



CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Wednesday, March 24, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.
Meeting Held Virtually Via Zoom

(Information for the public on how to participate will be available at missionks.org/calendar prior to the meeting)

If you require any accommodations (i.e. qualified interpreter, large print, reader, hearing assistance) in order to attend this meeting, please notify the Administrative Office at 913-676-8350 no later than 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Classification and Compensation System Discussion - Laura Smith

City of Mission	Item Number:	1.
DISCUSSION ITEM SUMMARY	Date:	March 24, 2021
Administration	From:	Laura Smith

Discussion items allow the committee the opportunity to freely discuss the issue at hand.

RE: Classification and Compensation Discussion

DETAILS: Wages and salaries make up the largest expenditure in any City's budget. In Mission's 2021 Budget they represent \$7,965,026 or 60% of Mission's General Fund expenses. Compensation that is too high is an unnecessary expense; too little compensation can result in problems with staffing and productivity. A well-constructed, properly-administered pay and classification plan helps attract and retain competent employees. It is also a useful tool in ensuring internal and external pay equity, determining promotions, making transfers, and evaluating performance. In March 2017, the City contracted with The Austin Peters Group (APG) to conduct a classification and compensation study.

The final report and implementation recommendations were presented in August/September of 2017. The Council reviewed several options, ultimately deciding to adopt a compensation philosophy which would allow the City to compete at the 60th percentile of the market. Meaning that four employers will pay more, and six will pay less. In addition to adopting an overall compensation philosophy, the Council also approved new salary ranges, moved employees to the new range minimums, and, most significantly, authorized one-time market compression pay adjustments.

The plan has been reviewed internally each year, but no significant changes, including range adjustments, have been implemented since 2018. At the outset of 2020, it was time for a more structured review based in part on attrition/retirement of several long-tenured employees, the introduction of new positions, and continually evolving roles and responsibilities in a number of departments. Unfortunately, with the stay-at-home order and shutdowns that occurred in March 2020, and the unknown budgetary impacts, the project was temporarily on hold. However, with the news that the City will be receiving funds directly through the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act, it seemed prudent to revive the conversation and to seriously consider how to move forward to implement changes and updates identified by APG.

During the work session, staff will present additional information for Council discussion and direction.

CFAA IMPACTS/CONSIDERATIONS: On-going review and management of the City's classification and compensation system ensures the City is appropriately positioned to respond to market changes and the current economic climate to attract and retain competent employees.

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	NA
Line Item Code/Description:	NA
Available Budget:	NA



MEMORANDUM

Date: March 19, 2021
To: Mayor and City Council
From: Laura Smith, City Administrator
RE: Classification and Compensation System Updates

Wages and salaries make up the largest expenditure in any City's budget. In Mission's 2021 Budget they represent \$7,965,026 or 60% of Mission's General Fund expenses. Compensation that is too high is an unnecessary expense; too little compensation can result in problems with staffing and productivity. A well-constructed, properly-administered pay and classification plan helps attract and retain competent employees. It is also a useful tool in ensuring internal and external pay equity, determining promotions, making transfers, and evaluating performance.

The overall objective in designing and maintaining a classification and compensation system is to create a credible plan that: ensures positions performing similar work with essentially the same level of complexity, responsibility, knowledge, skills and abilities are classified together; provides salaries commensurate with assigned duties; clearly outlines promotional opportunities and provides recognizable compensation growth; provides justifiable pay differential between individual classes; and maintains a level of competitiveness with relevant labor markets.

In March 2017, the City contracted with The Austin Peters Group (APG) to conduct a classification and compensation study. Although the City was reviewing the system annually, and making periodic adjustments based on market conditions, the last comprehensive compensation/classification analysis had not been completed since 2005. Ideally, a review of an organization's classification and compensation system would be done every 3-5 years.

During the 2017 process, the City sought input from the consultant to review market data, and to identify any potential structural deficiencies such as compression, overlap or internal equity concerns that existed. The study was also structured to address changes in City operations and staffing over time that may have affected the type, scope or level of work being performed by a particular position.

A project timeline was designed to produce study results and recommendations so that they could be reviewed as part of the 2018 Budget process. Project deliverables included:

- Development of an overall compensation philosophy
- An updated classification structure
- Market analysis

- Updated employee job descriptions
- Implementation strategies and cost analysis

The final report and implementation recommendations were presented in August/September of 2017. The Council reviewed several options, ultimately deciding to adopt a compensation philosophy which would allow the City to compete at the 60th percentile of the market. Meaning that four employers will pay more, and six will pay less. In addition to adopting an overall compensation philosophy, the Council also approved new salary ranges, moved employees to the new range minimums, and, most significantly, authorized one-time market compression pay adjustments. The estimated impact on base wages and additional salary related benefits (FICA, KPERS, KPF, etc.) was \$187,694.

The plan has been reviewed internally each year, but no significant changes, including range adjustments, have been implemented since 2018. At the outset of 2020, I felt it was time for a more structured review based in part on attrition/retirement of several long-tenured employees, the introduction of new positions, and continually evolving roles and responsibilities in a number of departments. Unfortunately, with the stay-at-home order and shutdowns that occurred in March 2020, and the unknown budgetary impacts, the project was temporarily on hold.

In September, I engaged APG for a limited review and update to our classification and compensation system which included a market analysis and recommendations regarding range and compression adjustments. A complete review and update of job descriptions was not necessary at this time. A copy of their report and recommendations is attached. You will note that the report contains analysis at both the 50th and 60th percentile of the market. Staff still supports and recommends maintaining the philosophy adopted in 2017 to remain competitive at the 60th percentile, but because of COVID budget impacts the APG group was asked to develop two possible budget scenarios.

As the 2021 budget year approached, it was clear there would still be revenues in the General Fund that would be significantly impacted by COVID, so we continued to hold the recommendations. However, with the news that the City will be receiving funds directly through the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act, it seemed prudent to revive the conversation and to seriously consider how to move forward to implement changes and updates identified by APG.

You will note that the APG report does not include specific dollar impacts for implementation. During the work session we will review general budgetary implications for implementation at both the 50th and 60th percentiles. Staff is recommending that we maintain the philosophy adopted in 2017 to be competitive at 60 percent of the market, but we will illustrate the differences in initial implementation costs as a part of our presentation. Once we have general direction from the Council, we will work on an employee specific implementation strategy and refined costs which will be brought back to the City Council in a future meeting.

In addition to establishing our target market position (50th percentile vs. 60th percentile), along with corresponding range movement and compression adjustments which are outlined in the APG report, there are several other reclassifications and structural changes which I am recommending be considered at this time also. They are detailed below, and any financial impacts of the recommended changes are already included in the implementation funding ranges that will be discussed.

Title Change

I am recommending changing the title for the Assistant City Administrator/Finance Director's position to that of Deputy City Administrator. The title change will more accurately reflect the increased responsibilities (Finance and Community Development Department supervision) that are currently assigned to the position. The current salary range is appropriate and no changes are recommended at this time. This is a title change for Brian Scott.

Reclassification

A position reclassification is the assignment of a new job profile and/or grade profile to an existing position. Changes are based on an evaluation of the duties, responsibilities, scope, impact, and minimum qualifications of the position. Reclassification is appropriate when there has been a significant increase in a position's scope, impact, complexity, responsibilities, and accountability such that the employee is required to exercise greater judgment and discretion, and to rely on a larger and more specific skill set than previously necessary in order to perform the work successfully.

Reclassification requests are often handled as a part of the annual budget development cycle if necessary, but it is also appropriate to consider them off-cycle to appropriately recognize and compensate employees for work that is being performed.

As a part of these classification and compensation discussions, there are three positions that are recommended for reclassification. The recommended reclassifications are explained below.

Assistant to the City Administrator to Assistant City Administrator: The recommendation would reclassify the position from Salary Grade 23 to Salary Grade 29. Over the last year, the Assistant to the City Administrator's position has taken on additional responsibilities including the supervision and oversight of Municipal Court, supervision and support for human resources, payroll and benefits, and the coordination of the city-wide branding and communications efforts among other things in addition to existing duties. The position currently functions at the level of a Department Director and should be reclassified with a title and corresponding salary grade change to reflect the current level of responsibility and authority. This is a reclassification of Emily Randel's position.

Court Clerk to Lead Court Clerk: The recommendation would reclassify an existing Court Clerk's position (Grade 13) as a Lead Court Clerk (Grade 14). Although overall supervision of Municipal Court is provided by the Assistant to the City Administrator, there is a need to designate a Lead Court Clerk who can manage and direct workflow and address court-specific issues on a day-to-day basis. Part of the responsibility of this position will be to ensure that all court staff are being appropriately cross-trained to ensure maximum flexibility in the operation of the department. This would be a formal reclassification of our most senior court clerk, Amberley Bard's who has been working "out of class" in this capacity for several months.

Public Works Crew Leader to Assistant Public Works Superintendent: This is a recommendation to reclassify one Public Works Crew Leader (Grade 16) position to an Assistant Public Works Superintendent (Grade 19). The existing Crew Leader positions are field supervisors, but they don't have direct supervisory responsibilities such as the ability to take disciplinary action or conducting annual performance reviews. This can result in less direct accountability, responsibility and productivity overall for the field crews. This supervisory responsibility is held by the Public Works Superintendent.

Currently the workload is such that the Public Works Director relies heavily on the Superintendent not only to manage the field crews, but to also assist with project management, right-of-way inspection and permit approval, and special projects. This does not allow him to spend the necessary time in the field. A breakdown of the current workload allocation is illustrated below:

- Field Crew Management (20%)
- Project Management/Special Projects (45%)
- Right-of-Way Programs (25%)
- Contract/Vendor Management (10%)

The proposed reclassification of one Crew Leader position to an Assistant Public Works Superintendent would shift a significant portion of managing the field crews away from the Public Works Superintendent and would allow for more efficiency, the ability to address issues more proactively and ideally an increase in productivity. An additional benefit of the reclassification would be the ability for succession planning, allowing for career progression and more internal promotional opportunities. This position would be advertised internally and would result in a promotion for an existing staff member.

Police Department Restructuring

Following the appointment of the new Chief of Police, we have been exploring ways to restructure the Department to provide enhanced opportunities for leadership development and succession planning without sacrificing the level of service provided to our residents and businesses. As we have discussed in previous meetings, we have already committed to

reducing the number of sworn personnel from 31 to 29 as a result of not moving forward with the Directed Patrol Unit (DPU).

Chief Madden and I will review proposed options for restructuring of the Department that, once approved, will allow him to move forward with promotional processes to fill the leadership positions that are currently vacant. Additionally, as a part of that discussion we will facilitate a discussion about the current staffing structure and rationale for how current personnel are assigned. The size and style of a police department and the types of services that it provides are a reflection of the character and demands of each community.



Market Survey Update
City of Mission, Kansas
November 2020



Team:
Elizabeth Tatarko, Vice President
Rebecca Crowder, President
Peter Tatarko, Consultant
4809 Prairie Vista
Fort Collins, CO 80526
Ph (970) 266-8724
Fax (913) 851-7529
etatarko@austinpeters.com
www.austinpeters.com

Table of Contents

Items	Page #
I. Background and Introduction	3
II. Recommendations	3
III. Market Study and Results	5
Collection of Salary Data	5
Table 1: Survey Respondents	5
Table 2: Proposed Ranges by Position	6

I. Background and Introduction

The City of Mission, Kansas engaged the services of The Austin Peters Group (APG), Inc., based in Overland Park, Kansas and Fort Collins, Colorado. The service engagement was for a market study update and a compression analysis. APG has provided the City Administrator with additional supporting documents for the project. This document is an overview of recommendations and findings. This document is the final report for the City of Mission.

II. Recommendations

The City of Mission approved engagement of The Austin Peters Group, Inc. in September 2020 for a market study update. The market study update follows a comprehensive compensation and classification study completed in 2017 for the City. The prior study used calculations at the 50th and 60th percentile of the market. The 60th percentile of the market means that four employers will pay more and six employers will pay less. The recommendations from the study are as follows:

Recommendation 1: Maintain a pay structure that moves current pay and ranges according to the market findings. APG found the City of Mission needs to make range adjustments. The City should move pay ranges according to an index that follows what pay ranges move for employers in Kansas City metropolitan area. Although ranges have not been adjusted since 2017, pay increases since 2017 have kept actual pay fairly competitive in most areas. Pay ranges do need moved to be competitive as well. Police pay was analyzed separately from all other employee pay and it was found that in general police did not lag as far behind as other employee groups. The proposed adjustments will increase competitiveness for all positions, including law enforcement. Proposed employee movements will include both adjustments to the new range minimums and a compression adjustment that is intended to be a placement in the ranges to separate employees based on time in position. APG recommends adjustments to the 50th or 60th percentile ranges and an additional adjustment for compression based on available funds.

Recommendation 2: Two positions in the current pay system need moved up according to market changes: the accountant and the planner.

In addition, APG collected market survey data for a proposed Lead Court Clerk position and the data has been incorporated into the proposed salary ranges.

III. Market Study and Results

Collection of Salary Data

The salary study was completed with data collected from peer cities used in the prior study. The market study update included all the positions from the prior study with a few

adjustments. A total of 39 positions were used in the market analysis. Data was collected on four additional positions but was not used due to lack of response or comparability.

Each market respondent was asked to complete a survey that included the following:

- A salary survey that asked participants to match and rate their own positions with those in the salary survey. For each position, the respondent provided the title of the position, minimum pay, maximum pay, average or actual pay, number of people in the position, number of people supervised by the position, and exempt or non-exempt status under Fair Labor Standards Act. Hourly wage rates were reported as of September, 2020. A sample and guide were provided to assist respondents.
- Each Market Peer was contacted a minimum of three times using email and telephone. Many Market Peers were contacted more than three times to clarify positions, reporting, and responsibilities. Some peers were able to provide all of the data requested, while others were able to provide partial information.

APG worked with the Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER) to purchase Cost of Living Index data (COLI). COLI data is recognized by the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, CNN Money, and the President's Council of Economic Advisors. This information was used to adjust peer data to make it comparable to the City of Mission, Kansas. The COLI indexes are included in Table 1.

A combined total of 21 cities and counties are represented in the market survey response (see Table 1). Eighteen (18) cities and counties responded to the market survey. Mid America Regional Council (MARC) salary and wage data was used for three additional cities.

Table 1: Respondents to the Survey

City/County	County	COLI	Response
Mission	Johnson County	107	Client
Atchison	Atchison County	92.8	No, used available MARC data
Bonner Springs	Leavenworth, Wyandotte Counties	80.8	Yes
Excelsior Springs	Clay, Ray Counties	92	Yes
Gardner	Johnson County	107	Yes
Gladstone	Clay County	92	Yes
Grandview	Jackson County	90.6	Yes
Johnson County	Johnson County	107	Yes
Kearney	Clay County	92	Yes
Lansing	Leavenworth County	93.3	Yes
Leawood	Johnson County	107	No
Lenexa	Johnson County	107	Yes
Merriam	Johnson County	107	No, used available MARC data
Oak Grove	Jackson County	90.6	Yes
Olathe	Johnson County	107	Yes
Ottawa	Franklin County	95.5	Yes
Overland Park	Johnson County	107	Yes
Pleasant Hill	Cass, Jackson	91.8	Yes
Prairie Village	Johnson County	107	Yes
Roeland Park	Johnson County	107	Yes
Shawnee	Johnson County	107	Yes
Smithville	Clay, Platte Counties	92	Yes
Unified Government	Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS	80.8	No, used available MARC data

The proposed pay ranges reflect the market midpoint. No positions or employees received a proposed decrease in pay. APG has provided the City Administrator a detailed analysis by person as to financial adjustments to be considered at both the 50th and 60th percentile of the market.

The proposed ranges for positions to align with the market are in Table 2. Two positions were found to need additional range adjustments based on the market: Accountant and Planner. Those adjustments are included in the proposed adjustments.

Table 2: Proposed Ranges by Position

Position Title	Pay Range	Current Hourly Min	Current Hourly Max	New Min at 50th Percentile	New Max at 50th Percentile	New Min at 60th Percentile	New Max at 60th Percentile
Office Assistant	11	\$ 15.51	\$ 22.49	\$ 16.86	\$ 24.45	\$ 17.58	\$ 25.50
Accountant	11 to 12	\$ 15.51	\$ 22.49	\$ 17.59	\$ 26.29	\$ 18.34	\$ 27.42
Payroll/Benefits Specialist	15	\$ 20.49	\$ 29.71	\$ 22.27	\$ 32.30	\$ 23.23	\$ 33.68
Accounting Manager	20	\$ 25.90	\$ 37.54	\$ 28.15	\$ 40.80	\$ 29.36	\$ 42.55
Assistant to the City Administrator	23	\$ 30.28	\$ 43.90	\$ 32.91	\$ 47.72	\$ 34.32	\$ 49.77
City Clerk	17	\$ 21.69	\$ 31.44	\$ 23.57	\$ 34.17	\$ 24.59	\$ 35.64
Asst City Administrator/ Finance Director	31	\$ 44.95	\$ 65.17	\$ 48.85	\$ 70.83	\$ 50.95	\$ 73.88
City Administrator	33	\$ 49.32	\$ 71.50	\$ 53.60	\$ 77.72	\$ 55.91	\$ 81.06
Court Clerk	13	\$ 17.84	\$ 25.88	\$ 19.39	\$ 28.13	\$ 20.23	\$ 29.34
Lead Court Clerk	14	n/a	n/a	\$ 21.25	\$ 30.76	\$ 22.16	\$ 32.08
Laborer/Equip Operator I	11	\$ 15.51	\$ 22.49	\$ 16.86	\$ 24.45	\$ 17.58	\$ 25.50
Laborer/Equip Operator II	13	\$ 17.84	\$ 25.88	\$ 19.39	\$ 28.13	\$ 20.23	\$ 29.34
Mechanic	15	\$ 20.49	\$ 29.71	\$ 22.27	\$ 32.30	\$ 23.23	\$ 33.68
Public Works Crew Leader	16	\$ 21.47	\$ 31.14	\$ 23.34	\$ 33.85	\$ 24.34	\$ 35.30
Public Works Superintendent	23	\$ 30.28	\$ 43.90	\$ 32.91	\$ 47.72	\$ 34.32	\$ 49.77
Public Works Director	29	\$ 40.58	\$ 58.84	\$ 44.10	\$ 63.95	\$ 46.00	\$ 66.70

Neighborhood Services Officer	14	\$ 19.55	\$ 28.30	\$ 21.25	\$ 30.76	\$ 22.16	\$ 32.08
Community Development Coordinator	16	\$ 21.47	\$ 31.14	\$ 23.34	\$ 33.85	\$ 24.34	\$ 35.30
Planner	16 to 17	\$ 21.47	\$ 31.14	\$ 23.57	\$ 34.18	\$ 24.58	\$ 35.65
Building Official	23	\$ 30.28	\$ 43.90	\$ 32.91	\$ 47.72	\$ 34.32	\$ 49.77
Maintenance Worker	10	\$ 14.94	\$ 21.65	\$ 16.23	\$ 23.53	\$ 16.93	\$ 24.54
Facilities & Maintenance Supervisor	20	\$ 25.90	\$ 37.54	\$ 28.15	\$ 40.80	\$ 29.36	\$ 42.55
Aquatics Facilities Manager	17	\$ 21.69	\$ 31.44	\$ 23.57	\$ 34.18	\$ 24.58	\$ 35.65
Aquatics Coordinator	13	\$ 17.84	\$ 25.88	\$ 19.39	\$ 28.13	\$ 20.23	\$ 29.34
Recreation Program Supervisor	20	\$ 25.90	\$ 37.54	\$ 28.15	\$ 40.80	\$ 29.36	\$ 42.55
Recreation Program Coordinator	15	\$ 20.49	\$ 29.71	\$ 22.27	\$ 32.30	\$ 23.23	\$ 33.68
Administrative Supervisor	20	\$ 25.90	\$ 37.54	\$ 28.15	\$ 40.80	\$ 29.36	\$ 42.55
Rental Coordinator	13	\$ 17.84	\$ 25.88	\$ 19.39	\$ 28.13	\$ 20.23	\$ 29.34
Membership Coordinator	13	\$ 17.84	\$ 25.88	\$ 19.39	\$ 28.13	\$ 20.23	\$ 29.34
Parks & Recreation Director	29	\$ 40.58	\$ 58.84	\$ 44.10	\$ 63.95	\$ 46.00	\$ 66.70
Police Records Clerk	13	\$ 17.84	\$ 25.88	\$ 19.39	\$ 28.13	\$ 20.23	\$ 29.34
Community Service Officer	13	\$ 17.84	\$ 25.88	\$ 19.39	\$ 28.13	\$ 20.23	\$ 29.34
Police Officer I	15	\$ 20.49	\$ 29.71	\$ 22.27	\$ 32.30	\$ 23.23	\$ 33.68
Police Officer II	16	\$ 21.47	\$ 31.14	\$ 23.34	\$ 33.85	\$ 24.34	\$ 35.30
Detective	19	\$ 24.91	\$ 36.11	\$ 27.08	\$ 39.25	\$ 28.24	\$ 40.94

Corporal	19	\$ 24.91	\$ 36.11	\$ 27.08	\$ 39.25	\$ 28.24	\$ 40.94
Sergeant	22	\$ 28.87	\$ 41.87	\$ 31.38	\$ 45.51	\$ 32.73	\$ 47.46
Captain	26	\$ 35.89	\$ 52.04	\$ 39.01	\$ 56.56	\$ 40.69	\$ 58.99
Chief of Police	31	\$ 44.95	\$ 65.17	\$ 48.85	\$ 70.83	\$ 50.95	\$ 73.88

The proposed ranges may vary due to rounding, the City Finance department will provide final ranges once approved by the Council.