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## KEY OBJECTIVES

## An effective compensation system must be...

$>$ Consistent with organizational structure
> Complimentary to the management style and objectives
> Internally equitable
> Externally competitive
> Easily understood
>Flexible to meet the changing needs of the City
> Financially sound
> Effectively and efficiently administered

## PROJECT DELIVERABLES

$>$ Developed Classification Structure and Job Evaluation (internal equity), Job Families and Career Ladders
>FLSA Review
$>$ Conducted Market Survey - Competitiveness of Pay, Benefits, and Pay Practices with comparable employers (external equity)
> Updated Pay Structures to ensure market competitiveness
$>$ Validated grade placement and position in range
> Cost Impact Analysis
> Developed Organization Charts reflecting new classification titles
> Drafted Pay Administration Policies
$>$ Developed Organizational Core and Specific Competencies for Job Families
> Developed Job Descriptions

## Segal's Approach to Compensation

## Four Key Elements

We developed a compensation and classification program that supports the City's organizational strategy and compensation philosophy.


## JOB CLASSIFICATION

## Classification Titles

$>$ The City of Fort Lauderdale initially requested 432 titles be encompassed in the classification study with 116 titles being excluded. Please note, some duplicate titles with varying job codes are included in these raw counts and some titles flagged to be excluded were added back at a later point.
> Grade recommendations were made for 399 classifications (includes additional grade recommendations being assigned by the City of Fort Lauderdale).
> Segal Waters updated/created 383 Fort Lauderdale job descriptions.

## Classification: Methodology

> Consolidate/collapse jobs with similar duties, responsibilities and qualifications; currently 399 proposed job titles
> Standardize competencies and skillsets for comparable roles resulting in pay equity within similar roles; Segal Evaluator ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ was used to evaluate the 8 common compensable factors of all jobs at all levels.
> Create clear distinction between managerial vs. supervisory roles and remove unnecessary single or dual incumbent positions; proposed job titling protocols
> Update job classifications to reflect the level and type of work incumbents are required to perform; proposed new titles that better reflect the nature of the work.
$>$ Identify market pay gaps that affect attracting and retaining a qualified and diverse workforce, especially for roles requiring advanced education and/or technical expertise in areas such as engineering, construction project management, information technology, urban planning, law, and building inspection; market survey identified competitive pay inequities.
$>$ Modernize job titles to match those found in the market; proposed job titling protocols

## Classification Analysis Overview

$>$ Developed and distributed to the workforce a customized Job Description Questionnaire (JDQ) which was completed in groups for multiple incumbent job titles.
$>$ Upon completion of the JDQ by each employee, supervisors/managers reviewed the content and verified the accuracy of the information provided.
$>$ Conducted two (2) consecutive days of employee interviews to validate and clarify information from the JDQs.
$>$ Developed and documented a recommended classification structure, which consolidated classification titles, developed new titles and modified existing titles.
$>$ Recommended placement of each employee within the structure.
> Conducted analysis of employees' FLSA exemption status.
$>$ Utilized Segal Evaluator ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ job evaluation tool to develop internal equity hierarchy
> City Department heads reviewed, validated and approved job evaluation results
$>$ Updated job descriptions to be consistent with FLSA, EEO and ADA considerations

## Segal Evaluator ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Job Evaluation Overview

Segal Evaluator ${ }^{T M}$ is a systematic process that defines an easily understood and defensible internal hierarchy which:
$>$ Uses specific compensable factors across all departments and positions to create an internal hierarchy of jobs
$>$ Provides an objective quantitative approach
$>$ Determines values for each compensable factor and calculates a total point score for each position
> Job evaluation scores are validated by department representatives and human resources
>Provides an organization-wide hierarchy which establishes internal equity
> Complements and co-exists with market data structure development


## Compensable Factors

## Compensable factors should be:

- Defensible
- Exist across departments
- Be easily understood by employees

The following previously validated factors are customized to support the operating environment and organizational structure of the City:

| Compensable Factor |
| :--- |
| Formal Education |
| Experience |
| Management/Supervision |
| Human Collaboration Skills |
| Freedom to Act and Impact of |
| Action |
| Technical Skills |
| Fiscal Responsibility and/or |
| Risk Impact |
| Working Conditions |

Measurement
Measures the minimum formalized training or education that is required for entry into the position
Measures the minimum level of work experience required for entry into the position
Measures the supervisory or managerial role of the job and the degree of complexity of work performed by those being supervised
Measures the job requirements of interaction with others outside direct reporting relationships
Measures the degree of freedom to exercise authority as well as assesses the impact of actions
Measures the job difficulty in terms of application of the knowledge required by the job

Measures the accountability and participation, if any, as it relates to the fiscal accountability for one's department or assigned area(s) of responsibility

Measures the surroundings or physical conditions under which the work must be performed

## Sample Segal Evaluator ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Job Evaluation Workbook

| Segal Recommended Job Title | JE Grade | JE Points | Formal Education | Experience | Management \& Supervision | Human Collaboration | Freedom to Act | Technical Skills | Fiscal Responsibility | Working Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senior Management Analyst | 111 | 643 | Bachelor's Degree | 3 to 5 year's experience | Supervising semi complex work | Policy recommendations with moderate impact | Limited direction with moderate impact | Moderate skills and comprehensive application | Moderate fiscal responsibility | Good conditions with occasional physical effort |
| Management Analyst | 109 | 509 | Bachelor's Degree | 1 to 3 year's experience | Occasional direction of semi complex work | Policy recommendations with moderate impact | General direction with moderate impact | Moderate skills and advanced application | Moderate fiscal responsibility | Good conditions with little physical effort |
| Management Assistant | 108 | 458 | Bachelor's Degree | Up to 1 year experience | None | Negotiating interaction with moderate impact | General direction with moderate impact | Advanced skills and standard application | Limited fiscal responsibility | Good conditions with little physical effort |
| Senior Administrative Assistant | 107 | 436 | 6 months + training beyond High School | 3 to 5 year's experience | Lead worker of semi complex work | Negotiating interaction with moderate impact | General direction with moderate impact | Standard skills and comprehensive application | Limited fiscal responsibility | Good conditions with little physical effort |
| Administrative Assistant III | 105 | 360 | 6 months + training beyond High School | 3 to 5 year's experience | Occasional direction of semi complex work | Negotiating interaction with moderate impact | Procedural direction with moderate impact | Standard skills and advanced application | Limited fiscal responsibility | Good conditions with little physical effort |
| Administrative Assistant II | 103 | 293 | High School diploma or equivalency | 1 to 3 year's experience | Occasional direction of semi complex work | Advising interaction with moderate impact | Procedural direction with moderate impact | Standard skills and advanced application | Limited fiscal responsibility | Good conditions with little physical effort |
| Administrative Assistant I | 101 | 194 | High School diploma or equivalency | Up to 1 year experience | None | Advising interaction with moderate impact | Immediate direction with moderate impact | Standard skills and application | None | Good conditions with little physical effort |

## MARKET COMPARISON

## Market Survey Benchmarks

$>$ Commonality of positions
$>$ Competition for jobs/talent
$>$ Location/proximity
$>$ Services provided
$>$ Comparable in size and operating budget to ensure strong matches
$>$ Other criteria as determined

## PEER COMPARATORS - FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES

## Surveyed Employers

| Cities |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| City of Boca Raton | $\sqrt{ }$ (Segal matched pay data) |
| City of Coral Springs | $\sqrt{ }$ (Submitted pay portion only) |\(\left.| \begin{array}{|l|}\hline City of Delray Beach <br>


submitted benefit data only)\end{array}\right]\)| City of Hialeah |
| :--- |
| City of Hollywood |
| City of Miami |
| City of Miami Beach |
| City of Miami Gardens |
| City of Miramar |
| City of Pembroke Pines |
| City of Pompano Beach |
| City of Sunrise |
| City of West Palm Beach |

$V$ = Responded to Survey
The study covers ninety-two (92) benchmark jobs

## PEER COMPARATORS FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES (CONTINUED)

## Surveyed Employers

| Counties |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Broward County | $\checkmark$ (Segal matched pay data) |
| Miami-Dade County | $\checkmark$ (Submitted pay portion only) |
| Palm Beach County |  |
| School Districts |  |
| Broward County School District |  |
| Miami-Dade County School District | $\checkmark$ |
| Palm Beach County School District |  |
| Transportation |  |
| Florida Department of Transportation | $\checkmark$ |
| Greater Orlando Aviation Authority | $\checkmark$ |
| Miami Executive Airport | $\checkmark$ |
| South Florida Regional Transportation Authority | $\sqrt{ }$ |

$\checkmark$ Responded to survey

## PEER COMPARATORS FOR GENERAL EMPLOYEES (CONTINUED)

## Surveyed Employers

| Universities |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Barry University |  |  |  |
| Florida International University |  |  |  |
| Miami-Dade College |  |  |  |
| University of Miami |  |  |  |
| Utilities |  |  |  |
| South Florida Water Management District |  |  |  |
| Orange County Utilities |  |  |  |
| Toho Water Authority |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## PEER COMPARATORS

## Published Survey Data

Published Private Sector Survey Data* included:
$\checkmark$ ERI - Economic Research Institute
$\checkmark$ Mercer Benchmark Database Survey - US
$\checkmark$ Towers Watson Data Services Compensation Surveys
*Data from the three published data sources above were aged to the data effective date of April 1, 2018.

## MARKET ANALYSIS

## Customized Salary Structures and Pay Practices Review

$>$ Desired competitive position and City's ability to pay/compete
$\Rightarrow$ Relationship of structure with market survey statistics
$>$ Review of Pay Supplements (certification pay, special skills, bilingual pay, etc.)
$>$ Review of Pay Practices (hiring salary guidelines, promotion, demotion, transfers, other)
$>$ Strategic design of new structure - width of ranges and number of grades, number of structures
$>$ Assignment of current employees in new structure

## WORK HOURS AND COST OF LABOR ADJUSTMENTS

$>$ Adjustments were made to ensure "apples to apples" comparison of salaries based on number of work hours
$>$ Use of Economic Research Institute's Cost of Labor Data

## PAY GRADES \& PAY STRUCTURES

## Pay Grades

> Per the 2018 Pay Plan the City of Fort Lauderdale has 157 unique pay grades. When considering Management Categories this creates 179 unique pay ranges.
$>$ Segal Waters recommends 18 grades for the general population (general + executive / upper management).

## Pay Structures

$>$ City of Fort Lauderdale started with multiple structures (8+)
$>$ Segal Waters is recommending two (2) structures one for general employees and one for executive / upper management

## BENCHMARK JOB TITLES - GENERAL COMPOSITION OF WORKFORCE

## BENCHMARK JOB TITLES BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY COMPOSITION OF WORKFORCE - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

| Occupational Category | Benchmark <br> Titles Being <br> Evaluated in <br> Study | Number of <br> Employees <br> within <br> Benchmark <br> Titles Being <br> Evaluated | Employees in <br> Benchmark <br> Titles Evaluated <br> As a Percent of <br> the Total <br> Workforce |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative \& Support Services | 11 | 201 | $6.6 \%$ |
| Managerial \& Supervisory | 6 | 19 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Paraprofessional | 8 | 92 | $3.0 \%$ |
| Professional | 31 | 274 | $9.1 \%$ |
| Service Maintenance | 13 | 646 | $21.4 \%$ |
| Skilled Crafts | 10 | 189 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Technical | 13 | 83 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Total: | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 7 \% ^ { \mathbf { 1 } }}$ |

${ }^{1}$ The percentage of total workforce value is based upon the 12-09-16 census provided by the client, which included a total of 3,024 job incumbents.
These values are subject to change with workforce fluctuations.

## BENCHMARK JOBS BY DEPARTMENT - GENERAL



## BENCHMARK JOBS BY DEPARTMENT - GENERAL (CONTINUED)

| Information Technology Services (10) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Application Developer | Network Support Analyst |
|  | Assistant Database Administrator | > Senior Tech Support Analyst |
|  | Computer Operator II | Systems Administrator |
|  | Data Warehouse Analyst | Technical Support Analyst |
| $\checkmark$ | Geographic Information System Analys | Technology Strategist |
| Parks and Recreation (12) |  |  |
| , | Apprentice Municipal Maintenance | > Pool Equipment Mechanic |
|  | Worker | Pool Lifeguard I |
|  | Community Program Supervisor | Recreation Instructor II |
|  | Field Operating Technician (Level IV) | Recreation Program Coordinator |
|  | Head Groundskeeper | Recreation Programmer I |
|  | Municipal Maintenance | Recreation Worker |
|  | Worker III (Parks/Facilities) Parks Foreman |  |
| Police (6) |  |  |
|  | Accident Investigator II | > Police Records Clerk |
|  | Crime Analyst II | > Public Safety Aide |
| Public Works / Building Services (12) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Distribution \& Collection Chief | > Municipal Maintenance Worker III (Public |
|  | Electro Technician | Services) |
|  | Engineering Aide II | > Public Service Maintenance Chief |
|  | Engineering Technician II | Utilities Mechanic I |
|  | Environmental Lab Technician | > Utilities Service Worker |
|  | Industrial Electrician | > Utility Field Representative |
|  |  | > Water Treatment Plant Operator II |

## BENCHMARK JOBS BY DEPARTMENT - GENERAL (CONTINUED)



## OVERALL MARKET POSITION - PAY ONLY

## CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL <br> MARKET POSITION AT THE 75TH PERCENTILE OVERALL PAY ONLY ${ }^{1}$

\left.|  | City of Fort Lauderdale as a Percent of the |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| the Market Average |  |  |  |$\right]$ th Percentile of

Figures shown in red are below market (less than 95\% of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to $105 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than 105\% of the market average)
${ }^{1}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor and work hours.

## OVERALL MARKET POSITION BY DEPARTMENT PAY ONLY

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL MARKET POSITION AT THE 75TH PERCENTILE BY DEPARTMENT - PAY ONLY ${ }^{1}$

|  | City of Fort Lauderdale as a Percent of the 75th <br> Percentile of the Market Average |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pay Range <br> Minimum | Pay Range <br> Midpoint | Pay Range <br> Maximum |
| City Attorney's Office | $108 \%$ | $106 \%$ | $106 \%$ |
| City Clerk's Office | $113 \%$ | $121 \%$ | $110 \%$ |
| City Commission's Office | $116 \%$ | $112 \%$ | $110 \%$ |
| City Manager's Office | $90 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| Crosses Multiple Departments | $100 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| Finance Department | $111 \%$ | $104 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Fire Department | $95 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Human Resources Department | $97 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Information Technology Department | $103 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Parks and Recreation Department | $97 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| Police | $93 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| Public Works / Building Services Department | $99 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Sustainable Development Department | $90 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Transportation and Mobility Department | $108 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 \%}$ | $9 \mathbf{9 3 \%}$ |

Figures shown in red are below market (less than 95\% of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to $105 \%$ of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than 105\% of the market average)
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${ }^{1}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor and work hours.

## Pay Structure Development and Costing Methodology

> Structures were developed using the 75th percentile market data. Range spreads are based on the market average range spread
$>$ Incumbents were brought to the minimum of the new pay grade based on the previously recommended and approved pay grades with the exception of adjusting any grades for positions with a proposed range to market range greater or less than 10\% from the market competitive rate (100\%) based on the 75th percentile.
> If the positions receiving grade changes caused compression in grades, those positions in relation to the adjusted positions were also adjusted.

## PROPOSED SALARY STRUCTURE GENERAL EMPLOYEES

|  |  | Proposed Salary Structure |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JE Grade | New Grade | Minimum | Mid | Maximum | Range Spread | Grade Progression |
| 101 | 1 | \$25,160.00 | \$32,079.00 | \$38,998.00 | 55.00\% |  |
| 102 | 2 | \$27,927.60 | \$35,607.69 | \$43,287.78 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 103 | 3 | \$30,999.64 | \$39,524.54 | \$48,049.44 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 104 | 4 | \$34,409.60 | \$43,872.23 | \$53,334.87 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 105 | 5 | \$38,194.65 | \$48,698.18 | \$59,201.71 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 106 | 6 | \$42,396.06 | \$54,054.98 | \$65,713.90 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 107 | 7 | \$47,059.63 | \$60,001.03 | \$72,942.43 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 108 | 8 | \$52,236.19 | \$66,601.14 | \$80,966.09 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 109 | 9 | \$57,982.17 | \$73,927.27 | \$89,872.36 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 110 | 10 | \$64,360.21 | \$82,059.27 | \$99,758.32 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 111 | 11 | \$71,439.83 | \$91,085.79 | \$110,731.74 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 112 | 12 | \$79,298.21 | \$101,105.22 | \$122,912.23 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |
| 113 | 13 | \$88,021.02 | \$112,226.80 | \$136,432.58 | 55.00\% | 11.00\% |

## PROPOSED SALARY STRUCTURE EXECUTIVE AND UPPER MANAGEMENT

|  |  | Proposed Salary Structure - Executive \& Upper Management |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JE Grade | New Grade | Minimum | Mid | Maximum | Range Spread | Grade Progression |
| 114 | 16 | \$96,535.56 | \$130,323.00 | \$164,110.44 | 70.00\% |  |
| 114 | 17 | \$104,258.40 | \$140,748.84 | \$177,239.28 | 70.00\% | 8.00\% |
| 115 | 18 | \$112,599.07 | \$152,008.75 | \$191,418.42 | 70.00\% | 8.00\% |
| 115 | 19 | \$121,607.00 | \$164,169.45 | \$206,731.90 | 70.00\% | 8.00\% |
| 116 | 20 | \$131,335.56 | \$177,303.00 | \$223,270.45 | 70.00\% | 8.00\% |

## TOTAL COMPENSATION MARKET POSITION

Overall, the total compensation analysis indicates:
$>39$ benchmark job titles are below market (less than 95\% at the midpoint)
$>34$ benchmark job titles are at market (between 95\% and 105\% at the midpoint)
> 17 benchmark job titles are above market (above 105\% at the midpoint)
$>2$ benchmark job titles did not garner sufficient matches to be statistically significant

Note: Health and retirement benefits used in the total compensation analysis reflect Public Sector peer employers only.

# OVERALL FOR MARKET POSITION TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES 

## CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 75TH PERCENTILE MARKET POSITION ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS - TOTAL COMPENSATION (Defined Benefit \& Deferred Compensation Only)

|  | Base Pay ${ }^{1}$ (Range Midpoint) | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs (Pay and Benefits) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs (Medical, Dental, \& Vision) | Total Retirement Benefits (Defined Benefit Plan \& Deferred Compensation)* |  |
| Overall Average | 96\% | 71\% | 137\% | 98\% |

Figures shown in red are below market (less than 95\% of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to 105\% of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than 105\% of the market average)
*Defined Contribution Plan excluded from overall cost of employer benefits, as employees hired before February 2008 are not eligible to participate.
${ }^{1}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor and work hours.

## OVERALL FOR MARKET POSITION TOTAL COMPENSATION - GENERAL EMPLOYEES

## CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FL <br> 75TH PERCENTILE MARKET POSITION ACROSS ALL BENCHMARKS AND PEER EMPLOYERS - TOTAL COMPENSATION GENERAL EMPLOYEES (Defined Contribution \& Deferred Compensation Only)

|  | Base Pay ${ }^{1}$ (Range Midpoint) | Employer Cost of Benefits |  | Employer Total Compensation Costs (Pay and Benefits) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Total Health Costs (Medical, Dental, \& Vision) | Total Retirement <br> Benefits <br> (Defined Contribution <br> \& Deferred <br> Compensation)* |  |
| Overall Average | 96\% | 71\% | 115\% | 95\% |

Figures shown in red are below market (less than 95\% of the market average)
Figures shown in black within the market range ( $95 \%$ to 105\% of the market average)
Figures shown in blue are above market (more than $105 \%$ of the market average)
*Defined Benefit Plan excluded from overall cost of employer benefits, as employees hired after February 2008 are not eligible to participate.
${ }^{1}$ Base pay rates have been adjusted for geographic differences in the cost-of-labor and work hours.

## COST IMPACT

Costs are attributable to:
$>$ Incumbent pay rate is below the minimum of the assigned pay grade
> Position was moved to new grade based on job reclassification and/or due to market adjustment and incumbent's resulting pay rate is below the newly assigned grade minimum

## COST IMPACT

|  | CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE 2018 PAY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COST SUMMARY |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Employee Group |
|  | General |
| Current Base Salary | \$112,859,904.98 |
| Number of Employees | 2136 |
| TO ADJUST TO NEW RANGE MINIMUM |  |
| New Range Minimum Adjustment | \$1,046,785.30 |
| Number Below New Range Minimum Adjustment Percent | $\begin{gathered} 414 \\ 0.9 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Newly Proposed Base Salary | \$113,906,690.28 |
| Salary Above Maximum Value |  |
| Current Structure | 608 |
| Proposed Structure | 100 |

## BENEFITS REVIEW

$>$ Comparison of Sick and Annual Paid Leave Policies (accrual rates and carryover)
$>$ Comparison of Medical Plan Employee vs. Employer Contributions (costsharing)
$>$ Review effect of Retirement Plan Contributions to net pay

## Further Questions



