

COUNTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 1997, 2:00 PM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Bacote, Commissioner
Johnnie Evans, Commissioner
H. Mac Tyson II, Commissioner

OTHERS: Doran Berry, Attorney
Dr. Archer, David M. Griffith & Associates
Mrs. Sally Archer, David M. Griffith & Associates
Mark Carpenter, David M. Griffith & Associates

STAFF: Cliff Strassenburg, County Manager
James Martin, Deputy County Manager
Pat Jones, Personnel Director
Ellen Fadden, Personnel Department
Doug Canders, Staff Attorney
Brenda Stenerson, Accountant, Sheriff's Office
Marsha Fogle, Clerk
Rhonda Davis, Deputy Clerk

AGENDA ITEMS

1. **Presentation by David M. Griffith and Associates of the Proposed Classification and Pay Plan.**

James Martin introduced Mark Carpenter with David M. Griffith and Associates to the committee. Mr. Carpenter is the manager of the County's pay plan project with DMG. Mr. Carpenter introduced Dr. and Mrs. Archer. Dr. Archer developed the systems purchased by David M. Griffith to perform the job evaluations and pay classifications. They have taken the original information presented in June and looked at all employee appeals and reclassification request forms. They have a revised report based on this review. Over two hundred appeals were reviewed.

Dr. Archer stated they had two dimensions to be concerned with. Internal equity (job evaluation) was the first one. Some changes were made to this and they are reflected in the revised study. The second dimension was external equity which would relate to outside the marketplace. In reviewing the dimensions, you measure the content of the job. They were not pursuing the minimum salary. The mid-point of the pay range is the competitive range. He felt the original plan was over aggressive in development of the benchmark jobs used to develop the mid-point.

Commissioner Bacote asked if other Counties were used when salary comparisons were made.

Dr. Archer advised what other counties were used for comparison purposes.

Commissioner Evans asked why the City of Fayetteville was not used, particularly when a large number of Sheriff's deputies are lost to the Fayetteville City Police Department.

Mr. Carpenter stated he feels some research was done using the City of Fayetteville, but he will have to check to make sure.

Mr. Strassenburg stated it would depend on the job when you consider who you are competing with. Most of the clerical positions the County would compete with local entities, but the more technical jobs would have a broader range.

Dr. Archer explained how the information presented was arrived at and the basis for the changes. He found the original analysis to be 2.9% too high. He used 51 benchmarks for the positions classified.

Commissioner Evans asked how the proposed classifications compare to current salaries.

Mr. Carpenter and Dr. Archer reviewed some specific positions so the committee could see some of the changes made.

Dr. Archer advised he regressed the two sets of data together and feels the pay range presented is equitable and competitive. Employees performing well could be brought up to the mid-point of the pay range to make their salaries competitive. If the employee is not meeting job requirements, you could leave them at the minimum of the pay scale.

Mr. Martin noted the costs to bring employees to the mid-point of their pay scale would be tremendous.

Dr. Archer then reviewed the costs to adjust to the new pay scale including proposed salaries, FICA and retirement.

Commissioner Tyson asked if longevity is reflected in the figures presented.

Dr. Archer advised longevity is not reflected as it is a lump sum payment. In the original plan the costs to bring all employees to the minimum salary would have reflected a 6.01% increase over the current costs. With the 3% already given to employees and the reduction in the salary grade, the cost to bring everyone up to the minimum would be \$1,042,906.

Mr. Carpenter stated they are still cleaning up data in the system and the total may vary slightly.

Dr. Archer stated there may be a job that needs to be looked at somewhere in the plan. This plan makes the County competitive with the lowest 12 1/2% of people out in the workforce. He advised the costs to adjust employees to the mid-point of their respective pay range would cost an additional 16.6% over the current payroll or \$9,803,220. It is the mid-point of the pay scale that needs to be concentrated on. The study presented in June did not address this.

Commissioner Bacote asked if Dr. Archer was saying the County is paying well below what it should be to its employees.

Dr. Archer stated Commissioner Bacote was correct. He also advised no County has been able to move everyone to the mid-point in the first year. He is not recommending that the County move everyone to the mid-point at this time. Anything the County did between the \$2,042,906 and the \$9,803,220 would be a good start.

Commissioner Bacote noted if the Board used the entire 2 million set aside for the plan, some adjustments could be made.

Mr. Carpenter stated some of the other monies could be used to move people up into their pay range.

Commissioner Bacote asked if this could be done over three to four years.

Mr. Strassenburg advised Management is suggesting that once a concurrence is received on the basic plan, then they can work on the employees compressed at the minimum. Another adjustment would be made for Sheriff's Department employees. Over time, a performance pay element will be added. This will allow the better performing employees to move forward in their pay scale.

Dr. Archer stated a pay for performance will say any increase will be based on the performance evaluation.

Commissioner Bacote asked if staff was comfortable with the number of reviews done. Does it mean employees will be satisfied with the pay plan.

Mr. Strassenburg stated not all employees will be happy with the plan. Some appeals resulted in changes, some didn't.

Commissioner Bacote noted he wants to know employees have been given the opportunity to appeal these classifications.

Commissioner Tyson asked if all appeals had an impartial review done by DMG.

Mr. Strassenburg advised all appeals did have an impartial review done by DMG.

Dr. Archer and Mr. Carpenter reviewed the changes due to the appeals and particularly the ones in the Parks and Recreation and Solid Waste Departments. Dr. Archer noted no evaluation was made solely on education. The functioning and skills required for the position were primarily used.

Commissioner Evans noted this committee has been working on a pay plan for years. He does not think it is fair to make a recommendation to be presented to the full board during a Commissioners meeting. He does not feel it is fair to ask the other four Commissioners to decipher this information during a board meeting. He feels it is necessary to have a board work session so that Mr. Carpenter and the staff and Dr. and Mrs. Archer if necessary, can go through this for the other board members.

MOTION: Commissioner Bacote offered a motion to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners to move forward with the proposed pay plan, but also to recommend the Board have a work session before the plan is presented during a Commissioners meeting for approval.

SECOND: Commissioner Tyson

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

2. **Consideration of the Proposal to Move Employees from the Minimum Step of the Proposed Pay Plan Based on Years of Service.**

The attached Schedule "E" (included in the minutes), which has an annual estimated cost of \$819,121. An employee with 3 years of service would receive 1% above the minimum pay. With 5 years of service the amount increases to 1.50% above minimum; with 10 years to 2.0%; with 15 years to 2.5% and with 20 years to 3.0% above minimum.

For general county employees (excluding law enforcement officers and certified jailers) the above percentages would be applied to the employee's minimum salary in the new pay plan and this would become the new rate of pay unless the employee's current pay exceeds this amount. In that event the employee's current pay would remain unchanged.

In the case of law enforcement officers and certified jailers it is important to maintain the integrity of the Career Development Plan. In order to do so, all LEO's and CJ's who are at step 1 (minimum) in the current pay plan would be raised to the minimum for their classification in the new pay plan. All LEO's and CJ's who are now above the minimum (step 1) would be raised to the new minimum plus the appropriate increase based on their current career development step. Each step is equivalent to 5%.

For example:

A deputy specialist now at step 2, grade 17 would move to the new minimum plus 5%; step 3, grade 17 - new minimum plus 10%, etc.

The cost of implementation for 6 months (January 1-June 30, 1998) will be approximately \$410,000 for general employees. This excludes Career Development Steps for law enforcement officers and certified jailers which the Sheriff's Department estimates to cost \$225,000-\$250,000. We anticipate the funds previously budgeted for the new pay plan implementation to be sufficient to cover these costs.

Commissioner Tyson stated the original intent of the pay plan was to bring people at the beginning to some competitiveness. The proposal seems to be loaded at the other end or the long term employees.

Mr. Strassenburg explained that if an employee's current salary is higher than the minimum plus the percentage increase, they will not get an increase in their current salary. If there is an employee who has been with the County for 20 years and is at the minimum of their pay grade, they will get the appropriate percentage increase. This proposal will "kick start" the plan and spread employees out through their respective pay grades. In the future, pay increases will depend on performance. A cost of living will be given to keep salaries in line.

MOTION: Commissioner Bacote offered a motion to accept the staff recommendation on the proposal to move employees from the minimum step of the proposed pay plan based on years of service and that this information be presented to the full board at a work session before the plan is presented during a Commissioners meeting for approval.

SECOND: Commissioner Tyson

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

3. Other Committee Concerns.

No other committee concerns were raised.

Meeting adjourned at 3:37 PM.