



CITY OF GAINESVILLE


Human Resources Department

040907 MOD

DATE: March 14, 2005

TO: Commissioner Chuck Chestnut, IV
Chair Personnel and Organizational Structure Committee

Commissioner Rick Bryant
Member Personnel and Organizational Structure Committee

FROM: Tom Motes, HR Director 

SUBJECT: City Auditor pay study

Summary: At the January 31, 2005 Audit and Finance Committee, the Chair of the P&O Committee requested, and the Audit and Finance Committee agreed, to refer the Auditor's pay study to the P&O Committee. The Chair of P&O asked the HR Director to determine whether the City Auditor used the same process in his pay study as was used for all of the other positions in the Managerial, Administrative, and Professional (MAP) pay structure. My review determined that the City Auditor used a process that is different from that used by the other five Charter Officers, and the result is that the MAP positions in the City Auditor's office would be placed in pay ranges approximately 13% to 31% higher at midpoint than had the same MAP methodology been used.

Background: The MAP pay structure was developed by obtaining market data to anchor key benchmark positions within each job family of similar positions. Then other positions were slotted into the structure in appropriate pay grades relative to the market benchmark positions in their respective job families. Respected published data sources were used to the maximum extent possible because of the consistency of their collection methodology. The Auditor's market study was based on a small sample (less than five in two of three positions) of positions, collected from sources other than Human Resource departments. We have maintained a strong stance with our bargaining units that studies collected in this manner are unreliable and often result in inconsistent data collection. Further for large organizations with diverse job types, gathering data in this manner is difficult, extremely costly and very time consuming. Thus, I reproduced the standard methodology used by the other Charter Officers for the positions in the Auditor's office. The difference between the two methods is outlined in the table below.

	City Auditor Method				Process Used for All Other MAP Positions			
	Pay Grade Recs	Min	Mid	Max	Pay Grade Recs	Min	Mid	Max
Asst. City Auditor	EXL	\$64,521	\$76,619	\$88,716	EXH	\$46,993	\$55,804	\$64,615
Senior Auditor	EXH	\$46,993	\$55,804	\$64,615	EXF	\$40,664	\$48,289	\$55,914
Staff Auditor	EXD	\$35,188	\$41,786	\$48,384	EXB	\$30,450	\$36,159	\$41,868

I also requested that the Auditor submit his reclassification request to Dr. Felix Lopez, the industrial psychologist who reviewed the appeals of those MAP employees who felt that their positions had been classified incorrectly. Normally, this would have been done after the market survey was completed and agreed upon, since by his own admission, Dr. Lopez is a classification expert and not a compensation expert. Because of the City Auditor's urgency in getting his positions in the pay structure, we attempted to do the classification and compensation concurrently rather than in sequence., as was done for the other Charter officers. For the positions of the other Charter Officers, the basic job families had already been anchored to the market, and thus the boundaries of reasonable classifications relative to the market had already been established.

In this instance the other MAP positions in the auditor job family had not yet been tied to the market, and Dr. Lopez made a recommendation relative to other positions in the MAP hierarchy (internal equity method). These other positions are not in the same job families or pay markets. The result is that the positions in the City Auditor's office are about 13% -31% higher than they otherwise would have been had the same methodology been used as was used by the other Charter Officers. (I should pointed out that some, but probably not all, of this gap may have been closed if the final matches were made on the job descriptions, but we need assistance from the City Auditor in order to complete this process). From an employee relations perspective, it would have been preferable, and consistent with what the other Charter Officers did, if the Assistant City Auditor and Staff Auditor had previously been placed in the hierarchy relative to their market value, and then the Senior City Auditor slotted in the hierarchy relative to these two positions. Given this experience, we would not recommend attempting to do these two processes concurrently again for any position, no matter what the perceived urgency.

Conclusion: The process used by the City Auditor for the three MAP positions in his office was different than the process used for all of the other MAP positions under the other five other Charter Officers. It is up to the discretion of the City Commission to determine whether allowing a different process for the Auditor's Office is desirable.



City of Gainesville

Text File

City Hall
200 East University Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Introduced: 3/14/2005

File Number: 040907 *MOD*

Version: 2

Status: On Consent Agenda

..Title

Proposed Reorganization of the City Auditor's Office (B)

..Explanation

At their meeting of January 31, 2005 the Audit and Finance Committee referred the proposed reorganization of the City Auditor's Office to the Personnel & Organizational (P&O) Structure Committee.

..Fiscal impact

The proposed reorganization, on an annualized basis, is expected to result in a decrease in the overall approved budget of the City Auditor's Office. For Fiscal Year 2005, it is anticipated that more than \$30,000 will be returned to the General Fund due to vacancies incurred during this transition.

..Recommendation

The Personnel and Organizational Structure Committee met March 1, 2005 and recommended:

1) The City Auditor and the Human Resources Director meet and discuss the proposed reorganization of the City Auditor's Office; and 2) the City Commission approve the reorganization of the City Auditor's Office by: a) Replacing the budgeted vacant Assistant City Auditor position with two entry level Staff Auditor positions; b) upgrading the current budgeted Staff Auditor to a Senior Auditor position; and c) reclassifying the current Staff Assistant II to an Executive Assistant position.