.00	\$66,875.00	\$83,750.00	67.5%	23
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney II	\$60,000.00	\$77,500.00	\$95,000.00	58.3%	15
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney III	\$68,000.00	\$88,500.00	\$109,000.00	60.3%	4
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney IV	\$75,000.00	\$95,000.00	\$115,000.00	53.3%	0
Chief	\$80,000.00	\$102,500.00	\$125,000.00	56.3%	1
Chief Investigator	\$45,000.00	\$60,000.00	\$75,000.00	66.7%	1
Chief of Operations	\$87,800.00	\$111,400.00	\$135,000.00	53.8%	1
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney	\$92,000.00	\$117,500.00	\$143,000.00	55.4%	1
Director	\$75,000.00	\$92,760.00	\$110,520.00	47.4%	1
Executive Assistant to Prosecuting Attorney	\$29,580.00	\$41,790.00	\$54,000.00	82.6%	1
Investigator	\$35,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$55,000.00	57.1%	2
Program Administrator	\$80,000.00	\$102,500.00	\$125,000.00	56.3%	1
Secretary to Prosecuting Attorney	\$26,410.00	\$33,450.00	\$40,490.00	53.3%	0
Trial Team Leader	\$77,150.00	\$98,575.00	\$120,000.00	55.5%	10
Victim Services Director	\$41,075.00	\$54,425.00	\$67,775.00	65.0%	0



**EXHIBIT 3A (Continued)  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
CHAPTER 2 GOVERNMENT**

Classification Title	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Employees
<b>Schedule V - Public Administrator</b>					
Administrative Assistant	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	2
Chief Deputy Public Administrator	\$52,450.00	\$69,500.00	\$86,550.00	65.0%	1
Legal Counsel	\$37,776.00	\$48,163.00	\$58,550.00	55.0%	3
Public Administrator	\$66,980.00	\$88,750.00	\$110,520.00	65.0%	1
Secretary to Public Administrator	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	1
<b>Schedule VI - Sheriff</b>					
Major	\$89,000.00	\$95,000.00	\$101,000.00	13.5%	1
Secretary / Administrative Assistant to Sheriff	\$26,410.00	\$33,675.00	\$40,940.00	55.0%	0
<b>OVERALL</b>				<b>60.0%</b>	<b>147*</b>

\* Does not include 12 employees whose job titles are not included in the schedule

**EXHIBIT 3B  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
COMMUNICATIONS EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Annual Salary	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
CS1	\$29,619.20	0	0
CS2	\$31,096.00	1	3
CS3	\$32,656.00	1	2
CS4	\$34,278.40	1	2
CS5	\$37,710.40	1	3
CS6	\$41,496.00	1	2
<b>OVERALL</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>

The Corrections salary schedule with six grades for 212 employees is displayed in **Exhibit 3C**. The range spreads vary from 5.0 to 58.4 percent, with an average of 22.2 percent. Midpoint progressions vary from 10.0 to 29.3 percent—with an average of 16.6 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3C  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
C01	\$31,200.00	\$31,980.00	\$32,760.00	5.0%	-	1	57
C02	\$36,025.60	\$37,835.20	\$39,582.40	9.9%	18.3%	1	109
C03	\$39,603.20	\$43,576.00	\$47,528.00	20.0%	15.2%	1	3
C04	\$43,576.00	\$47,944.00	\$52,291.20	20.0%	10.0%	2	29
C05	\$47,944.00	\$52,748.80	\$57,512.00	20.0%	10.0%	1	9
C06	\$52,748.80	\$68,182.40	\$83,574.40	58.4%	29.3%	1	5
<b>OVERALL</b>				<b>22.2%</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>212</b>



**Exhibit 3D** displays the salary schedule for 546 General employees. This schedule features 13 pay grades. Range spreads vary from 45.8 to 65.1 percent—with an average spread of 58.5 percent. Midpoint progressions vary slightly between 11.9 to 13.1 percent—with an average of 12.7 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3D  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
G03	\$20,800.00	\$25,313.60	\$30,326.40	45.8%	-	12	68
G04	\$22,672.00	\$28,329.60	\$33,987.20	49.9%	11.9%	9	22
G05	\$24,876.80	\$31,740.80	\$38,563.20	55.0%	12.0%	18	56
G06	\$27,872.00	\$35,547.20	\$43,160.00	54.9%	12.0%	28	105
G07	\$31,200.00	\$39,811.20	\$48,401.60	55.1%	12.0%	37	99
G08	\$35,276.80	\$44,948.80	\$54,662.40	55.0%	12.9%	37	84
G09	\$39,873.60	\$50,835.20	\$61,776.00	54.9%	13.1%	27	41
G10	\$43,326.40	\$57,428.80	\$71,489.60	65.0%	13.0%	21	32
G11	\$48,963.20	\$64,896.00	\$80,787.20	65.0%	13.0%	20	20
G12	\$55,348.80	\$73,320.00	\$91,312.00	65.0%	13.0%	11	11
G13	\$62,545.60	\$82,867.20	\$103,188.80	65.0%	13.0%	8	8
G14	\$70,636.80	\$93,620.80	\$116,604.80	65.1%	13.0%	0	0
G15	\$79,851.20	\$105,809.60	\$131,747.20	65.0%	13.0%	0	0
<b>OVERALL</b>				<b>58.5%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>546</b>

**Exhibit 3E** shows the five pay grades that comprise the Park Rangers salary schedule, which applies to 11 employees. Range spreads vary significantly between 9.1 and 34.3 percent—with an average spread of 20.0 percent. Midpoint progressions vary between 9.1 to 13.6 percent—with an average of 11.9 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3E  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
PARK RANGERS**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	Midpoint Progression	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
PR1	\$33,321.60	\$34,840.80	\$36,360.00	9.1%	-	1	1
PR2	\$36,192.00	\$38,001.60	\$39,894.40	10.2%	9.1%	1	1
PR3	\$40,352.00	\$42,369.60	\$50,481.60	25.1%	11.5%	1	6
PR4	\$45,760.00	\$48,048.00	\$55,868.80	22.1%	13.4%	1	2
PR5	\$52,000.00	\$54,600.00	\$69,846.40	34.3%	13.6%	1	1
<b>OVERALL</b>				<b>20.2%</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>



Exhibit 3F displays the Sheriff salary schedule for 94 employees and features 11 pay grades. Grades SP3 through SP11 do not feature ranges, as these grades instead have a flat hourly rate; these rates have been annualized for ease of comparison with other schedules. The range spreads for Grades SP12 and SP13 are 4.7 and 4.4 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT 3F  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
SHERIFF EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Minimum	Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
SP3	\$40,560.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	22
SP4	\$45,489.60	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	11
SP5	\$50,440.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	14
SP6	\$55,432.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	4
SP7	\$60,382.40	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	21
SP8	\$62,878.40	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	6
SP9	\$70,324.80	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	3
SP10	\$75,316.80	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	4
SP11	\$80,267.20	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	4
SP12	\$88,000.00	\$90,080.00	\$92,160.00	4.7%	1	2
SP13	\$94,240.00	\$96,320.00	\$98,400.00	4.4%	1	3
<b>OVERALL</b>				<b>4.6%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>94</b>

Exhibit 3G displays the six classification titles comprising the Trades salary schedule which is reserved for the 22 employees. All classifications within this schedule are placed in pay grade U90. The schedule does not feature pay ranges, but instead a flat hourly rate for each title; these rates have been annualized for ease of comparison with other schedules.

**EXHIBIT 3G  
SALARY SCHEDULE  
TRADES EMPLOYEES**

Classification Title	Annual Salary	Employees
Painter	\$53,289.60	3
Building Trade Foreman	*	3
Operations Engineer	\$67,995.20	5
Carpenter	\$68,681.60	5
Electrician	\$69,742.40	3
Plumber	\$80,163.20	3
<b>OVERALL</b>		<b>22</b>

\* The Building Trade Foreman is paid \$2/hr more than the specific trade supervised



**Exhibit 3H** displays all classification titles in the County's seven salary schedules. As can be seen, the County has a total of 329 unique classification titles.

**EXHIBIT 3H  
LIST OF COUNTY CLASSIFICATION TITLES**

Classification Title	Classification Title
Accountant	Assistant to County Executive
Accounting Analyst	Assistant Treasurer
Accounting and Finance Administrator	Audit Assistant
Accounts Payable and Payroll Specialist	Auditor
Accounts Payable Coordinator	Benefits/Booking Supervisor
Accounts Payable Specialist	Billing Clerk
Accounts Receivable Administrator	Board of Equalization Specialist
Accreditation Manager	Bond Investigator
Administrative Assistant	Bookkeeper
Administrative Specialist	Budget Analyst
Administrative Supervisor	Budget Coordinator
Anti-Drug Program Administrator	Budget Officer
Applications Program Manager	Budgeting Supervisor
Assistant Auditor	Building Official
Assistant County Counselor	Building Services Specialist
Assistant Court Administrator	Building Services Technician
Assistant Director for Enterprise Software	Building Trade Foreman
Assistant Director of Accounting	Business and Real Estate Special
Assistant Director of Collections	Business Personal Property Auditor
Assistant Golf Professional	Business Personal Property Supervisor
Assistant Marina Administrator	Captain
Assistant Population Control Coordinator	Captain 1
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney	Captain 2
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney I	Care Manager
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney II	Care Manager Supervisor
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney III	Carpenter
Assistant Road and Bridge Administrator	Case Records Processor
Assistant Superintendent of Park Safety	Chief Administrative Officer
Assistant Systems Administrator	Chief Deputy Auditor
Chief Deputy County Counselor	County Counselor
Chief Deputy County Counselor - Litigations	County Executive
Chief Deputy Public Administrator	County House Arrest Officer
Chief Investigator	Courthouse Security Officer
Chief of Health Services	Criminal Records Administrator
Chief of Operations	Criminal Records Supervisor
Chief of Staff	CSE Supervisor



**EXHIBIT 3H (Continued)**  
**LIST OF COUNTY CLASSIFICATION TITLES**

Classification Title	Classification Title
Chief Operating Officer	Data Analyst
Child Support Enforcement Technician	Database Specialist
Child Support Enforcement Technician I	Database Supervisor
Child Support Enforcement Technician II	Delinquent Tax Administrator
Civil Engineer I	Delinquent Tax Collector
Civil Engineer II	Delinquent Tax Coordinator
Civil Engineer III	Deputy County Clerk
Clerk	Deputy County Counselor
Clerk - Collections	Deputy Director of Administration
Clerk - Sore	Deputy Director of Assessment for Administration
Clerk - Warrants	Deputy Director of Combat
Clerk of the County Legislature	Deputy Director of Enterprise Operation
Client Advocate	Deputy Director of Human Resources
Client Advocate Supervisor	Deputy Director of Park Operations
Code Compliance Officer	Deputy Medical Examiner
Collections Supervisor	Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Combat Director	Deputy Sheriff 1
Commercial Property Appraisal Supervisor	Deputy Sheriff 2
Communications/E-Gov't Coord./Public Info. Officer	Deputy Sheriff 3
Communications Marketing Administrator	Deputy Sheriff 4
Communications Specialist 1	Deputy Sheriff 5
Communications Specialist 2	Deputy Superintendent of Park Operations
Communications Specialist 3	Development Division Administrator
Complaint Officer	Director
Compliance Review Officer	Director of Assessment
Concealed Carry Weapon Specialist	Director of Collections
Concession Administrator	Director of Communications
Concession Specialist	Director of Family Support Services
Corrections Captain	Director of Finance and Purchasing
Corrections Community Outreach Coordinator	Director of Human Resources
Corrections Lead Building Repairer	Director of Information Technology
Corrections Officer I	Director of OHRCC
County Auditor	Director of Parks and Recreation
Director of Personal Property Tax	Inmate Worker Recreation Coordinator
Director of Public Works	Investigative Security Specialist
Director of Recorder of Deeds	Investigative Specialist
Dispatcher	Investigator
Division Chief	Investigator I
Electrician	Investigator II
Emergency Management and Safety Coordinator	Landscape Architect
Engineering CADD Tech	Lead Care Manager
Engineering Technician	Lead Clerk
Entitlements Technician	Lead Communications Specialist
Environmental Health Administrator	Lead County House Arrest Officer



**EXHIBIT 3H (Continued)**  
**LIST OF COUNTY CLASSIFICATION TITLES**

Classification Title	Classification Title
Equipment Operator I	Lead Criminal Records Supervisor
Equipment Operator II	Lead Records Representative
Executive Assistant	Lead Support Services Specialist
Executive Assistant to Prosecutor	Lead Victim Advocate
Executive Project Lead	Legal Assistant
Exemptions Analyst	Legal Counsel
Facilities Management Administrator	Legislative Aide
Facilities Management Assistant Administrator	Legislative Secretary
Facilities Specialist	Librarian
Finance and Systems Supervisor	Litigation Investigator
Foreman	Living History Interpreter
Forensic Fellow	Mail Services Coordinator
Forensic Supervisor	Manager of Detention
Forensic Technician	Marina Supervisor
Forensic Transcriptionist	Marketing and Graphics Specialist
GIS Developer	Master Corrections Officer
GIS Specialist I	Mental Health Claims Examiner
GIS Specialist II	Multimedia Production Specialist
GIS Specialist III	Municipal Court Administrator
Golf Course Maintenance Supervisor	Municipal Court Specialist
Golf Professional	Narcotics Investigative Specialist
Grant, Audit and Risk Administrator	Network Support Administrator
Historic Site Supervisor	Network Support Analyst
Human Resource Administrator	Network Support Technician
Human Resource Specialist	Nurse Case Manager
Human Resources Administrator	Office Administrator
Human Resources Specialist	Office Coordinator
Inmate Services Administrator	Officer in Charge
Inmate Services Coordinator	On-Site Wastewater Specialist
Operations Administrator	Regional Correctional Center Deputy Director
Operations Analyst	Regional Correctional Center Director
Operations Coordinator	Registration Specialist
Operations Engineer	Registration Supervisor
Operations Administrator	Research Analyst
Outdoor Education Supervisor	Residential Appraisal Coordinator
Painter	Residential Appraiser
Paralegal	Residential Property Appraisal Supervisor
Park Ranger Captain	Restitution Coordinator
Park Ranger I	Road and Bridge Administrator
Park Ranger II	Secretary
Park Ranger Major	Secretary to Public Administrator
Payroll Specialist	Senior Administrative Assistant
Payroll Supervisor	Senior Administrative Manager
Personnel/Payroll Analyst	Senior Assistant Auditor



**EXHIBIT 3H (Continued)**  
**LIST OF COUNTY CLASSIFICATION TITLES**

Classification Title	Classification Title
Plumber	Senior Bad Check Collector
Population Control Coordinator	Senior Buyer
Probationary Corrections Officer	Senior Commercial Appraiser
Probationary Park Ranger	Senior Communications Specialist
Program Analyst	Senior Database Administrator
Program Manager	Senior Equipment Operator
Program Services Supervisor	Senior Information Security Manager
Project/Quality Control Inspector	Senior Legal Assistant
Project and Safety Coordinator	Senior Paralegal
Projects Coordinator	Senior Park Ranger
Property and Investment Coordinator	Senior Planner and Program Manager
Property Officer	Senior Project Manager
Prosecuting Attorney	Senior Research Analyst
Public Administrator	Senior Residential Appraiser
Public Health Specialist	Senior Software Engineer
Public Health Specialist III	Sergeant 1
Public Health Supervisor	Sergeant 2
Purchasing Administrator	Sergeant 3
Ranger Dispatcher	Sergeant 4
Record Center Facility Coordinator	Sheriff
Recorder of Deeds Supervisor	Shift Supervisor
Records Maintenance Technician	Shift Supervisor Lieutenant
Records Representative	Software Engineer
Records Specialist	Special Assessment Supervisor
Recreation Therapist II	Special Assessment Tax and Records Coordinator
Special Duties Officer	Support Services Supervisor
Special Events Coordinator	Support Services Technician
Special Populations Service Outreach	Systems Administrator
Special Populations Services Administrator	Systems Engineer
Special Projects Analyst	Taxpayer Assistance Supervisor
Special Projects Coordinator	Taxpayer Services Administrator
Sports and Aquatic Administrator	Taxpayer Support Administrator
Superintendent of Golf Course	Team Leader Sergeant
Superintendent of Historic Sites	Title Specialist
Superintendent of Park Operations	Treasurer
Superintendent of Park Safety	Trial Team Leader
Superintendent of Recreation	Utilities/Construction Inspector
Supervisor	Victim Advocate
Support Center Administrator	Warrant Extradition Coordinator
Support Services Administrator	Wastewater Treatment Specialist
Support Services Specialist	-

**Note:** For ease of comparison, all analyses from this point forward omit pay grades with no incumbents. Classifications with no established pay range are also omitted.

### 3.2 GRADE PLACEMENT ANALYSIS

When assessing the effectiveness of a salary schedule and associated policies it is helpful to analyze where employee salaries stand in comparison to their classification's salary range. In general, placement of an employee at a classification's grade minimum would generally indicate a newer employee or an employee that was recently promoted into a classification who has not had the opportunity or experience needed to progress through the range. In contrast, an employee at or near the maximum of their grade is generally an employee with longer tenure who has had the opportunity or experience necessary to progress towards the top of the salary range.

**Exhibits 3I** through **3L** display the percentage of employees compensated at the salary range minimum and salary range maximum thresholds of their respective pay grade for the Corrections, General, Park Ranger, and Sheriff salary schedules. Employees not included on these charts are compensated somewhere between the upper and lower thresholds. The percentages presented are based on the total number of employees in that grade.

As shown in **Exhibit 3I**, 169 Corrections employees (79.7 percent) are compensated at their pay grade minimum, while 27 (12.7 percent) are compensated at their pay grade maximum.

**EXHIBIT 3I**  
**EMPLOYEES AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE**  
**CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	At Min		At Max	
		#	%	#	%
C01	57	31	54.4%	26	45.6%
C02	109	103	94.5%	1	0.9%
C03	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
C04	29	24	82.8%	0	0.0%
C05	9	9	100.0%	0	0.0%
C06	5	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12.7%</b>

As displayed in **Exhibit 3J**, 56 General employees (10.3 percent) are compensated at their pay grade minimum, while 34 (6.2 percent) are compensated at their pay grade maximum.



**EXHIBIT 3J  
EMPLOYEES AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE  
GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	At Min		At Max	
		#	%	#	%
G03	68	12	17.6%	3	4.4%
G04	22	0	0.0%	2	9.1%
G05	56	7	12.5%	3	5.4%
G06	105	9	8.6%	0	0.0%
G07	99	12	12.1%	7	7.1%
G08	84	12	14.3%	6	7.1%
G09	41	4	9.8%	5	12.2%
G10	32	0	0.0%	1	3.1%
G11	20	0	0.0%	5	25.0%
G12	11	0	0.0%	2	18.2%
G13	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6.2%</b>

Exhibit 3K shows that nine Park Rangers (81.8 percent) are compensated at their pay grade minimum, while none are compensated at their pay grade maximum.

**EXHIBIT 3K  
EMPLOYEES AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE  
PARK RANGERS**

Grade	Employees	At Min		At Max	
		#	%	#	%
PR1	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
PR2	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
PR3	6	5	83.3%	0	0.0%
PR4	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
PR5	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Exhibit 3L indicates that no Sheriff employees (only in Grades SP12 and SP13) are compensated at their pay grade minimum or their pay grade maximum.



**EXHIBIT 3L  
EMPLOYEES AT MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE  
SHERIFF EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	At Min		At Max	
		#	%	#	%
SP12	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
SP13	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>94*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

\* Includes all Sheriff employees

In addition to assessing the number of employees at minimum and maximum, an analysis was conducted to determine the number of employees below and above the salary range midpoint. Exhibits 3M through 3P display these figures for the Corrections, General, Park Ranger, and Sheriff salary schedules.

As shown in Exhibit 3M, 180 Corrections employees (84.9 percent) are compensated below their pay grade midpoint, one (0.5 percent) is compensated at the midpoint, and 31 (14.6 percent) are compensated above the midpoint.

**EXHIBIT 3M  
EMPLOYEES BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE  
CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< Mid		At Mid		> Mid	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
C01	57	31	54.4%	0	0.0%	26	45.6%
C02	109	106	97.2%	0	0.0%	3	2.8%
C03	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%
C04	29	28	96.6%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%
C05	9	9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
C06	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>84.9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>14.6%</b>

Exhibit 3N indicates that 358 General employees (65.6 percent) are compensated below their pay grade midpoint, three (0.5 percent) are compensated at their midpoint, and 185 (33.9 percent) are compensated above the midpoint.



**EXHIBIT 3N  
EMPLOYEES BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE  
GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< Mid		At Mid		> Mid	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
G03	68	57	83.8%	0	0.0%	11	16.2%
G04	22	12	54.5%	0	0.0%	10	45.5%
G05	56	41	73.2%	1	1.8%	14	25.0%
G06	105	80	76.2%	1	1.0%	24	22.9%
G07	99	62	62.6%	0	0.0%	37	37.4%
G08	84	52	61.9%	1	1.2%	31	36.9%
G09	41	24	58.5%	0	0.0%	17	41.5%
G10	32	20	62.5%	0	0.0%	12	37.5%
G11	20	6	30.0%	0	0.0%	14	70.0%
G12	11	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	8	72.7%
G13	8	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	7	87.5%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>65.6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>33.9%</b>

As displayed in Exhibit 30, all 11 Park Rangers are compensated below their pay grade midpoint and none are compensated above the midpoint.

**EXHIBIT 3O  
EMPLOYEES BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE  
PARK RANGERS**

Grade	Employees	< Mid		At Mid		> Mid	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
PR1	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR2	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR3	6	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR4	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR5	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Exhibit 3P shows that two (2.1 percent) Sheriff employees (only in Grades SP12 and SP13) are compensated below their pay grade midpoint, while three (3.2 percent) are compensated above the midpoint.

**EXHIBIT 3P  
EMPLOYEES BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE  
SHERIFF EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< Mid		At Mid		> Mid	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
SP12	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%
SP13	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>94*</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.2%</b>

\* Includes all Sheriff employees



### 3.3 QUARTILE ANALYSIS

In a quartile analysis, each salary range is divided into four equal segments or quartiles, and employees are assigned a quartile based on where their current salary falls. While there is no best practice for what average tenure should be for each quartile, and other factors outside of the breadth of this analysis can impact placement (e.g. promotional and hiring practices), this analysis is useful in revealing areas of compression within a compensation system when paired with tenure data. Generally, the ideal outcome is for the analysis to show a strong correlation between tenure and quartile, where higher tenure would be experienced in higher quartiles.

**Exhibits 3Q** through **3T** show the number of employees that are in each quartile of each range, as well as the average overall salary schedule tenure (i.e. how long an employee has been at the County) by quartile for the Corrections, General, Park Ranger, and Sheriff employees.

**Exhibit 3Q** shows that 84.0 percent of Corrections employees fall within the first quartile of their respective pay range, while 1.4 percent fall into the second quartile, 0.9 percent fall into the third quartile, and 13.7 percent fall into the fourth quartile. Additionally, the overall average tenure among Corrections employees is 8.8 years and average tenure increases through the quartiles, with the fourth quartile being the exception. Average tenure in the first quartile is 7.2 years. This increases to 10.2 years in the second quartile, increases to 22.9 years in the third quartile, but decreases to 12.4 years in the fourth quartile. This seems to indicate that employees are not moved entirely through their range with a positive linear relationship between tenure and pay.

As shown in **Exhibit 3R**, 42.5 percent of General employees fall within the first quartile of their respective pay range, while 23.6 percent fall into the second quartile, 14.5 percent fall into the third quartile, and 19.4 percent fall into the fourth quartile. Additionally, the overall average tenure among General employees is 11.9 years and average tenure increases through the quartiles. Average tenure in the first quartile is 7.6 years, increases to 13.6 years in the second quartile, increases to 14.9 years in the third quartile, and increases to 18.0 years in the fourth quartile. This seems to indicate that employees are moved through their range with a positive linear relationship between tenure and pay.

**Exhibit 3S** indicates that all Park Rangers fall within the first quartile of their respective pay range, with none found in the second, third, and fourth quartiles. Additionally, the overall average tenure among Park Rangers is 15.8 years.

**Exhibit 3T** shows that 2.1 percent of Sheriff employees (only in Grades SP12 and SP13) fall within the first quartile of their respective pay range, 1.1 percent fall in the third quartile, and 2.1 percent fall in the fourth quartile, with none found in the second quartile. Additionally, the overall average tenure among all Sheriff employees is 15.9 years.



**EXHIBIT 3Q  
QUARTILE ANALYSIS  
CORRECTION EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Avg. Tenure	1st Quartile			2nd Quartile			3rd Quartile			4th Quartile		
			#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure
C01	57	0.6	31	54.4%	0.5	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	26	45.6%	0.9
C02	109	4.7	104	95.4%	4.0	2	1.8%	13.3	0	0.0%	N/A	3	2.8%	24.0
C03	3	18.6	1	33.3%	10.1	0	0.0%	N/A	2	66.7%	22.9	0	0.0%	N/A
C04	29	9.9	28	96.6%	10.0	1	3.4%	7.0	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
C05	9	9.1	9	100.0%	9.1	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
C06	5	9.8	5	100.0%	9.8	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>84.0%</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>12.4</b>

**EXHIBIT 3R  
QUARTILE ANALYSIS  
GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Avg. Tenure	1st Quartile			2nd Quartile			3rd Quartile			4th Quartile		
			#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure
G03	68	5.9	41	60.3%	1.9	16	23.5%	8.1	2	2.9%	10.1	9	13.2%	19.4
G04	22	10.8	6	27.3%	5.0	6	27.3%	5.1	3	13.6%	18.6	7	31.8%	17.4
G05	56	7.1	28	50.0%	2.5	14	25.0%	7.6	6	10.7%	11.4	8	14.3%	18.9
G06	105	9.4	54	51.4%	6.5	27	25.7%	8.5	13	12.4%	14.0	11	10.5%	20.8
G07	99	12.5	36	36.4%	6.1	26	26.3%	11.2	18	18.2%	19.3	19	19.2%	20.0
G08	84	15.5	35	41.7%	10.5	18	21.4%	17.4	16	19.0%	21.7	15	17.9%	18.5
G09	41	15.8	18	43.9%	9.4	6	14.6%	17.9	4	9.8%	26.5	13	31.7%	20.5
G10	32	13.4	10	31.3%	7.3	10	31.3%	13.9	5	15.6%	14.3	7	21.9%	20.8
G11	20	13.9	3	15.0%	25.0	3	15.0%	15.5	6	30.0%	10.3	8	40.0%	11.8
G12	11	15.0	1	9.1%	1.5	2	18.2%	26.1	3	27.3%	13.3	5	45.5%	14.3
G13	8	11.7	0	0.0%	N/A	1	12.5%	18.3	3	37.5%	4.1	4	50.0%	15.7
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	<b>18.0</b>



**EXHIBIT 3S  
QUARTILE ANALYSIS  
PARK RANGERS**

Grade	Employees	Avg. Tenure	1st Quartile			2nd Quartile			3rd Quartile			4th Quartile		
			#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure
PR1	1	0.2	1	100.0%	0.2	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
PR2	1	0.7	1	100.0%	0.7	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
PR3	6	13.3	6	100.0%	13.3	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
PR4	2	32.5	2	100.0%	32.5	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
PR5	1	32.2	1	100.0%	32.2	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**EXHIBIT 3T  
QUARTILE ANALYSIS  
SHERIFF EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Avg. Tenure	1st Quartile			2nd Quartile			3rd Quartile			4th Quartile		
			#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure
SP12	2	37.2	1	50.0%	32.9	0	0.0%	N/A	1	50.0%	41.4	0	0.0%	N/A
SP13	3	26.5	1	33.3%	22.3	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	2	66.7%	28.6
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>94*</b>	<b>15.9*</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>28.6</b>

\* Includes all Sheriff employees.



### 3.4 COMPRESSION ANALYSIS

Compression can be seen as a threat to internal equity and morale. According to the Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM), specific examples of actions that may cause pay compression include the following:

- Reorganizations change peer relationships and can create compression if jobs are not reevaluated.
- Certain departments may be relatively liberal with salary increases, market adjustments, and promotions, while others are not.
- Some employers have overlooked human resources policies designed to regulate pay, paying new hires more than existing employees for similar jobs under the mantra of “paying what it takes to get the best talent”.

One common form of pay compression can be defined as the lack of variation in salaries between employees with significantly different levels of experience and responsibility. An example of this can be observed when the pay of highly tenured staff and newly hired employees in the same job are too similar. The following analysis attempts to determine if such compression can be observed in the County.

**Exhibits 3U through 3AA** show the ratio of subordinate salaries to supervisor salaries by grade for Chapter 2, Communications, Corrections, General, Park Ranger, Sheriff, and Trades employees, respectively. Employees were grouped into their respective classification levels and actual salary data were utilized to determine if an employee’s salary was either less than 80 percent, less than 95 percent, or more than 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary.

As shown in **Exhibit 3U**, 126 (79.2 percent) Chapter 2 employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, 15 (9.4 percent) fall below 95 percent, and 12 (7.5 percent) fall above 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary.

**Exhibit 3V** shows that all Communications employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, with none falling below or above 95 percent.

As displayed in **Exhibit 3W**, 184 Corrections (86.8 percent) employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, 28 (13.2 percent) fall below 95 percent, and no employee salaries fall above 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary.

**Exhibit 3X** indicates that 464 General (85.0 percent) employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, 69 (12.6 percent) fall below 95 percent, and 13 (2.4 percent) fall above 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary.

As shown in **Exhibit 3Y**, four Park Rangers (36.4 percent) employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, seven (63.6 percent) fall below 95 percent, and no employee salaries fall above 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary.



**Exhibit 3Z** shows that 60 Sheriff (63.8 percent) employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, 25 (26.6 percent) fall below 95 percent, and nine (9.6 percent) fall above 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary.

As displayed in **Exhibit 3AA**, four (18.2 percent) Trades employee salaries fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, 13 (59.1 percent) fall below 95 percent, and five (22.7 percent) fall above 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary.

**EXHIBIT 3U  
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE  
CHAPTER 2 EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
G99	159*	126	79.2%	15	9.4%	12	7.5%

\* Six employee salaries are not included in this analysis

**EXHIBIT 3V  
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE  
COMMUNICATIONS EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
CS2	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CS3	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CS4	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CS5	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CS6	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**EXHIBIT 3W  
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE  
CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
C01	57	57	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
C02	109	108	99.1%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%
C03	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
C04	29	13	44.8%	16	55.2%	0	0.0%
C05	9	1	11.1%	8	88.9%	0	0.0%
C06	5	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>86.8%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>



**EXHIBIT 3X  
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE  
GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
G03	68	68	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
G04	22	21	95.5%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%
G05	56	55	98.2%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%
G06	105	94	89.5%	11	10.5%	0	0.0%
G07	99	76	76.8%	17	17.2%	6	6.1%
G08	84	60	71.4%	21	25.0%	3	3.6%
G09	41	36	87.8%	4	9.8%	1	2.4%
G10	32	25	78.1%	6	18.8%	1	3.1%
G11	20	15	75.0%	3	15.0%	2	10.0%
G12	11	8	72.7%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
G13	8	6	75.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>12.6%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2.4%</b>

**EXHIBIT 3Y  
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE  
PARK RANGERS**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
PR1	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR2	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR3	6	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%
PR4	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
PR5	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**EXHIBIT 3Z  
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE  
SHERIFF EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
SP3	22	22	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
SP4	11	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
SP5	14	9	64.3%	5	35.7%	0	0.0%
SP6	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
SP7	21	6	28.6%	8	38.1%	7	33.3%
SP8	6	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
SP9	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
SP10	4	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%
SP11	4	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
SP12	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
SP13	3	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26.6%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9.6%</b>





**EXHIBIT 3AA  
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE  
TRADES EMPLOYEES**

Classification Title	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Painter	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Building Trade Foreman	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%
Operations Engineer	5	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
Carpenter	5	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
Electrician	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Plumber	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59.1%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>22.7%</b>

Employees who are at or above expected placement are employees with salaries that are between 0.0 and 10.0 percent ahead of their expected salary and employees with salaries that are more than 10.0 percent ahead of their expected salary. Employees who are at or below expected placement are employees with salaries that are between 0.0 and 10.0 percent behind their expected salary and employees with salaries that are lower than 10 percent behind their expected salary. Generally, the only source of concern would be employees that are more than 10 percent behind expected placement. However, simply having employees in this group does not necessarily mean there are corresponding compression issues, assuming there is a reason for these placements.

**Exhibits 3AB** through **Exhibit 3AE** display the average tenure of employees whose actual placement varies from their expected placement by pay grade, including those whose actual placement is below expected placement, those whose actual placement is at expected placement, and those whose actual placement is above expected placement.

As can be seen in **Exhibit 3AB**, 83.0 percent of Corrections employees (176) are at or below expected placement, while 17.0 percent (36) are at or above expected placement.

**Exhibit 3AC** shows that 30.8 percent of General employees (168) are at or below expected placement, while 69.2 percent (378) are at or above expected placement.

As displayed in **Exhibit 3AD**, all Park Rangers (11) are at or below expected placement, with none at or above expected placement.

**Exhibit 3AE** indicates that 2.1 percent (2) of Sheriff employees (only Grades SP12 and SP13) are at or below expected placement and 3.2 percent (3) are at or above expected placement.

This analysis assumes a 30-year period between minimum and maximum, which may differ slightly from the County’s compensation policy and practice. Therefore, this analysis should not be interpreted to mean that any employee is underpaid or overpaid.

**EXHIBIT 3AB  
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT  
CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< -10%		0 to -10%		0 to 10%		> 10%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
C01	57	0	0.0%	31	54.4%	26	45.6%	0	0.0%
C02	109	0	0.0%	105	96.3%	4	3.7%	0	0.0%
C03	3	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%
C04	29	0	0.0%	28	96.6%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%
C05	9	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
C06	5	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**EXHIBIT 3AC  
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT  
GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< -10%		0 to -10%		0 to 10%		> 10%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
G03	68	2	2.9%	35	51.5%	18	26.5%	13	19.1%
G04	22	0	0.0%	2	9.1%	7	31.8%	13	59.1%
G05	56	0	0.0%	10	17.9%	22	39.3%	24	42.9%
G06	105	0	0.0%	44	41.9%	24	22.9%	37	35.2%
G07	99	3	3.0%	27	27.3%	17	17.2%	52	52.5%
G08	84	2	2.4%	30	35.7%	15	17.9%	37	44.0%
G09	41	0	0.0%	10	24.4%	12	29.3%	19	46.3%
G10	32	0	0.0%	2	6.3%	11	34.4%	19	59.4%
G11	20	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	2	10.0%	17	85.0%
G12	11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	10	90.9%
G13	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>29.5%</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>45.6%</b>

**EXHIBIT 3AD  
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT  
PARK RANGERS**

Grade	Employees	< -10%		0 to -10%		0 to 10%		> 10%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
PR1	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR2	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR3	6	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR4	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
PR5	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>72.7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**EXHIBIT 3AE  
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT  
SHERIFF EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< -10%		0 to -10%		0 to 10%		> 10%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
SP12	2	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
SP13	3	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>94*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

\*Includes all sheriff employees

**3.5 DEPARTMENT DISTRIBUTION**

As of May 2019, the County employed 1,056 employees across 51 different departments, excluding courts. The following analysis is intended to provide basic information regarding how employees are distributed among departments.

**Exhibit 3AF** depicts the number of classifications that are present in each department, along with the number and overall percentage of total employees by department. As the exhibit illustrates, the largest department (in terms of employees) is Corrections, with 281 employees, representing 26.6 percent of the County’s workforce.

**EXHIBIT 3AF  
EMPLOYEES AND CLASSES BY DEPARTMENT**

Department/Location	Employees	Classifications	% of Total
Adair Softball Park	2	2	0.2%
Assessment	60	26	5.7%
Board of Equalization	2	2	0.2%
Clerk of County Legislature	5	5	0.5%
Collections	29	14	2.7%
COMBAT Administration	14	13	1.3%
Corrections	281	37	26.6%
County Counselor	11	9	1.0%
County Executive	8	7	0.8%
County Municipal Court	4	3	0.4%
DART	4	4	0.4%
Detention - Population Control	5	5	0.5%
Engineering	6	6	0.6%
Equipment Service Center	3	1	0.3%
Facilities Management	30	12	2.8%
Fifth District	1	1	0.1%
Finance	20	18	1.9%
First District	2	1	0.2%
Fourth District	1	1	0.1%

**EXHIBIT 3AF (Continued)  
EMPLOYEES AND CLASSES BY DEPARTMENT**

Department/Location	Employees	Classifications	% of Total
Fred Arbanas Golf Course	12	8	1.1%
Gang Intelligence	1	1	0.1%
Health Services	8	6	0.8%
Heritage Programs and Museums	12	5	1.1%
Human Relations and Citizens Complaints	3	3	0.3%
Human Resources	9	7	0.9%
Information Technology	30	18	2.8%
JAG	10	6	0.9%
JC Drug Task Force	6	5	0.6%
Legislative Auditor	6	6	0.6%
Legislature As A Whole	1	1	0.1%
Marinas	6	2	0.6%
Medical Examiner	20	11	1.9%
Natural Resources	8	3	0.8%
Office of Communications	5	4	0.5%
Park Operations	53	19	5.0%
Park Safety and Interpretation	14	8	1.3%
Prevention/Prosecution of Sexual Assault	6	2	0.6%
Prosecuting Attorney	122	31	11.6%
Public Administrator	28	17	2.7%
Public Works Development	7	7	0.7%
Recorder of Deeds	17	8	1.6%
Recreational Programs	5	5	0.5%
Registration and Permits	4	3	0.4%
Road and Bridge Maintenance	45	12	4.3%
Rock Island Rail Corridor Authority	2	2	0.2%
Second District	2	1	0.2%
Sheriff	118	33	11.2%
Sixth District	1	1	0.1%
Special Recreation	3	3	0.3%
Third District	2	2	0.2%
VAWA (Sexual Assault Grant)	2	2	0.2%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>1,056</b>	<b>409*</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* There are a total of 329 unique classification titles in the Jackson County. The total displayed here differs due to duplicate classifications across departments.

### 3.6 SUMMARY

The information contained in this chapter identifies a number of strengths and weaknesses in Jackson County related to the overall structure of the compensation system, as well as the administration of it at the individual employee level. Notably, the following was found:

- **Range Spread** – Range spreads throughout the County salary schedules vary significantly—4.4 to 65.1 percent, with an average of 38.6 percent—which is not in keeping with the best practice of establish consistent range spreads between 50 and 70 percent.
- **Midpoint Progression** – Midpoint progressions also vary throughout the different schedules—9.1 to 13.6 percent, with an average of 12.5 percent. The current midpoint progression was not in keeping with the best practice of setting progression between three and five percent.
- **Salary Placement** – The vast majority of employees are compensated below their pay grade’s midpoint—with over half in the first quartile alone.
- **Grade Penetration** – The County generally maintains a healthy positive linear relationship between experience and pay.

The analysis in **Chapter 3** acts as a starting point for development of recommendations in this report. Paired with market data, Evergreen is able to make recommendations that will ensure that Jackson County’s compensation system is structurally sound, competitive with the market, and treats employees equitably.



## Chapter 4 – Salary Survey Summary

**Chapter 4** focuses on the external salary survey conducted by Evergreen Solutions. Conducting a salary comparison analysis determines the relative competitive market position of the compensation system in Jackson County. This is accomplished by examining salary ranges and the various components within the County’s respective labor market. Data collected are used to analyze the overall market competitiveness of the County, as well as to develop compensation recommendations that will assist the County in recruiting and retaining talented employees. This salary analysis can be used to examine the overall competitiveness of the County and not for evaluating salaries at the individual level—as individual pay is determined through a combination of factors, which can include demand for the type of job, performance, experience, negotiation, and budgetary concerns.

Salary comparisons should be considered a snapshot of current market conditions, as the data collected are reflective of market information at the time of the study. Market conditions can change and market surveys should be completed at regular intervals to ensure the County’s salary structure remains up to date with the current market.

### **4.1 SURVEY DATA SOURCES**

Evergreen collected pay range information from target organizations in the County’s competitive market using a customized market survey tool. The development of this tool included selecting benchmark classifications to be surveyed. The classification title, a description of assigned duties, and the education and experience requirements were provided to each peer in the survey tool for each benchmarked classification. Peers were asked to provide the classification title in their organization that best matches the given essential job functions and education/experience requirements of each title in the County; Evergreen’s goal is to ensure at least a 70 percent match of responsibilities.

Data were collected from peer organizations in the immediate region. While some peers were selected based on shared characteristics (i.e. demographics, service offerings, etc.), many were selected based on the competition for quality candidates and employees they present to the County.

Twenty (20) market peers were asked to participate and salary data were obtained from 17 peers as shown in **Exhibit 4A**. Some classifications in the County can be found in the private sector; private sector salary data provided by the Economic Research Institute (ERI) were also gathered to supplement the public sector data.



**EXHIBIT 4A  
MARKET PEERS**

Peer	Cost-of-Living Index
<b>Jackson County, MO</b>	<b>88.2</b>
<b>Counties</b>	
Clay County, MO	89.1
Greene County, MO	87.1
Johnson County, KS	102.1
Sedgwick County, KS	90.0
St. Charles County, MO	90.6
St. Louis County, MO	99.3
Wyandotte County, KS	78.1
<b>Cities</b>	
City of Blue Springs*	88.2
City of Independence	88.2
City of Kansas City	88.2
City of Lee's Summit	88.2
City of Omaha, NE	97.5
City of Overland Park, KS	102.1
City of St. Louis	99.3
City of Des Moines, IA	92.5
City of Wichita, KS	90.0
<b>Cities</b>	
U.S. Federal Government*	88.2
State of Missouri Government	89.5
Truman Medical Center	88.2
University of Kansas Medical Center*	78.1

\* No salary data obtained

Data were adjusted for cost-of-living using index factors which allow for salary dollars from entities outside of the County's area to be compared in spending power. The cost-of-living for each peer organization is determined at the County level. Evergreen utilizes data from the Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER) as the source for the COLI (Cost-of-Living Index).

## 4.2 SALARY DATA

Making use of the County's assigned pay ranges, Evergreen was able to make direct market evaluations across classifications and benchmark groupings, as well as compare the ranges of benchmarked positions to the salary ranges collected from the target organizations identified in **Exhibit 4A**.

The market differentials and the percentage difference between the County and the market are shown in **Exhibit 4B** for survey market range minimum, midpoint, and maximum. A positive differential indicates the County is above market for that classification at the range minimum, midpoint, or maximum; a negative differential indicates that the County is below market for that classification at that range position. The differentials do not necessarily mean incumbents are overpaid or underpaid in their classifications. It simply displays the difference between the salary range and the average published salary range in the County's market.

**Exhibit 4B** provides a summary of the results at the market average for each comparison point. The exhibit contains the following information:

- each of the 68 benchmarked classifications;
- the market salary range information for each benchmarked classification, including the average of the peer responses for the salary range minimum, midpoint, and maximum (**Note:** Data are not included for the five classifications that received less than four responses, as they could not reliably be considered representative of the market. Therefore, market data are displayed for 63 benchmarked classifications.);
- a percentage differential between current salary ranges and average market ranges;
- the survey average pay range; and
- the total number of survey responses for each classification and the average number of responses for all classifications.



**EXHIBIT 4B  
SALARY SURVEY MARKET SUMMARY**

Classification Title	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg. Range	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Accountant	\$40,824.58	5.9%	\$50,750.00	12.3%	\$60,675.42	16.4%	48.4%	10
Accounts Payable Specialist	\$30,754.49	-21.1%	\$37,297.83	-16.2%	\$43,841.18	-12.8%	42.6%	13
Administrative Assistant	\$30,766.01	-21.2%	\$38,610.92	-19.6%	\$46,455.83	-18.6%	50.8%	12
Applications Program Manager	\$62,220.71	-23.8%	\$78,697.14	-19.3%	\$95,173.58	-16.4%	52.2%	8
Assistant Director of Accounting	\$71,545.66	-25.5%	\$90,220.59	-20.7%	\$108,895.52	-17.6%	51.5%	6
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney I	\$53,858.32	-7.4%	\$69,576.88	-4.0%	\$85,295.44	-1.8%	58.0%	10
Auditor	\$44,228.82	-22.5%	\$56,606.04	-22.9%	\$68,983.26	-23.2%	55.5%	9
Bookkeeper	\$27,056.00	-17.6%	\$33,494.39	-16.7%	\$39,932.77	-16.1%	47.6%	9
Budget Analyst	\$43,902.68	-33.8%	\$55,479.88	-32.9%	\$67,057.07	-32.3%	52.6%	7
Building Official	\$44,447.07	-35.0%	\$56,139.34	-34.1%	\$67,831.61	-33.4%	51.9%	8
Building Services Technician	\$25,712.41	-21.1%	\$31,735.39	-21.5%	\$37,758.37	-21.8%	47.9%	11
Captain I	\$71,339.90	-3.3%	\$83,610.40	-12.0%	\$95,880.90	-18.9%	34.7%	7
Chief Administrative Officer	\$107,964.06	-20.6%	\$135,256.76	-15.1%	\$162,549.46	-11.6%	50.8%	6
Chief Investigator	\$47,780.34	-15.1%	\$62,191.27	-13.3%	\$76,602.20	-12.2%	60.5%	7
Child Support Enforcement Supervisor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Civil Engineer I	\$50,703.99	-35.9%	\$64,579.03	-35.8%	\$78,454.08	-35.7%	54.2%	9
Clerk	\$23,487.14	-12.1%	\$28,951.35	-12.4%	\$34,415.57	-12.6%	47.2%	11
Collections Supervisor	\$39,200.89	-22.7%	\$49,521.55	-21.8%	\$59,842.22	-21.1%	52.9%	7
Communications Specialist I	\$34,766.32	-11.1%	\$44,128.08	N/A	\$53,489.84	N/A	54.2%	10
Communications/E-Govt Coordinator/PIO	\$53,649.36	-14.5%	\$68,561.52	-10.9%	\$83,473.68	-8.6%	55.0%	9
Corrections Officer I	\$31,951.38	-2.4%	\$40,841.23	-24.3%	\$49,731.07	-41.1%	55.8%	8
County House Arrest Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Courthouse Security Officer	\$30,183.81	-36.8%	\$37,257.99	-37.2%	\$44,332.17	-37.5%	47.0%	9
Deputy County Counselor	\$87,904.96	-25.5%	\$113,664.10	-24.9%	\$139,423.24	-24.5%	58.1%	6
Deputy Sheriff I	\$43,157.27	-23.3%	\$53,522.35	N/A	\$63,887.43	N/A	48.6%	9
Director of Communications	\$84,155.53	-11.5%	\$111,230.78	-18.1%	\$138,306.03	-22.3%	63.6%	6
Director of Finance and Purchasing	\$96,936.15	-25.5%	\$129,129.68	-32.8%	\$161,323.21	-37.4%	66.0%	8
Director of Human Resources	\$87,964.59	-15.9%	\$118,275.08	-24.2%	\$148,585.57	-29.4%	68.5%	9
Director of Information Technology	\$92,220.82	-20.6%	\$119,121.48	-24.9%	\$146,022.15	-27.7%	57.9%	9
Director of Parks and Recreation	\$89,448.00	-17.6%	\$119,561.03	-25.2%	\$149,674.06	-30.1%	66.7%	8
Director of Public Works	\$98,225.87	-26.8%	\$131,589.40	-34.6%	\$164,952.93	-39.5%	67.0%	9
Equipment Operator I	\$31,132.27	-22.3%	\$37,192.46	-15.9%	\$43,252.66	-11.5%	39.8%	13
Executive Assistant	\$41,380.18	-28.1%	\$51,686.83	-26.0%	\$61,993.48	-24.6%	49.5%	11
Facilities Management Assistant Administrator	\$53,460.09	-20.9%	\$70,542.68	-20.5%	\$87,625.26	-20.3%	63.6%	10
Foreman	\$38,641.17	-9.1%	\$48,202.54	-6.9%	\$57,763.92	-5.5%	49.1%	10

**EXHIBIT 4B (Continued)  
SALARY SURVEY MARKET SUMMARY**

Classification Title	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg. Range	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
GIS Developer	\$51,618.86	-17.5%	\$65,874.49	-13.7%	\$80,130.11	-11.4%	55.1%	9
Golf Course Maintenance Supervisor	\$38,580.99	3.3%	\$49,576.90	2.5%	\$60,572.82	2.0%	56.1%	5
Human Resources Administrator	\$53,246.06	-20.5%	\$69,143.27	-18.5%	\$85,040.48	-17.3%	59.0%	8
Human Resources Analyst	\$44,247.22	-22.6%	\$56,207.64	-22.2%	\$68,168.05	-22.0%	53.6%	12
Inmate Services Coordinator	\$34,406.60	2.5%	\$43,784.64	2.7%	\$53,162.67	2.8%	55.0%	4
Investigator I - Medical Examiner	\$36,051.53	-3.0%	\$45,315.23	-0.7%	\$54,578.92	0.8%	51.8%	5
Investigator I - Prosecuting Attorney	\$43,902.56	-49.8%	\$53,421.61	-45.3%	\$62,940.67	-42.4%	43.4%	5
Legal Assistant	\$36,272.98	-26.2%	\$45,046.38	-23.7%	\$53,819.78	-22.0%	48.7%	9
Living History Interpreter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Network Support Technician	\$34,296.49	-9.5%	\$43,816.79	-9.6%	\$53,337.08	-9.7%	55.8%	9
Office Administrator	\$39,082.84	-22.4%	\$48,393.16	-19.5%	\$57,703.48	-17.5%	47.3%	8
Paralegal	\$38,996.67	-44.2%	\$47,126.40	-39.1%	\$55,256.13	-35.6%	40.7%	8
Park Ranger I	\$33,366.89	8.1%	\$41,381.40	-8.4%	\$49,395.92	-21.3%	48.2%	7
Payroll Specialist	\$36,488.87	-26.8%	\$44,875.62	-23.3%	\$53,262.36	-21.0%	45.7%	12
Prosecuting Attorney	\$84,411.29	N/A	\$106,846.68	N/A	\$129,282.07	N/A	52.7%	7
Public Health Specialist	\$39,497.83	-23.5%	\$49,156.30	-21.0%	\$58,814.77	-19.4%	49.4%	5
Records Representative	\$29,435.40	-34.4%	\$35,123.86	-31.5%	\$40,812.33	-29.5%	39.4%	6
Records Specialist	\$27,545.05	-10.2%	\$33,268.65	-4.8%	\$38,992.25	-1.1%	42.3%	7
Research Analyst	\$37,337.46	-29.0%	\$47,357.56	-28.6%	\$57,377.66	-28.3%	54.0%	5
Residential Appraiser	\$34,213.14	-20.4%	\$43,263.40	-19.7%	\$52,313.66	-19.2%	53.1%	7
Residential Property Appraisal Supervisor	\$43,673.12	-9.1%	\$54,171.08	-6.4%	\$64,669.05	-4.6%	48.3%	6
Senior Assistant Auditor	\$50,285.10	-20.2%	\$64,626.53	-17.1%	\$78,967.97	-15.3%	57.1%	5
Senior Buyer	\$40,253.47	-13.2%	\$51,982.30	-14.5%	\$63,711.13	-15.3%	58.4%	7
Senior Commercial Appraiser	\$38,790.09	-9.5%	\$49,203.08	-9.0%	\$59,616.07	-8.7%	53.8%	7
Senior Equipment Operator	\$30,499.28	2.3%	\$37,402.40	6.2%	\$44,305.52	8.8%	45.6%	10
Senior Software Engineer	\$56,184.87	-25.8%	\$71,548.81	-21.9%	\$86,912.76	-19.5%	54.7%	8
Shift Supervisor Lieutenant	\$49,305.97	-2.8%	\$61,860.51	-15.9%	\$74,415.06	-25.6%	51.0%	7
Superintendent of Recreation	\$60,133.28	-20.5%	\$75,418.59	-15.0%	\$90,703.91	-11.6%	49.6%	7
Support Center Administrator	\$66,015.45	-29.7%	\$83,183.11	-24.7%	\$100,350.78	-21.6%	51.8%	8
Support Services Specialist	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Systems Engineer	\$58,810.46	-30.3%	\$72,455.61	-23.2%	\$86,100.76	-18.5%	46.1%	7
Trial Team Leader	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Victim Advocate	\$33,751.50	-7.9%	\$42,367.49	-6.2%	\$50,983.47	-5.2%	51.1%	7
<b>Overall Average</b>		<b>-18.7%</b>		<b>-18.4%</b>		<b>-18.3%</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>7.7</b>
<b>Total</b>								<b>523</b>

## Market Minimums

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

**Exhibit 4B** illustrates that the County was, on average, approximately 18.7 percent below market at the minimum of their respective salary ranges for all surveyed classifications.

Several conclusions can be drawn based on the collected data:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 49.8 percent below market minimum for the Investigator I – Prosecuting Attorney classification to 8.1 percent above market for the Park Ranger I classification.
- Of the 62 classifications with market minimum percentage differentials, 57 (91.9 percent) were below market at the minimum, while the remaining five (8.1 percent) were above market at the minimum of surveyed salary ranges (**Note:** One classification does not have an established pay range).
- Thirty-six (36) surveyed positions were 20 percent or more below their respective market minimums.

## Market Midpoints

This subsection explores the comparison between average peer midpoints and the midpoints for classifications in the County. Market midpoints are important to consider as they are commonly recognized as the salary point at which employees have achieved full proficiency, and are performing satisfactorily in their classification.

**Exhibit 4B** illustrates that the County was, on average, approximately 18.4 percent below market at the midpoint of the respective salary ranges for all surveyed classifications.

Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 45.3 percent below market midpoint for the Investigator I – Prosecuting Attorney classification to 12.3 percent above market for the Accountant classification.
- Of the 60 classifications with market midpoint percentage differentials, 56 (93.3 percent) are below market at the midpoint, while the remaining four (6.7 percent) were above market at the midpoint of surveyed salary ranges (**Note:** Three classifications do not have established pay range midpoints).
- Twenty-eight (28) surveyed positions were 20 percent or more below their respective market midpoints.



## Market Maximums

The peer salary range maximums are compared to the County's range maximums for each benchmarked classification. The market maximum is significant as it represents the upper limit salary that an organization might provide to retain and/or reward experienced and high performing incumbents. Additionally, being competitive at the maximum allows organizations to retain highly qualified employees in classifications that are difficult to fill.

**Exhibit 4B** illustrates that the County was, on average, approximately 18.3 percent below market at the maximum of the respective salary ranges for all surveyed classifications.

Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 42.4 percent below market maximum for the Investigator I – Prosecuting Attorney classification to 16.4 percent above market for the Accountant classification.
- Of the 60 classifications with market maximum percentage differentials, 55 (91.7 percent) were below market at the maximum, while the remaining six (8.3 percent) were above market at the midpoint of surveyed salary ranges (**Note:** Three classifications do not have established pay range maximums).
- Twenty-seven (27) surveyed positions were 20 percent or more below their respective market maximums.

## Range Spreads

Range spreads (the width of salary ranges) allow for flexibility when determining hiring salaries, indicate the room for growth within a classification, and provide a metric for which the County can compare its current compensation structure to the rest of the market. Range spread is generally set between 50 to 70 percent for best practice.

**Exhibit 4B** shows the average market range spreads for each of the surveyed positions. The average market range spread across the salary ranges of all surveyed positions is 52.2 percent. The market range spreads vary between 34.7 percent for the Captain I classification and 68.5 percent for the Director of Human Resources classification. Overall, the County has much narrower range spreads compared to the market, with an overall average range spread of 39.4 percent across all pay ranges.

## **4.3 MARKET SURVEY SUMMARY**

From the analysis of the data gathered in the external labor market assessment, the following conclusions can be made:

- From 523 survey responses (7.7 per benchmarked classification), it was determined that Jackson County is approximately 18.7 percent below the market minimum, 18.4 percent below the market midpoint, and 18.3 percent below the market maximum of salary ranges of benchmark positions.

- The average market range spread across the salary ranges of all surveyed positions is 52.2 percent, which is broader than the 39.4 percent overall average found across all of the County’s pay ranges.

Information gained from the market survey is used in conjunction with current environmental factors (such as budget) to develop a recommended compensation system that places the County in a strong position to stay competitive in today’s market. A discussion of a proposed pay plan and study recommendations can be found in **Chapter 6** of this report.

## Chapter 5 – Benefits Survey Summary

Evergreen Solutions conducted a benefits survey for Jackson County. A benefits survey, much like a salary evaluation, represents a snapshot in time of what is available in peer organizations and can provide the organization with an understanding of the total compensation package (salary and benefits) offered by its peers.

This information should be used as a cursory overview and not a line-by-line comparison, since benefits can be weighted differently depending on the importance to the organization. Also, benefits are usually negotiated and acquired through third-parties, so one-to-one comparisons can be difficult. The analysis in this chapter highlights aspects of the benefits survey that provide pertinent information that can be considered reliably representative of market conditions.

Chapters includes the following sections:

- 5.1 – General Benefits
- 5.2 – Insurance Coverages
- 5.3 – Retirement
- 5.4 – Leave
- 5.5 – Fringe Benefits
- 5.6 – Conclusion

As shown in **Exhibit 5A**, 20 market peers were asked to participate and benefits data were obtained from 17 organizations.

### 5.1 GENERAL BENEFITS

**Exhibit 5B** displays the comparison of organizational demographics between the County and responding peers. The average workforce for responding peers was 2,113 employees (89.3 percent) and 253 part-time employees (11.0 percent). By comparison the County is smaller, with 1,056 full-time employees (not including vacant positions).

Benefits as a percent of total compensation is a broad common indicator that is used to assess how generous benefits are at individual organizations. Total compensation refers to the total dollar amount an employee receives from the organization and is generally calculated as the employee's salary plus all benefits (expressed as a dollar amount). Therefore, benefits as a percentage of total compensation is calculated by dividing benefits by the amount of total compensation. Benefits as a percentage of total compensation for the County are approximately 35.0 percent; by comparison, the market average was found to be 30.1 percent.



**EXHIBIT 5A  
BENEFITS SURVEY RESPONDENTS**

Market Peer	
Counties	
Clay County, MO*	
Greene County, MO	
Johnson County, KS	
Sedgwick County, KS	
St. Charles County, MO	
St. Louis County, MO	
Wyandotte County, KS	
Cities	
City of Blue Springs*	
City of Independence	
City of Kansas City	
City of Lee’s Summit	
City of Omaha, NE	
City of Overland Park, KS	
City of St. Louis	
City of Des Moines, IA	
City of Wichita, KS	
Other	
U.S. Federal Government	
State of Missouri Government	
Truman Medical Center	
University of Kansas Medical Center*	

\* No benefits data obtained

**EXHIBIT 5B  
COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS**

Organization Demographics	Peer Average		Jackson County	
Full-Time Employees	2,113	89.3%	1,056	100.0%
Part-Time Employees	253	10.7%	-	0.0%



## 5.2 INSURANCE COVERAGES

### Health

Responding peers provide an average of 2.9 health plans (any combination of HMO, PPO, or another type of plan) to their employees. As shown, 20.0 percent offer an HMO plan, 80.0 percent offer a PPO plan, and 66.7 percent offer some other sort of health plan. Among the other types of plans offered by 66.7 percent of responding peers, the most common are HSAs (Health Savings Accounts), HDHPs (High Deductible Health Plans), and POS (Point of Service) plans. **Exhibits 5C, 5D, and 5E** display data on the types of health plans offered by the peers in comparison with what is offered by Jackson County.

**Exhibit 5C** indicates that among the 18.8 percent of responding peers that provide their employees HMO plans, the average employer contribution to premiums ranges from \$471.39 for employee-only coverage to \$1,177.42 for employee-plus-family coverage. The County offers an HMO plan and its contributions, by comparison, range from \$583.58 for employee-only coverage to \$1,470.09 for employee-plus-family coverage.

**Exhibit 5D** shows that among the 81.3 percent of responding peers that provide their employees with PPO plans, employer contributions to premiums range from \$580.90 for employee-only coverage to \$1,122.73 for employee-plus-family coverage. By comparison, the County offers two PPO plans and the average contribution ranges from \$577.41 for employee-only coverage to \$1,436.20 for employee-plus-family coverage.

**Exhibit 5E** displays all other plans (i.e. HSAs, HDHPs, POS, etc.) that 62.5 percent of responding peers provide to their employees. Average employer contributions to premiums among responding peers range from \$523.17 for employee-only coverage to \$1,257.15 for employee-plus-family coverage. The County, by comparison, offers three plans—two EPO (Exclusive Provider Organization) plans and a HDHP—and the average contribution to premiums ranges from \$562.91 for employee-only coverage to \$1,305.38 for employee-plus-family coverage.

### Dental

**Exhibit 5F** shows that 70.6 percent of responding peers offer employer-paid dental insurance for employees. The average premium ranges from \$27.13 for employee-only coverage to \$57.68 for employee-plus-family coverage; by comparison, the County offers three employer-paid plans and the premiums for all three range from \$4.38 for employee-only coverage to \$11.00 for employee-plus-family coverage.

As shown in **Exhibit 5G**, all responding peers provide employee-paid dental insurance. The average cost to peer employees ranges from \$17.09 for employee-only coverage to \$55.78 for employee-plus-family coverage. The County offers three different employee-paid plans by comparison; the cheapest plan (in terms of premiums) has costs that range from \$4.38 for employee-only coverage to \$11.00 for employee-plus-family coverage, while the most expensive plan has costs that range from \$23.26 for employee-only coverage to \$79.97 for employee-plus family coverage.



**EXHIBIT 5C  
COMPARISON OF HMO HEALTH PLANS**

Health Plan Premiums & Deductibles	Peer HMO Average	Jackson County
Percentage of peers offering each plan	18.8%	HMO - Blue Care
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	\$471.39	\$583.58
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	90.5%	83.6%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	\$49.48	\$114.69
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	9.5%	16.4%
Individual maximum deductible in-network	*	\$0.00
Individual maximum deductible out-of-network	*	\$0.00
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	\$961.98	N/A
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	83.5%	N/A
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	\$190.24	N/A
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	16.5%	N/A
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible in-network	*	N/A
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible out-of-network	*	N/A
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	\$909.61	\$1,267.01
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	83.1%	79.8%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	\$184.38	\$320.23
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	16.9%	20.2%
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible in-network	*	\$0.00
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible out-of-network	*	\$0.00
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	\$1,177.42	\$1,470.09
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	79.3%	75.1%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	\$307.45	\$488.52
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	20.7%	24.9%
Employee plus family maximum deductible in-network	*	\$0.00
Employee plus family maximum deductible out-of-network	*	\$0.00

\* Insufficient data were gathered to calculate an average that is reliably representative of the market.



**EXHIBIT 5D  
COMPARISON OF PPO HEALTH PLANS**

Health Plan Premiums & Deductibles	Peer PPO Average	Jackson County	
		Blue Saver QHDHP PPO Preferred Care Blue	Traditional PPO Preferred Care Blue
Percentage of peers offering each plan	81.3%		
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	\$580.90	\$572.28	\$582.53
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	90.5%	89.1%	85.2%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	\$60.77	\$70.14	\$101.48
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	9.5%	10.9%	14.8%
Individual maximum deductible in-network	\$1,122.73	\$2,700.00	\$1,000.00
Individual maximum deductible out-of-network	\$2,138.10	\$2,700.00	\$2,500.00
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	\$917.99	N/A	N/A
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	77.7%	N/A	N/A
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	\$264.00	N/A	N/A
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	22.3%	N/A	N/A
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible in-network	\$2,322.73	N/A	N/A
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible out-of-network	\$4,368.18	N/A	N/A
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	\$1,042.15	\$1,237.59	\$1,257.60
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	79.8%	83.7%	80.6%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	\$264.00	\$240.19	\$302.06
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	20.2%	16.3%	19.4%
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible in-network	\$2,304.76	\$5,400.00	\$2,000.00
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible out-of-network	\$4,676.19	\$5,400.00	\$4,500.00
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	\$1,274.24	\$1,418.32	\$1,454.08
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	79.2%	79.0%	75.9%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	\$334.07	\$376.35	\$462.19
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	20.8%	21.0%	24.1%
Employee plus family maximum deductible in-network	\$2,371.43	\$5,400.00	\$2,000.00
Employee plus family maximum deductible out-of-network	\$4,880.95	\$5,400.00	\$4,500.00

**EXHIBIT 5E  
COMPARISON OF OTHER HEALTH PLANS**

Health Plan Premiums & Deductibles	Other Plans Average	Jackson County		
		EPO Blue Select Plus	EPO Spira Care Blue Select Plus	QHDHP & Spira Care Blue Select Plus
Percentage of peers offering each plan	62.5%			
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	\$523.17	\$575.85	\$566.04	\$546.84
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	95.0%	92.9%	94.1%	99.3%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	\$27.32	\$44.30	\$35.24	\$4.00
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	5.0%	7.1%	5.9%	0.7%
Individual maximum deductible in-network	\$1,627.27	\$0.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,700.00
Individual maximum deductible out-of-network	\$2,685.71	Not covered	Not covered	Not covered
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	\$1,036.20	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	86.6%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	\$160.95	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	13.4%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible in-network	\$3,254.55	N/A	N/A	N/A
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible out-of-network	\$5,585.71	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	\$1,098.17	\$1,251.91	\$1,225.41	\$1,181.98
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	85.0%	88.7%	89.5%	93.2%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	\$193.94	\$159.27	\$143.11	\$86.74
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	15.0%	11.3%	10.5%	6.8%
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible in-network	\$3,254.55	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$5,400.00
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible out-of-network	\$5,585.71	Not covered	Not covered	Not covered
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	\$1,257.15	\$1,149.70	\$1,402.31	\$1,364.13
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	81.6%	79.8%	83.1%	88.6%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	\$283.95	\$290.51	\$285.17	\$175.74
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	18.4%	20.2%	16.9%	11.4%
Employee plus family maximum deductible in-network	\$3,254.55	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$5,400.00
Employee plus family maximum deductible out-of-network	\$5,585.71	Not covered	Not covered	Not covered

**EXHIBIT 5F  
COMPARISON OF DENTAL AND VISION PLANS  
EMPLOYER-PAID**

Dental and Vision Coverage		Offered?	Average Number of Plans Offered	Average Maximum Monthly Amount Employer Pays for Employee-only Coverage	Average Maximum Monthly Amount Employer Pays for Employee-plus-Dependent Coverage	Average Maximum Monthly Amount Employer Pays for Employee-plus-Family Coverage
Dental Insurance	Employer-Paid	70.6%	1.5	\$27.13	\$47.70	\$57.68
	Jackson County	Yes	3.0	\$4.38	\$7.14	\$11.00
Vision Plan	Employer Paid	41.2%	1.0	\$7.09	\$13.01	\$13.17
	Jackson County	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**EXHIBIT 5G  
COMPARISON OF DENTAL AND VISION PLANS  
EMPLOYEE-PAID**

Dental and Vision Coverage		Offered?	Average Number of Plans Offered	Average Maximum Monthly Amount Employee Pays for Employee-only Coverage	Average Maximum Monthly Amount Employee Pays for Employee-plus-Dependent Coverage	Average Maximum Monthly Amount Employee Pays for Employee-plus-Family Coverage
Dental Insurance	Employee-Paid	100.0%	1.8	\$17.09	\$39.37	\$55.78
	Jackson County	Yes	3.0	\$4.38/\$13.10/\$23.26	\$7.12/\$25.23/\$47.36	\$11.00/\$47.29/\$79.97
Vision Plan	Employee Paid	82.4%	1.1	\$5.53	\$11.33	\$16.56
	Jackson County	Yes	1.0	\$5.57	\$10.58	\$16.37

**Vision**

**Exhibits 5F and 5G** also provide a comparison of vision plans. As shown in **Exhibit 5F**, 41.2 percent of responding peers offer employer-paid vision insurance for employees and the average cost to peer organizations ranges from \$7.09 for employee-only coverage to \$13.17 for employee-plus-family coverage. By comparison, Jackson County does not offer an employer-paid vision plan.

**Exhibit 5G** indicates that 81.3 percent offer employee-paid plans with an average cost to peer employees that ranges from \$5.53 for employee-only coverage to \$16.56 for employee-plus-family coverage. By comparison, the County offers an employee-paid plan that has a monthly cost to employees ranging from \$5.57 for employee-only coverage to \$10.58 for employee-plus-family coverage.

**Disability Plans**

**Exhibit 5H** shows that 18.8 percent of responding peers offer employer-paid short-term disability insurance for employees, while 66.8 provide long-term coverage. Insufficient data were gathered to calculate average peer costs for both types, as they often depend upon various factors such as the employee’s salary. Too few peers provide employer-paid short-term coverage to calculate a reliable average, but for long-term coverage the average benefit is 60.6 percent of the employee’s salary. By comparison, the County does not provide employer paid long-term coverage, but does provide short-term coverage with a benefit of 60 percent of the employee’s salary.

**EXHIBIT 5H  
COMPARISON OF DISABILITY PLANS  
EMPLOYER-PAID**

Disability Coverage		Offered?	Maximum Monthly Amount Employer Pays for Coverage	Percentage of Salary the Employee Receives
Short-Term Disability	Employer Paid	18.8%	1	1
	Jackson County	Yes	2	60.0%
Long-Term Disability	Employer Paid	66.8%	1	60.6%
	Jackson County	No	N/A	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Insufficient data were gathered to calculate an average that can reliably be considered representative of the market.

<sup>2</sup> Depends on the employee’s salary

As shown in **Exhibit 5I**, 50.0 percent of responding peers provide employee-paid short-term disability insurance to their employees, and 50.0 percent provide long-term coverage. Like the employer-paid coverages, insufficient data were gathered to calculate average peer costs for both types, as they often depend upon the employee’s salary. For short-term coverage the average benefit is 57.5 percent of salary, while long-term coverage averages 46.0 percent of the employee’s salary. By comparison, the County does not provide employee-paid short-term coverage, but does provide long-term coverage with a monthly cost which varies based on the employee’s age and salary and a benefit of 60.0 percent of the employee’s salary.



**EXHIBIT 5I  
COMPARISON OF DISABILITY PLANS  
EMPLOYEE-PAID**

Disability Coverage		Offered?	Maximum Monthly Amount Employee Pays for Coverage	Percentage of Salary the Employee Receives
Short-Term Disability	Employee Paid	50.0%	*	57.5%
	Jackson County	No	N/A	N/A
Long-Term Disability	Employee Paid	50.0%	*	46.0%
	Jackson County	Yes	†	60.0%

\* Insufficient data were gathered to calculate an average that can reliably be considered representative of the market.

† Based on age and salary

**Life**

Exhibit 5J summarizes the life insurance offerings of responding peers and Jackson County. Overall, all responding peers offer employer-paid life insurance, 94.1 percent offer optional dependent coverage, all offer additional life insurance, and 82.4 percent offer accidental death coverage; the County offers all by comparison. The average benefit amount among responding peers was \$29,000, with an average cost to the employer of \$2.03/month; the County offers a benefit of up to \$15,000 which costs them \$1.05 per \$15,000 of coverage. Among many responding peers, the average monthly cost and benefit amount depend upon various factors, such as the employee’s age and salary.

**EXHIBIT 5J  
COMPARISON OF LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE**

Life Insurance	Peer Average	Jackson County
Is employer-paid life insurance offered?	100.0%	Yes
Cost (monthly) to employer for individual coverage	\$2.03	\$1.05 per \$15,000 of coverage
Dollar amount of death benefit	\$29,000	\$15,000
Is optional dependent coverage offered?	94.1%	Yes
Can the employee purchase additional life insurance if desired?	100.0%	Yes
Is accidental death insurance provided?	82.4%	Yes

**5.3 RETIREMENT**

Exhibit 5K shows that responding peers provide their employees an average of 1.7 retirement options, compared with the one offered by the County—the Jackson County Revised Pension Plan. Among responding peers, 84.6 percent participate in a State Retirement Plan and 38.5 percent offer at least one retirement option other than a State Plan.



**EXHIBIT 5K  
COMPARISON OF RETIREMENT OPTIONS**

Retirement Details	Peer Average	Jackson County
Number of retirement plans offered	1.7	1.0
Number of years required to fully vest	4.0	5.0
Is a COLA offered to retiree pensions?	100.0%	Yes
If offered, does COLA vary?	80.0%	Yes
Does the retirement plan offer a disability provision?	50.0%	Yes
Percent of salary the organization contributes to retirement option	10.0%	100.0%
Percent of salary the employee contributes to retirement option	4.2%	0.0%

**Exhibit 5K** also shows the details of these retirement options on average and the comparable within Jackson County. The average number of years required to fully vest in non-state retirement plans is 4.0 among responding peers. All responding peers offer a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to retiree pensions and this COLA varies for 80.0 percent of responding peers that offer one. Also, 50.0 percent offer a disability provision as part of their retirement plan. The average contribution by the employer is 10.0 percent and is 4.2 percent for employees. By comparison, the County offers and pays for one retirement plan that requires five years to fully vest; a COLA is offered to retiree pensions and varies. The County’s retirement plan also offers a disability provision.

**Exhibit 5L** summarizes a comparison of other retirement options offered between responding peers and the County. As shown, 31.3 percent of responding peers provide a Deferred Retirement Option Plan (DROP) and 33.3 percent responding positively contribute to the plan; all offer either a 401k, 401a, 403(b), or 457 plan and 37.5 percent responding positively contribute to such plans; and 6.7 percent provide some other form of retirement plans and all responding peers positively contribute.

**EXHIBIT 5L  
COMPARISON OF OTHER RETIREMENT OPTIONS**

Other Retirement Options		Offered?	If so, does the employer contribute to this option?	If so, how much is contributed?
Deferred Retirement Option Plan (DROP)	Peer Average	31.3%	33.3%	*
	Jackson County	No	N/A	N/A
401k, 401a, 403(b), or 457	Peer Average	100.0%	37.5%	4.3%
	Jackson County	Yes	No	N/A
Other	Peer Average	6.7%	100.0%	*
	Jackson County	No	N/A	N/A

\* Insufficient data were gathered to calculate an average that is reliably representative of the market.

**Exhibit 5M** displays responses relating to retiree health coverages. As shown, 82.4 percent of responding peers offer health insurance to retirees, 64.7 percent offer dental insurance, 70.6 percent offer vision insurance, and 29.4 percent offer life insurance. By comparison, the County offers health and dental insurance, but does not offer vision and life insurance to retirees.

**EXHIBIT 5M  
COMPARISON OF RETIREE INSURANCE COVERAGES**

Insurance for Retirees	Peer Average	Jackson County
Is health insurance offered?	82.4%	Yes
Is dental insurance offered?	64.7%	Yes
Is vision insurance offered?	70.6%	No
Is life insurance offered?	29.4%	No

## 5.4 LEAVE

**Exhibit 5N** shows that 93.8 percent of responding peers offer sick leave, 87.5 percent offer annual/vacation leave, 50.0 percent offer personal leave, and 20.0 percent offer paid time off (PTO). By comparison, Jackson County offers sick, annual/vacation, and personal leave, but does not provide PTO.

### Sick Leave

The average minimum monthly accrual rate among responding peers was 6.3 hours for sick leave which begins after 0.1 years of employment and the average maximum monthly accrual rate was 7.4 hours which begins after 0.5 years of employment; on average, peers cap sick leave at 95.3 hours per year. By comparison, the monthly sick leave accrual rate at the County is 8.0 hours which begins accruing immediately upon employment; leave is capped at 96 annual hours.

### Annual Leave

The average minimum monthly accrual rate among responding peers was 6.4 hours for annual leave which begins after 0.1 years of employment; the maximum monthly accrual rate is 14.1 hours which begins after an average of 16.3 years of employment; on average, peers cap annual leave at 259.8 hours per year. By comparison, county has a banded system where an employee with less than 5 years of employment accrues 3.1 hours per month and is capped at 120 annual hours; employees with five to ten years of employment accrue 4.6 hours per month and are capped at 180 annual hours; employees with ten to 15 years accrue 6.2 hours per month and are capped at 240 hours; and employees with 15 years of employment or more accrue 7.7 hours per month and are capped at 240 annual hours.





**EXHIBIT 5N  
COMPARISON OF LEAVE ACCRUAL**

Leave Accrual		Offered?	Monthly Minimum Accrual Rate (Hours)	Years of Service Required to Begin Accruing at Minimum Rate	Monthly Maximum Accrual Rate (Hours)	Years of Service Required to Begin Accruing at Maximum Rate	Absolute Maximum Total Accrual for a Year (Hours)				
Sick Leave	Peer Average	94.1%	6.3	0.1	7.4	0.5	95.3				
	Jackson County	Yes	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	96.0				
Annual/Vacation Leave	Peer Average	88.2%	6.4	0.1	14.1	16.3	259.8				
	Jackson County	Yes	*	*	*	*	*				
Personal Leave	Peer Average	46.7%					24.7				
	Jackson County	Yes					8.0				
Paid Time Off (PTO)	Peer Average	18.8%									†
	Jackson County	No									N/A

\* Annual/vacation leave varies between County employees.

† Insufficient data were gathered to calculate an average that is reliably representative of the market.

**Personal Leave**

Among responding peers, 46.7 percent provide employees personal leave and the average number of annual hours is 24.7. By comparison, the County offers 8.0 hours per year.

**Paid Time Off**

Among responding peers, 18.8 percent provide their employees with paid time off (PTO). However, due to so few offering this benefit, insufficient data were gathered to calculate a reliable average. By comparison, the County does not provide PTO.

**Paid Leave Upon Separation**

**Exhibit 50** summarizes policies regarding sick leave payout among peers and in the County. Sick leave is paid out by 60.0 percent of responding peers upon voluntary separation and all responding positively cap payout at 1,451.7 hours, on average; 33.3 percent pay out upon involuntary separation and all responding positively cap payout at 1,157.5 hours, on average. Also, 50.0 percent allow unused sick leave to count toward retirement and 66.7 percent responding positively cap those hours. By comparison, the County pays out unused sick leave in both cases of voluntary and involuntary separation. A cap of five percent is placed on employees with one year of employment; ten percent for employees with two years; 15 percent for those with three years; 20 percent for those with four years; and 25 percent for those with five years or more of employment. Also, the County does not allow unused sick leave to count towards retirement.

**EXHIBIT 50  
COMPARISON OF PAID LEAVE POLICIES**

Paid Leave Upon Separation		Paid out upon voluntary separation?	If so, are hours capped?	If so, what are the maximum hours?	Paid out upon involuntary separation?	If so, are hours capped?	If so, what are the maximum hours?	Can unused leave count towards retirement?	If so, are hours capped?	If so, what are the maximum hours?
Sick Leave	Peer Average	60.0%	100.0%	1,451.7	33.3%	100.0%	1157.5	50.0%	66.7%	*
	Jackson County	Yes	Yes	†	Yes	Yes	†	No	N/A	N/A
Annual/Vacation Leave	Peer Average	100.0%	78.6%	358.0	93.3%	84.6%	374.9			
	Jackson County	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A			

\* Insufficient data were gathered to calculate an average that is reliably representative of the market.

† one year of service = 5%; two years = 10%; three years = 15%; four years = 20%; five or more years = 25%

**Exhibit 50** also summarizes policies regarding annual/vacation leave payout among peers and in the County. Annual/vacation leave is paid out by all responding peers upon voluntary separation and 78.6 percent responding positively cap payout at 358.0 hours, on average; 84.6 percent pay out upon involuntary separation and 91.7 percent responding positively cap payout at 374.9 hours, on average. By comparison, the County pays out unused sick/vacation leave for both voluntary and involuntary separation and does not cap the payout.

**5.5 FRINGE BENEFITS**

As shown in **Exhibit 5P**, all responding peers offer an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) to employees and their family members, with an average of 5.3 annual visits available. By comparison, the County offers an EAP to employees and their family members and caps annual visits at three.

**EXHIBIT 5P  
EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

Employee Assistance Program	Peer Average	Jackson County
Is an employer-paid Employee Assistance Program offered?	100.0%	Yes
If so, are benefits also available to family members?	100.0%	Yes
Number of annual visits provided?	5.3	3.0

As seen in **Exhibit 5Q**, 52.9 percent of responding peers indicated that they provide tuition reimbursement for employees and the average plan limit is \$2,800 annually; many responding peers set credit hour limits instead of a financial limit. The County also offers tuition reimbursement and the reimbursement varies depending on the department's budget.

**EXHIBIT 5Q  
TUITION REIMBURSEMENT**

Tuition Reimbursement	Peer Average	Jackson County
Is tuition reimbursement offered?	52.9%	Yes
If so, what is the limit?	\$2,800.00	*

\* Depends on department budget

As seen in **Exhibit 5R**, 31.3 percent of responding peers offer longevity pay, 73.3 percent offer merit raises, 26.7 percent offer merit bonuses, and 18.8 percent offer some other form of incentive pay. By comparison, the County offers only merit raises when budgeted and the amount varies based upon a performance evaluation.

**EXHIBIT 5R  
ADDITIONAL PAY**

Additional Pay	Peer Average	Jackson County
Longevity Pay	31.3%	No
Merit Raises	73.3%	Yes*
Bonuses	26.7%	No
Other	18.8%	No

\* When budgeted and the amount varies on performance evaluation

As seen in **Exhibit 5S**, 88.2 percent of responding peers provide a wellness program, 64.7 percent provide gym membership or access to a gym, 35.3 percent offer fitness, and 52.9 percent offer weight management incentive programs. By comparison, the County offers a wellness program, a gym membership reimbursement of \$55.00, fitness classes by a wellness coordinator, and a weight management incentive program.

**EXHIBIT 5S  
WELLNESS PROGRAMS**

Wellness Programs	Peer Average	Jackson County
Is a wellness program provided to employees?	88.2%	Yes
Is gym membership or access to a gym provided?	64.7%	No*
Are fitness classes offered to employees?	35.3%	Yes†
Are weight management incentive programs offered?	52.9%	Yes‡

\* Associates are reimbursed \$55 for wellness expenses (i.e. gym membership, personal trainer, weight management, etc.)

† Offered by wellness coordinator

‡ Weight Watchers at work



As seen in **Exhibit 5T**, 82.4 percent of responding peers provide parking for employees; 46.2 percent of responding peers said there is a charge for parking. Parking costs \$14.00 monthly, on average. None of the responding peers reimburse parking-related expenses. By comparison, the County provides parking at no cost to employees.

### EXHIBIT 5T PARKING

Parking	Peer Average	Jackson County
Is parking provided for employees?	82.4%	Yes
If so, is there a charge?	46.2%	No
If so, what is the monthly charge?	\$14.00	N/A
If parking is not provided, are employees reimbursed for any parking-related expenses?	0.0%	N/A

### Paid Holidays

The percentage of peers that offer various paid holidays is shown in **Exhibit 5U**. On average, responding peers offer 10.9 holidays to employees, compared to the 11 (including one floating holiday) offered by the County.

As seen in **Exhibit 5V**, 57.9 percent of responding peers provide straight time holiday pay to their employees, 36.8 pay time and a half if the hours worked exceed the maximum for straight time, and 5.3 percent pay time and a half regardless of the hours worked during the pay period. By comparison, the County pays employees straight time, in addition to the other two options dependent on labor agreements in place and personnel rules.

### EXHIBIT 5U PAID HOLIDAYS

Paid Holiday	Peer Average	Jackson County
New Year's Day	100.0%	Yes
New Year's Eve	5.9%	No
Martin Luther King, Jr. Day	94.1%	Yes
Lincoln's Birthday	23.5%	No
Washington's Birthday	11.8%	No
Presidents Day	82.4%	Yes
Good Friday	11.8%	No
Memorial Day	100.0%	Yes
Independence Day	100.0%	Yes
Labor Day	100.0%	Yes
Veteran's Day	82.4%	Yes
Thanksgiving Day	94.1%	Yes
Day after Thanksgiving	88.2%	Yes
Christmas Eve	23.5%	No
Christmas Day	94.1%	Yes
Personal Holiday	29.4%	Yes
Employee Birthday	11.8%	No
<b>Total Paid Holidays Observed</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>12.0*</b>

\* Includes Truman's Birthday



**EXHIBIT 5V  
HOLIDAY PAY POLICIES**

Holiday Policies	Peer Average	Jackson County
How are employees paid for holidays?		
Straight time	57.9%	Yes
Time and a half if hours worked exceed maximum for straight time	36.8%	*
Time and a half regardless of hours worked during the pay period	5.3%	*

\* Where applicable, pay is dependent on labor agreements in place and in conjunction with personnel rules

**5.6 CONCLUSION**

Overall, the peer benefits data summarized in this chapter indicate that Jackson County has a higher overall total benefits package than responding peers. When single benefits are analyzed in isolation, the County is ahead of the market in the following specific areas:

- dental insurance;
- vision insurance;
- sick leave;
- tuition reimbursement;
- wellness programs; and
- paid holidays.

The County is weaker in areas such as health insurance premiums, its Employee Assistance Program, annual/vacation leave accrual rates, and the provision of additional forms of pay.

## Chapter 6 - Recommendations

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

The recommendations in this chapter seek to build on the strengths of the classification and compensation plan in Jackson County and also to address the challenges observed by Evergreen consultants over the course of the study. Internal factors such as the future direction of the County, the organizational culture, and availability of resources influenced these recommendations. Each recommendation has also been developed to address a specific need based on the collected information while taking into account the external environment. Arriving at the overall solution for the County was a detailed process involving all components of the research conducted which were reviewed and discussed in previous chapters of this report.

The recommendations presented in this chapter seek to build on the strengths of the current system while addressing the areas of opportunity discovered over the course of the study. Evergreen is proposing changes to the County's structure that use the existing plan as a foundation while improving market competitiveness.

### 6.2 CLASSIFICATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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 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 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 and levels.

In the analysis of the County's classification system, 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 County's classifications. The MIT process provided supervisors an opportunity to provide specific recommendations regarding the pay or classification of positions in their areas.

Two additional secondary processes were performed prior to the completion of the JAT and MIT submission period. Evergreen conducted a series of job series specific focus groups and individual interviews in order to further clarify and explore issues related to the County's compensation and classification systems. Evergreen reviewed and utilized the data provided

in the JATs and MITs, as well as through the secondary discussions, as a basis for the classification recommendations below.

## FINDING

The classification system being used by the County was found to be generally accurate and job titles typically described the work being performed by employees. However, it was found that some classification titles did not accurately reflect the pay grade or tasks completed by the employee. Evergreen has proposed 84 classification changes within the current classification system. A comprehensive listing of the classification changes can be found in Exhibit 6A.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: Adopt the 84 classification title changes proposed in Exhibit 6A.**

### EXHIBIT 6A PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION TITLE CHANGES

Current Classification Title	Recommended Classification Title
Administrative Assistant	Administrative Assistant II
Administrative Specialist	Administrative Assistant III
Anti-Drug Program Administrator	Program Administrator
Assistant Director for Enterprise Software	Director of Information Technology/GIS, Assistant
Assistant Director of Collections	Director of Collections, Deputy
Assistant Director of IT/GIS	Director of Information Technology/GIS, Deputy
Assistant to County Executive	Executive Assistant
Audit/Appeals Examiner	Business Personal Property Auditor, Senior
Billing Clerk	Bookkeeper, Assistant
Board of Equalization Specialist	Board of Equalization Supervisor
Budget Officer	Budget Administrator
Building Repairman	Building Specialist
Building Services Specialist	Custodian, Head
Building Services Technician	Custodian
Building Trade Foreman	Foreman - Building Trades
Captain	Corrections Captain
Captain 1	Sheriff Captain I
Captain 2	Sheriff Captain II
Chief Trial Assistant	Division Chief
Child Support Enforcement Technician I	Child Support Enforcement Technician
Child Support Enforcement Technician II	Child Support Enforcement Specialist
Clerk	Administrative Assistant I
Clerk	Bankruptcy Specialist
Clerk	Collections Specialist
Clerk - Collections	Administrative Assistant I
Clerk - Personal Property Tax	Administrative Assistant I
Clerk - Sore	Administrative Assistant I
Clerk - Warrants	Administrative Assistant I
Communications Marketing Administrator	Combat Marketing Administrator
Comms/E-Govt Coordinator/Public Info Officer	Public Information Officer
Concession Administrator	Concession Supervisor
Concession Specialist	Concession Coordinator
Corrections Officer I	Corrections Officer II
Deputy Director of Assessment for Administration	Director of Assessment, Deputy
Director of Family Support Services	Director (Prosecuting Attorney)
Director of Personal Property Tax	Director of Intergovernmental Affairs

**EXHIBIT 6A (Continued)**  
**PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION TITLE CHANGES**

Current Classification Title	Recommended Classification Title
Division Chief	Division Chief (Prosecuting Attorney)
Executive Assistant to Prosecutor	Executive Assistant
Facilities Management Administrator	Director of Facilities Management, Deputy
Finance and Systems Supervisor	Finance and Systems Administrator
Foreman	Foreman - Golf Course
Foreman	Foreman - Natural Resources
Foreman	Foreman - Park Operations
Foreman	Foreman - Recreation
Foreman	Foreman - Road and Bridge Maintenance
Foreman	Foreman - Softball Park
Inmate Services Administrator	Corrections Classification Administrator
Inmate Services Coordinator	Corrections Case Worker
Inmate Worker Recreation Coordinator	Corrections Recreation Coordinator
Lead Clerk	Administrative Assistant II
Lead Records Representative	Records Representative
Legislative Aide - Personal Property Tax	Legislative Aide
Office Administrator	Administrative Assistant III
Office Coordinator	Administrative Assistant III
Operations Administrator	Office Administrator
Park Ranger I	Park Ranger II
Park Ranger II	Park Ranger III
Personnel/Payroll Analyst	Payroll Specialist
Probationary Corrections Officer	Corrections Officer I
Probationary Park Ranger	Park Ranger I
Program Analyst	Heritage Programs and Museums Coordinator
Program Manager	Combat Programs Administrator
Program Services Supervisor	Inmate Program Services Coordinator
Project/Quality Control Inspector	Project Inspector
Recreation Therapist II	Recreation Therapist
Regional Correctional Center Deputy Director	Correctional Center Deputy Director
Regional Correctional Center Director	Correctional Center Director
Secretary to Public Administrator	Administrative Assistant I
Senior Administrative Assistant	Administrative Assistant II
Senior Administrative Manager	Administrative Manager
Senior Assistant Auditor	Assistant Auditor, Senior
Senior Bad Check Collector	Bad Check Collector
Senior Database Administrator	Database Administrator
Senior Equipment Operator	Equipment Operator III
Senior Information Security Manager	Information Security Manager
Senior Park Ranger	Park Ranger IV
Senior Project Manager	Assessment Project Manager
Sergeant 1	Sheriff Sergeant I
Sergeant 2	Sheriff Sergeant II
Sergeant 3	Sheriff Sergeant III
Sergeant 4	Sheriff Sergeant IV
Shift Supervisor Lieutenant	Corrections Lieutenant
Special Assessment Supervisor	Special Assessment Coordinator
Special Duties Officer	IT Support Specialist
Special Populations Services Administrator	Special Populations Services Supervisor
Supervisor	Construction Supervisor
Supervisor	Natural Resources Supervisor
Supervisor	Park Operations Supervisor
Support Center Administrator	IT Support Center Administrator
Team Leader Sergeant	Corrections Sergeant





## FINDING

Evergreen will be providing the County with updated job descriptions, which encompass any edits or changes necessary to reflect the most current work being performed in the role. Also, included with the updated descriptions, Evergreen provided a recommendation on the FLSA status of each classification as it relates to the updated tasks and responsibilities listed in the new description. The basis for these recommendations comes from the input from employees and supervisors provided during the JAT collection process.

The updated classification specifications are separate from this report and are being provided to the County's human resources staff under separate cover.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: Update current classification specifications and corresponding FLSA status to align with the selected classification structure and be reflective of the employee-provided JAT information.**

## 6.3 COMPENSATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The compensation system analysis consisted of three parts:

- an assessment of the current compensation system;
- an external salary survey; and
- an internal equity assessment (JAT).

Upon receiving data related to the County's salary schedules and employees, an assessment was performed to examine the nature of the existing salary schedules, the progression of employee salaries through pay grades, employee tenure, and the distribution of employees in the County. The findings of this assessment are summarized in **Chapter 3** of this report.

During the market salary survey, the County's pay ranges for selected benchmarked classifications were compared to the average of the identified market. Details regarding the market salary survey were provided in **Chapter 4** of this report.

The internal equity assessment (JAT) reviewed and analyzed the relationships between and the type of work being performed by the County's employees. Specifically, a composite score was assigned to each of the County's classifications that quantified the classification's level on five separate compensatory factors. The level for each factor was determined based on responses to the JAT.

These compensatory (job) factors are:

- **Leadership** - degree to which a position receives direction or provides direction to others.
- **Working Conditions** - degree to which a position operates in an environment of change or risk to oneself or others



- **Complexity** - degree to which higher level educational, knowledge, or analytical abilities must be utilized
- **Decision Making** - degree to which a position acts autonomously and oversees the actions of others.
- **Relationships** – degree to which the position interacts with others

## FINDING\*

Ensuring that the structural elements of a salary schedule are competitive with the market is just as important as ensuring actual salaries are competitive with other organizations. As such, a component of this study included assessing the structure (salary schedules) used in administering compensation in the County.

The current system has a number of inconsistencies as discussed in **Chapter 3**:

- **Range Spread** – Range spreads throughout the County salary schedules vary significantly—5.0 to 65.1 percent, with an average of 39.4 percent. This spread is not in keeping with the common practice of setting spreads between 50 and 70 percent.
- **Midpoint Progression** – Midpoint progressions also vary significantly throughout the different schedules—10.0 to 29.3 percent, with an average of 14.1 percent. The current midpoint progression was not in keeping with the common practice of setting progression between three and five percent.
- **Salary Placement** – The vast majority of employees are compensated below their pay grade’s midpoint—with over half in the first quartile alone.
- **Grade Penetration** – The County generally maintains a healthy positive linear relationship between experience and pay.

Therefore, Evergreen is proposing changes to the County’s existing compensation structure. Whereas the County currently has seven separate salary schedules, Evergreen is proposing a single, unified schedule which will transition over the next three years to the desired living wage of \$15 per hour by 2022. For each of the next three years, the proposed salary schedule will feature the following common elements:

- twenty-nine (29) separate pay grades;
- a constant range spread of 55.0 percent for Grades 100 through 350;
- a range spread of 70.0 percent for Grades 360 and 370, which are reserved for high-level managers; and
- Grade 999 which is reserved for senior executive positions, such as County Administrator, Medical Examiner, and Deputy Medical Examiner.



\* The City of Kansas City recently instituted a living wage ordinance, which ensures that no City workers will be making less than a “living wage” (defined by the study as \$15.00 per hour) by 2022. To transition into this wage, the City has established a minimum wage of \$12.50 per hour for 2020 and \$13.75 per hour for 2021. The County desires to institute a similar structure.

The salary schedule for 2020 is displayed in **Exhibit 6B**. In addition to the previously mentioned features, the schedule has a minimum of \$26,000 (equivalent to \$12.50 per hour), a constant midpoint progression between Grades 100 and 360 of 5.0 percent, and a midpoint progression of 11.0 percent between Grades 360 and 370.

**EXHIBIT 6B  
PROPOSED 2020 SALARY SCHEDULE**

Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum	Range Spread	Grade Progression
100	\$26,000	\$33,150	\$40,300	55.0%	-
110	\$27,300	\$34,808	\$42,315	55.0%	5.0%
120	\$28,665	\$36,548	\$44,431	55.0%	5.0%
130	\$30,098	\$38,375	\$46,652	55.0%	5.0%
140	\$31,603	\$40,294	\$48,985	55.0%	5.0%
150	\$33,183	\$42,309	\$51,434	55.0%	5.0%
160	\$34,842	\$44,424	\$54,005	55.0%	5.0%
170	\$36,584	\$46,645	\$56,705	55.0%	5.0%
180	\$38,413	\$48,977	\$59,540	55.0%	5.0%
190	\$40,334	\$51,426	\$62,518	55.0%	5.0%
200	\$42,351	\$53,998	\$65,644	55.0%	5.0%
210	\$44,469	\$56,698	\$68,927	55.0%	5.0%
220	\$46,692	\$59,533	\$72,373	55.0%	5.0%
230	\$49,027	\$62,510	\$75,992	55.0%	5.0%
240	\$51,478	\$65,635	\$79,791	55.0%	5.0%
250	\$54,052	\$68,917	\$83,781	55.0%	5.0%
260	\$56,755	\$72,363	\$87,970	55.0%	5.0%
270	\$59,593	\$75,981	\$92,369	55.0%	5.0%
280	\$62,573	\$79,781	\$96,988	55.0%	5.0%
290	\$65,702	\$83,770	\$101,838	55.0%	5.0%
300	\$68,987	\$87,959	\$106,930	55.0%	5.0%
310	\$72,436	\$92,356	\$112,276	55.0%	5.0%
320	\$76,058	\$96,974	\$117,890	55.0%	5.0%
330	\$79,861	\$101,823	\$123,785	55.0%	5.0%
340	\$83,854	\$106,914	\$129,974	55.0%	5.0%
350	\$88,047	\$112,260	\$136,473	55.0%	5.0%
360	\$92,449	\$124,806	\$157,163	70.0%	5.0%
370	\$102,618	\$138,535	\$174,451	70.0%	11.0%
999	\$175,000	\$237,500	\$300,000	71.4%	N/A



The 2021 schedule displayed in **Exhibit 6C** adjusts the 2020 schedule up to a minimum of \$28,600 (equivalent of \$13.75 per hour), while lowering the constant range spread between Grades 100 and 360 to 4.7 percent in order to prevent the schedule from maxing out too high; Grade 999 is not adjusted.

**EXHIBIT 6C  
PROPOSED 2021 SALARY SCHEDULE**

Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum	Range Spread	Grade Progression
100	\$28,600	\$36,465	\$44,330	55.0%	-
110	\$29,944	\$38,179	\$46,413	55.0%	4.7%
120	\$31,351	\$39,973	\$48,594	55.0%	4.7%
130	\$32,824	\$41,851	\$50,877	55.0%	4.7%
140	\$34,367	\$43,818	\$53,269	55.0%	4.7%
150	\$35,982	\$45,877	\$55,772	55.0%	4.7%
160	\$37,673	\$48,033	\$58,393	55.0%	4.7%
170	\$39,444	\$50,291	\$61,138	55.0%	4.7%
180	\$41,298	\$52,655	\$64,012	55.0%	4.7%
190	\$43,239	\$55,130	\$67,020	55.0%	4.7%
200	\$45,271	\$57,721	\$70,170	55.0%	4.7%
210	\$47,399	\$60,434	\$73,468	55.0%	4.7%
220	\$49,627	\$63,275	\$76,922	55.0%	4.7%
230	\$51,959	\$66,248	\$80,536	55.0%	4.7%
240	\$54,401	\$69,362	\$84,322	55.0%	4.7%
250	\$56,958	\$72,622	\$88,285	55.0%	4.7%
260	\$59,635	\$76,035	\$92,434	55.0%	4.7%
270	\$62,438	\$79,609	\$96,779	55.0%	4.7%
280	\$65,373	\$83,351	\$101,328	55.0%	4.7%
290	\$68,446	\$87,269	\$106,091	55.0%	4.7%
300	\$71,663	\$91,371	\$111,078	55.0%	4.7%
310	\$75,031	\$95,665	\$116,298	55.0%	4.7%
320	\$78,557	\$100,160	\$121,763	55.0%	4.7%
330	\$82,249	\$104,868	\$127,486	55.0%	4.7%
340	\$86,115	\$109,797	\$133,478	55.0%	4.7%
350	\$90,162	\$114,957	\$139,751	55.0%	4.7%
360	\$94,400	\$127,440	\$160,480	70.0%	4.7%
370	\$104,784	\$141,459	\$178,133	70.0%	11.0%
999	\$175,000	\$237,500	\$300,000	71.4%	N/A

**Exhibit 6D** adjusts the 2021 schedule up to a “living” minimum wage of \$31,200 (equivalent of \$15 per hour) and lowers the constant midpoint progressions between Grades 100 and 360 to 4.4 percent in order to prevent the schedule from maxing out too high; Grade 999 is not adjusted.



**EXHIBIT 6D  
PROPOSED 2022 SALARY SCHEDULE**

Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Midpoint	Proposed Maximum	Range Spread	Grade Progression
100	\$31,200	\$39,780	\$48,360	55.0%	-
110	\$32,573	\$41,531	\$50,488	55.0%	4.4%
120	\$34,006	\$43,358	\$52,709	55.0%	4.4%
130	\$35,502	\$45,265	\$55,028	55.0%	4.4%
140	\$37,064	\$47,257	\$57,449	55.0%	4.4%
150	\$38,695	\$49,336	\$59,977	55.0%	4.4%
160	\$40,398	\$51,508	\$62,617	55.0%	4.4%
170	\$42,176	\$53,775	\$65,373	55.0%	4.4%
180	\$44,032	\$56,141	\$68,250	55.0%	4.4%
190	\$45,969	\$58,611	\$71,252	55.0%	4.4%
200	\$47,992	\$61,190	\$74,388	55.0%	4.4%
210	\$50,104	\$63,883	\$77,661	55.0%	4.4%
220	\$52,309	\$66,694	\$81,079	55.0%	4.4%
230	\$54,611	\$69,629	\$84,647	55.0%	4.4%
240	\$57,014	\$72,693	\$88,372	55.0%	4.4%
250	\$59,523	\$75,892	\$92,261	55.0%	4.4%
260	\$62,142	\$79,231	\$96,320	55.0%	4.4%
270	\$64,876	\$82,717	\$100,558	55.0%	4.4%
280	\$67,731	\$86,357	\$104,983	55.0%	4.4%
290	\$70,711	\$90,157	\$109,602	55.0%	4.4%
300	\$73,822	\$94,123	\$114,424	55.0%	4.4%
310	\$77,070	\$98,265	\$119,459	55.0%	4.4%
320	\$80,461	\$102,588	\$124,715	55.0%	4.4%
330	\$84,001	\$107,102	\$130,202	55.0%	4.4%
340	\$87,697	\$111,814	\$135,930	55.0%	4.4%
350	\$91,556	\$116,734	\$141,912	55.0%	4.4%
360	\$95,584	\$129,039	\$162,493	70.0%	4.4%
370	\$106,098	\$143,233	\$180,367	70.0%	11.0%
999	\$175,000	\$237,500	\$300,000	71.4%	N/A

The proposed salary schedules conform to best practice, while using the existing County salary schedules as a framework. The proposed salary schedules will allow the County to slot classifications at or near market value now and moving forward as positions are created or revised, as well as ensure external equity across all positions.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** Adopt the proposed salary schedules displayed in Exhibits 6B through 6D to simplify and bring consistency to the compensation system, as well as enable Jackson County to provide a living wage to its employees.



## FINDING

In order to ensure that classifications are being compensated competitively in comparison to the market, Evergreen proceeded to determine the placement of classifications within the proposed salary schedules, using the results of the market salary survey as a guide.

For those positions not included in the survey, a regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the internal data gathered by the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) process and the external data gathered by the market salary survey. The analysis essentially determines the market dollar value associated with every JAT point. This allows Evergreen to project an approximate pay range for each classification, which is used preliminarily to guide the slotting of positions into the proposed pay grades.

After initial slotting was complete, additional adjustments were made to maintain existing hierarchy and to account for the County’s understanding and knowledge of each position which cannot be captured through the JAT or salary survey processes. Based on this process, **Exhibit 6E** displays the proposed placement of each classification into a specific pay grade.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** Adopt the proposed grade order list in Exhibit 6E, which ensures appropriate grading within the current classification structure.

### EXHIBIT 6E PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS

Proposed Classification Title	Grade
Custodian	100
Mail Services Coordinator	100
Support Services Technician	100
Carpenter	110
Custodian, Head	110
Records Maintenance Technician	110
Support Services Specialist	110
Case Records Processor	120
County House Arrest Officer	120
Delinquent Tax Collector	120
Litigation Investigator	120
Notary Clerk	120
Administrative Assistant I	130
Bad Check Collector	130
Bankruptcy Specialist	130
Bookkeeper, Assistant	130
Collections Specialist	130
Courthouse Security Officer	130
Entitlements Technician	130
Forensic Transcriptionist	130
Living History Interpreter	130
Municipal Court Specialist	130
Painter	130
Ranger Dispatcher	130
Records Financial Specialist	130
Records Representative	130
Registration Specialist	130
Secretary	130



**EXHIBIT 6E (Continued)**  
**PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Grade
Accounts Payable Specialist	140
Administrative Assistant II	140
Bookkeeper	140
Building Specialist	140
Business and Real Estate Specialist	140
Child Support Enforcement Technician	140
Communications Specialist, Probationary	140
Concealed Carry Weapon Specialist	140
Corrections Lead Building Repairer	140
Corrections Officer I	140
County House Arrest Officer, Lead	140
Equipment Operator I	140
Librarian	140
Mental Health Claims Examiner	140
Property Officer	140
Records Specialist	140
Support Services Specialist, Lead	140
Title Specialist	140
Accounting Analyst	150
Administrative Assistant III	150
Bond Investigator	150
Business Personal Property Auditor	150
Client Advocate	150
Communications Specialist 1	150
Concession Coordinator	150
Corrections Officer II	150
Corrections Recreation Coordinator	150
Engineering Technician	150
Equipment Operator II	150
GIS Specialist I	150
Human Resources Specialist	150
Investigative Security Specialist	150
Legislative Secretary	150
Litigation Investigator/Paralegal	150
Operations Analyst	150
Paralegal	150
Plumber	150
Property and Investment Coordinator	150
Record Center Facility Coordinator	150
Records Specialist, Lead	150
Recreation Therapist	150
Special Projects Analyst	150
Warrant and Extradition Coordinator	150
Case Manager	160
Communications Specialist 2	160
Dispatcher/Information Systems Coordinator	160
Electrician	160
Equipment Operator III	160
Payroll Specialist	160
Research Analyst	160
Secretary to Medical Examiner	160
Victim Advocate	160



**EXHIBIT 6E (Continued)**  
**PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Grade
Wastewater Treatment Specialist	160
Accounts Payable and Payroll Specialist	170
Appraiser, Residential	170
Board of Equalization Supervisor	170
Child Support Enforcement Specialist	170
Communications Specialist 3	170
Complaint Officer	170
Corrections Officer, Master	170
Database Specialist	170
Delinquent Tax Coordinator	170
Executive Assistant	170
Exemptions Analyst	170
Facilities Specialist	170
GIS Specialist II	170
Heritage Programs and Museums Coordinator	170
Investigative Specialist	170
Investigator	170
Legal Assistant	170
Marina Supervisor, Assistant	170
Marketing and Graphics Specialist	170
Multimedia Production Specialist	170
Network Support Technician	170
Operations Engineer	170
Population Control Supervisor	170
Research Analyst, Senior	170
Special Populations Service Outreach Coordinator	170
Victim Advocate, Lead	170
Accounts Payable Coordinator	180
Appraiser, Commercial	180
Appraiser, Senior Residential	180
Audit Assistant	180
Case Manager, Lead	180
Communications Specialist, Senior	180
Criminal Records Supervisor	180
Legal Assistant, Senior	180
Narcotics Investigative Specialist	180
Paralegal, Senior	180
Park Ranger I	180
Public Health Specialist	180
Registration Supervisor	180
Restitution Coordinator	180
Administrative Supervisor	190
Appraiser, Senior Commercial	190
Budget Analyst	190
Business Personal Property Auditor, Senior	190
Code Compliance Officer	190
Code Compliance Officer/Building Inspector	190
Communications Specialist, Lead	190
Corrections Case Worker	190
Court Administrator, Assistant	190
GIS Specialist III	190
Golf Professional, Assistant	190





**EXHIBIT 6E (Continued)**  
**PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Grade
On-Site Wastewater Specialist	190
Park Ranger II	190
Project Inspector	190
Public Health Specialist II	190
Systems Administrator, Assistant	190
Utilities/Construction Inspector	190
Benefits Analyst	200
Building Official	200
Business Personal Property Supervisor	200
Client Advocate Supervisor	200
Collections Supervisor	200
Compliance Review Officer	200
Concession Supervisor	200
Corrections Community Outreach Coordinator	200
Corrections Sergeant	200
Criminal Records Supervisor, Lead	200
CSE Supervisor	200
Deputy Sheriff 1	200
Engineering CAD Technician	200
Foreman - Building Trades	200
Foreman - Golf Course	200
Foreman - Natural Resources	200
Foreman - Park Operations	200
Foreman - Recreation	200
Foreman - Road and Bridge Maintenance	200
Foreman - Softball Park	200
Forensic Technician	200
Inmate Program Services Coordinator	200
Nurse Case Manager	200
Outdoor Education Supervisor	200
Park Ranger III	200
Public Health Specialist III	200
Recorder of Deeds Supervisor	200
Sports and Aquatic Administrator	200
Systems Analyst	200
Taxpayer Assistance Supervisor	200
Assistant Auditor	210
Bookkeeping and Benefits Supervisor	210
Budget Coordinator	210
Case Manager Supervisor	210
Data Analyst	210
Database Supervisor	210
Deputy Sheriff 2	210
Director of OHRCC	210
Forensic Technician/Investigator	210
Marina Supervisor	210
Network Support Administrator	210
Office Administrator	210
Operations Coordinator	210
Park Ranger IV	210
Project and Safety Coordinator	210
Residential Appraisal Coordinator	210



**EXHIBIT 6E (Continued)**  
**PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Grade
Senior Buyer	210
Special Assessment Tax and Records Coordinator	210
Special Projects Coordinator	210
Accounts Receivable Administrator	220
Budgeting Supervisor	220
Building Superintendent	220
Construction Project Manager	220
Crime Analyst	220
Delinquent Tax Administrator	220
Deputy Sheriff 3	220
Golf Professional	220
Historic Site Supervisor	220
Investigator I	220
Landscape Architect	220
Municipal Court Administrator	220
Payroll Supervisor	220
Planner and Program Manager, Senior	220
Projects Coordinator	220
Residential Property Appraisal Supervisor	220
Special Assessment Coordinator	220
Special Populations Services Supervisor	220
Support Services Administrator	220
Systems Administrator	220
Taxpayer Services Administrator	220
Taxpayer Support Administrator	220
Website Administrator	220
Accountant	230
Assistant Auditor, Senior	230
Civil Engineer I	230
Clinical Services Manager	230
Construction Supervisor	230
Corrections Classification Administrator	230
Corrections Lieutenant	230
Criminal Records Administrator	230
Deputy Sheriff 4	230
Finance and Systems Administrator	230
GIS Developer	230
Golf Course Maintenance Supervisor	230
IT Support Specialist	230
Natural Resources Supervisor	230
Network Support Analyst	230
Park Operations Supervisor	230
Population Control Coordinator, Assistant	230
Public Health Supervisor	230
Road and Bridge Administrator, Assistant	230
Software Engineer	230
Special Events Coordinator	230
Support Services Supervisor	230
Combat Marketing Administrator	240
Combat Programs Administrator	240
Commercial Property Appraisal Supervisor	240
Database Administrator	240



**EXHIBIT 6E (Continued)**  
**PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Grade
Deputy Sheriff 5	240
Facilities Management Administrator, Assistant	240
Forensic Supervisor	240
Investigator II	240
Accounting and Finance Administrator	250
Administrative Manager	250
Assessment Project Manager	250
County Clerk, Deputy	250
County Counselor, Assistant	250
Development Division Administrator	250
Emergency Management and Safety Coordinator	250
Environmental Health Administrator	250
Human Resources Administrator	250
IT Support Center Administrator	250
Legal Counsel	250
Prosecuting Attorney I, Assistant	250
Public Information Officer	250
Sheriff Sergeant I	250
Software Engineer, Senior	250
Superintendent of Park Operations, Deputy	250
Superintendent of Park Safety, Assistant	250
Systems Engineer	250
Accreditation Manager	260
Budget Administrator	260
Chief Deputy Auditor	260
Chief Deputy Public Administrator	260
Civil Engineer II	260
Corrections Captain	260
Grant, Audit, and Risk Administrator	260
Population Control Coordinator	260
Purchasing Administrator	260
Road and Bridge Administrator	260
Sheriff Sergeant II	260
Superintendent of Golf Course	260
Superintendent of Historic Sites	260
Superintendent of Park Operations	260
Superintendent of Park Safety	260
Superintendent of Recreation	260
Treasurer, Assistant	260
Applications Program Manager	270
County Counselor, Deputy	270
Database Administrator, Senior	270
GIS Program Manager	270
Officer in Charge	270
Prescription Drug Monitoring Program Coordinator	270
Prosecuting Attorney II, Assistant	270
Sheriff Sergeant III	270
Manager of Detention	280
Sheriff Sergeant IV	280
Technology Operations Manager	280
Chief Investigator	290
Civil Engineer III	290



**EXHIBIT 6E (Continued)**  
**PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Grade
Information Security Manager	290
Prosecuting Attorney III, Assistant	290
Sheriff Captain I	290
Correctional Center Deputy Director	300
Director of Accounting, Assistant	300
Director of Administration, Deputy	300
Director of Assessment, Deputy	300
Director of Collections, Deputy	300
Director of Combat, Deputy	300
Director of Enterprise Operation, Deputy	300
Director of Facilities Management, Deputy	300
Director of Human Resources, Deputy	300
Director of Information Technology/GIS, Deputy	300
Director of Park Operations, Deputy	300
Sheriff Captain II	300
Forensic Fellow	310
Prosecuting Attorney IV, Assistant	310
Treasurer	310
Trial Team Leader	320
Director (Prosecuting Attorney)	340
Clerk of the County Legislature	350
COMBAT Director	350
Correctional Center Director	350
Director of Assessment	350
Director of Collections	350
Director of Communications	350
Director of Finance and Purchasing	350
Director of Human Resources	350
Director of Information Technology	350
Director of Parks and Recreation	350
Director of Recorder of Deeds	350
Division Chief (Prosecuting Attorney)	350
Program Administrator	350
Public Administrator	350
Chief Deputy County Counselor	360
Chief Deputy County Counselor - Litigations	360
Chief Deputy Operating Officer	360
Chief of Health Services	360
Chief of Operations	360
Chief Operating Officer	360
Director of Public Works	360
Major	360
Prosecuting Attorney, Deputy	360
Chief Administrative Officer	370
Chief of Staff	370
County Auditor	370
County Counselor	370
County Administrator	999
Medical Examiner	999
Medical Examiner, Deputy	999
Prosecuting Attorney, Assistant	N/A

\* The Assistant Prosecuting Attorney classification is a grandfathered position and is not assigned to a pay grade. Instead, the minimum of its pay range is the minimum of Grade 250 and its maximum is the maximum of Grade 310.



## FINDING

As part of this study, Evergreen presented various implementation options for transitioning the County from the old pay structure to the new pay structure. Evergreen is providing two options to transition employees into the new structure—each of which carries different annual fiscal impacts.

The two options and their operational definitions are:

- **Bring to New Minimum** – This approach maintains current employee salaries unless their existing salary falls below their newly assigned pay grade’s minimum. When this occurs, the employee’s salary is raised to the new minimum.
- **Classification Date Parity** – Each employee's salary is placed within their recommended range based on how long they have worked in their current position. This is done on the basis of 30 year career trajectory, where an employee with 15 years of experience would be placed at the midpoint, whereas an employee with 30 or more years would be at maximum. If an employee's hourly rate exceeds where they would be projected in the recommended range, no adjustment is made.

There is not a “correct” approach for transitioning employees into the proposed system and each has its own unique strengths. For example, a strength of the Bring to New Minimum approach is that it minimizes transition costs, whereas a strength of the Classification Date Parity model is that it addresses compression to the extent possible.

### RECOMMENDATION 5: Adopt the best implementation option for Jackson County.

Exhibits 6F through 6H show the implementation cost for each of the next three years for each option (not including benefits), the number of employees impacted by the change, the average adjustment for those receiving adjustments, and the average magnitude of the change on the impacted employees.

**EXHIBIT 6F  
2020 IMPLEMENTATION OPTION COSTS**

Option	2020			
	Total Implementation Cost	# Employees Receiving Adjustments	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Percentage Adjustment
Bring to New Minimum	\$1,670,497	398	\$4,197	14.4%
Class Date Parity	\$2,967,273	541	\$5,485	16.9%



**EXHIBIT 6G  
2021 IMPLEMENTATION OPTION COSTS**

Option	2021			
	Total Implementation Cost	# Employees Receiving Adjustments	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Percentage Adjustment
Bring to New Minimum	\$1,393,332	565	\$2,466	6.6%
Class Date Parity	\$2,629,114	816	\$3,222	7.9%

**EXHIBIT 6H  
2022 IMPLEMENTATION OPTION COSTS**

Option	2022			
	Total Implementation Cost	# Employees Receiving Adjustments	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Percentage Adjustment
Bring to New Minimum	\$1,928,894	763	\$2,528	6.4%
Class Date Parity	\$3,174,399	889	\$3,571	8.1%

#### 6.4 SYSTEM MAINTENANCE AND ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

Any organization’s compensation and classification system will need periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided in this chapter were developed based on conditions at the time the study was conducted. Without proper upkeep of the system, the potential for recruitment and retention issues may increase as the compensation and classification system becomes dated and less competitive.

##### FINDING

While salary is a major factor in employee recruitment and retention, benefits also play a significant role. This chapter has already provided recommendations related to the County’s salary structure, but a consideration of its benefits structure must also be given.

As discussed in **Chapter 5**, it was found that Jackson County offers employees a larger overall benefits package (in terms of the percentage that benefits comprise total compensation)—35.0 percent—when compared with the market—30.1 percent.

When single benefits were analyzed in isolation, the County is ahead of the market in the following specific areas:

- dental insurance;
- vision insurance;
- short-term disability insurance;
- sick leave;



- paid sick leave upon separation;
- tuition reimbursement;
- wellness programs; and
- paid holidays.

However, the County was found to be behind the market in the following specific areas:

- health insurance;
- annual/vacation leave; and
- employee assistance programs.

**RECOMMENDATION 6: Jackson County is commended for its generous benefits options and should seek to bolster the overall competitiveness of its benefits package, particularly in the area of health insurance.**

## FINDING

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

### Salary Progression

As outlined above, Evergreen recommends that the County implement the new salary schedule which would involve an adjustment of employee salaries to ensure they are properly placed in the proposed salary schedule. While this major adjustment should be performed when financial feasible, the County should also adjust salaries annually. Evergreen recommends that the basis of salary adjustment in the future be done at three distinct levels:

1. **Structural:** Adjustment to the pay ranges should be done annually, with the aim of adjusting for the changes in cost-of-living. Evergreen recommends the County tie the annual compensation structure movement to the local change in the Consumer-Price-Index (CPI). This annual adjustment will ensure pay ranges do not rapidly fall out of line with that of market peers. However, when conducting small-scale surveys, the County should also collect salary schedule movement and anticipated movement from its peers to gauge if market movement is keeping pace with CPI movement.
2. **Classification:** As a result of the market surveys, the County may identify classifications or job families that are experiencing considerable market movement and, as a result, reassignment of the pay grades should be considered when this occurs. Alternatively, for any classifications that have become hard to recruit and retain, pay grade reassignment should also be considered to ensure the County is competitive for both recruiting new talent and retaining existing employees.



3. **Individual:** Evergreen recommends that the County provide regular increases to individual employee salaries that are based upon regular performance evaluations.

### **New Hires**

A new employee's starting salary largely depends on the amount of education and experience the employee possesses beyond the minimum requirements for the job. Typically, an employee holding the minimum education and experience requirements for a classification is hired at or near the classification's pay grade minimum. However, for recruiting purposes, the County needs the ability to offer salaries to new employees that consider prior related experience. It is recommended that the County continue to allow flexibility when establishing new employee salaries. It is also important, however, when determining new hire salaries to, when possible, preserve the internal equity of employees' salaries within the classification.

### **Promotions**

When an employee is promoted to a new classification, it is important to have guidelines for calculating the employee's new salary that rewards the employee for his or her new responsibilities, moving the salary into the new pay grade, and ensuring internal equity in the new classification. For example, a range of three to seven percent increase is common today, with consideration given to preserving the internal equity of employee salaries within the classification. The County has established promotion guidelines which will continue to require review going forward to remain current with best practice.

### **Transfers**

An employee transfer occurs when an employee is reassigned to a classification at the same pay grade as his or her current classification or when an employee's classification stays the same, but his or her department changes. In either of these cases, it is likely that no adjustment is necessary to the employee's salary. The only situation in which a salary adjustment would be needed for a transferred employee would be if his or her current salary is not aligned with the salaries of employees in the new classification or department. If that occurs, it may be necessary to adjust the salary of the employee or the incumbents of the classification to ensure salary equity within the new classification.

**RECOMMENDATION 7: Develop/maintain guidelines for progressing employee salaries through the salary schedules, including those for determining salaries of newly hired employees and employees who have been promoted or transferred to a different classification or department or who have been reclassified.**

### **FINDING**

While it is unlikely that all classifications will need to be analyzed and adjusted for several years, a small number of classification 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 County 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 County to offer incentives to attract employees to the position and/or to encourage employees to remain in the position.

**RECOMMENDATION 8: Conduct small-scale salary surveys as needed to assess the market competitiveness of selected classifications with recruitment and/or retention issues and make changes to pay grade assignments as necessary.**

## FINDING

In order to maintain competitiveness between compensation and classification studies, the County should continue adjusting its salary schedule on an annual basis, as required. In addition to using the consumer price index (CPI) values for cost of living adjustments, the County would benefit from also contacting the local peer group and determining the approach to salary schedule adjustments made by peers.

The County may find it struggles to navigate through changing economic conditions and with organizations competing for the same human resources. For this reason, the County should conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every five years.

**RECOMMENDATION 9: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study approximately every five years.**

## FINDING

As part of this study, Evergreen was tasked with developing a recommended schedule for future evaluations of all job classifications. An established process allows for assessment of a classification to determine if, internally, it is compensated equitably in comparison to other like classifications and assists with collecting the data necessary to determine if the classification is titled correctly. A well-established schedule allows for evaluation of positions—as requested by employees or supervisors—when there is evidence that a position's primary duties have changed, when a classification is newly created, and/or at regular intervals to ensure that slotting relationships are maintained across the organization.

The tool used by Evergreen to assess internal job worth as part of this study was the Job Assessment Tool (JAT). The results of this tool, paired with market data, provided a final, data-driven value that was used to match the classification under review up to an appropriate midpoint on the County's proposed salary schedule. With all County classifications now assessed and slotted using this methodology, the County has an excellent foundation on which to base compensation and classification decisions surrounding any position. Moving forward, the County should employ the same methodology to continually assess positions.

The County should adopt the JAT and market-driven approach to be used for all future job evaluations for all employees. This process serves as an unbiased means to capture a snapshot of a position's current duties and requirements, as well as identify a reasonable level of compensation that aligns with the slotting established during the course of this study.



Every two years, on a rotating basis, the County should internally use the JAT to reassess all job classifications. Supervisors can assist in the process by providing information on changes to job duties or responsibilities thereby allowing updates to JAT scores where appropriate. Calculations can then be run to ensure that all positions are slotted appropriately.

The County should also establish a mechanism or process to evaluate new and/or updated position titles as needed between review cycles. Evergreen recommends the following process:

1. A department head/supervisor submits completed Job Review Form to Human Resources to request a job evaluation for either a new or existing position. The proposed form is displayed in **Exhibit 6I**. Note that one form per job should be submitted.
2. Human Resources staff receive the completed Job Review Form and determine what action is needed. If action requires the completion of a JAT, a blank JAT is emailed by HR to the department head/supervisor for completion. If the position is new, the JAT should be filled out by the person with the most knowledge of the position. If no JAT is needed, HR staff proceeds to Step 5.
3. The department head/supervisor completes the JAT and submits to HR within five business days.
4. The Human Resources Director receives and reviews the JAT for accuracy. A score is entered into the existing regression database (provided by Evergreen).
5. If market data on file are greater than one year old or not available for the position in question, fresh market data is collected from market peers.
6. An average market midpoint is entered into the existing regression database by HR staff.
7. With JAT and market data collected, the regression database provides HR staff with a projected midpoint. This midpoint is used to preliminarily guide the placement of the position in the County's salary schedule.
8. The Human Resources Director records the final recommended pay grade and job title in the second section of the Job Review Form (see **Exhibit 6I**).
9. A copy is emailed to the department head/supervisor, as well as to the County Executive for final approval. Prior to final approval by the County Executive or his/her designee will send a copy of the evaluated position to the County Auditor.

With this process in place, and continued use of the JAT and market data in making classification and compensation decisions, the County will ensure an equitable system is maintained. As part of this project, Evergreen will also be providing HR staff with JAT training and access to all the tools necessary to continue this process.

**RECOMMENDATION 10: Adopt the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) and market data-based methodology from Evergreen to evaluate new and updated position titles in the future.**



EXHIBIT 6I  
PROPOSED JOB REVIEW FORM

# Job Review Form

Please complete all fields, scan, and electronically submit to the Human Resources Department.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD COMPLETES**

Requester Name and Title:	
Phone:	
E-mail Address:	
Department:	
Today's Date:	
Job Title for Review:	
Position Type (New or Existing):	
Reason for Review:	
Desired Outcome:	



**EXHIBIT 6I (Continued)  
PROPOSED JOB REVIEW FORM**

<b>HR USE ONLY</b>	
Form Received by:	
Form Reviewed by:	
Today's Date:	
<b>Action:</b>	
JAT Sent (Y/N):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   Once Returned, record date received ____
Market Data Needed (Y/N):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Final JAT Score	
Market Midpoint Value	
Regression Midpoint	
Title Recommendation:	
Grade Recommendation:	
Explanation of Findings:	
Reviewer Notes:	

  

Signature: _____ <p align="center"><b>Director of Human Resources</b></p> Date: _____	Signature: _____ <p align="center"><b>County Executive</b></p> Date: _____
--	---

## 6.5 SUMMARY

The objective of this Job Classification and Compensation Study was to improve the internal and external equity of both the structure by which employees are compensated, as well as the way positions relate and compare to one another across the organization. This was accomplished by analyzing data gathered internally and externally, which informed the recommendations made in this chapter.

The external salary survey identified certain classifications compensated below market average. Overall, it was determined that the County is approximately 18.7 percent below the market minimum, 18.4 percent below the market midpoint, and 18.3 percent below the market maximum of salary ranges of benchmark positions.

Combining the market data with the internal data gathered through the JAT process, Evergreen was able to make recommendations which improve the equity and competitiveness of the County's pay structure and the placement of classifications within that structure. Using the market data that was obtained for the 2019 fiscal year, by adopting the proposed salary schedule and grade order list for the 2020 fiscal year, the County's salary schedule will move to approximately 2.6 percent behind the market at the minimum, 1.7 percent behind at the midpoint, and 1.1 percent behind at the maximum. Using the 2019-20 market data, by adopting the proposed salary schedule and grade order list for the 2022 fiscal year, the County's salary schedule will move to approximately 8.5 percent above the market at the minimum, 9.3 percent above at the midpoint, and 9.9 percent above at the maximum.

The recommendations in this chapter provide a competitive compensation structure—internally aligned with the classification structure—and system administration practices that will provide Jackson County with a responsive compensation and classification system for years to come. While the upkeep of this recommended system and associated pay and classification guidelines will require work, the County will find that having a competitive compensation and classification system that encourages strong recruitment and employee retention is well worth the effort.

