# Minnehaha Creek Watershed District

# REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

| MEETING DATE:   | December 20, 2018   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| TITLE:  | Acceptance of 2018 Classification and Compensation Study Results; and Adoption of MCWD Pay Structure          |  |  |  |  |
| RES. NUMBER:  | 18-126  |  |  |  |  |
| PREPARED BY:  | James Wisker  |  |  |  |  |
| E-MAIL:   | Jwisker@minnehahacreek.org <b>TELEPHONE</b> : 952-641-4509  |  |  |  |  |
| REVIEWED BY:  | □ Administrator       □ Counsel       □ Program Mgr.       □ Board Committee         □ Engineer       □ Other |  |  |  |  |
| WORKSHOP ACTIO  | N:  |  |  |  |  |
| ☐ Advance to Board mtg. Consent Agenda. ☐ Advance to Board meeting for discussion prior to action |   |  |  |  |  |
| ☐ Refer to a future   | workshop (date):  |  |  |  |  |
| ☐ Return to staff fo  | or additional work.   No further action requested.  |  |  |  |  |
| ☑ Other (specify): Final Action on December 20, 2018  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |

### **ACTION REQUESTED:**

The Board of Managers is requested to take the following actions:

- Accept the results and findings of the 2018 Classification and Compensation Study
- Adopt the proposed MCWD Pay Structure

#### **BACKGROUND:**

On October 8, 2015 the Board of Managers approved a strategic planning process to evaluate and align MCWD programs (Resolution 15-005). This planning process:

- Defined and aligned the purpose of programs around the revised mission and goals
- Prioritized initiatives within programs
- Prioritized programmatic initiatives across the organization
- Prioritized and allocated resources within and across programs

At the conclusion of that process, on February 9, 2017, the Board of Managers approved a Strategic Alignment Plan (Resolution 17-007), and provided direction to the Administrator to incorporate and implement the realigned organizational priorities into the District's:

- Watershed Management Plan
- Budget and Financial Plans
- Information Technology Plans
- Human Resource Plans

Prior to the conclusion of the Strategic Alignment Plan, on November 17, 2016 the Board of Managers authorized a contract with Springsted Inc., to assist MCWD in realigning its human resources around its strategic priorities (Resolution 16-082). Goals of this planning effort included ensuring that the right people, in

the right amount, with the right skills, are in the right place, at the right time, to deliver on the organizational priorities established through the 2017 Strategic Alignment Plan.

On August 24, 2017 the Board of Managers approved a Human Resources Plan that included a revised organizational chart to restructure MCWD's personnel to support the 2017 Strategic Alignment Plan.

On January 11, 2018 staff outlined a plan for implementing the proposed organizational restructure, and provided a roadmap for complementary and ongoing HR development including:

- Restructure organization
  - Realign departments and personnel around strategic priorities
- Implement a classification and compensation structure
  - o Develop clear plan and supporting policy for what MCWD pays, how and why
- Internal framework for clear expectations, accountability and professional development
  - Ensure consistent and high expectations and accountability
  - Develop clarity of proficiency and professional development requirements for each department and position

#### CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY:

On February 9, 2018, the Board of Managers authorized a second contract with Springsted Inc., to assist the District in implementing the organizational restructure, focused on appropriately classifying MCWD's positions and determining a market competitive pay structure (Resolution 18-011).

### Scope of Work:

Springsted's work was to:

- Understand the goals of the adopted organizational chart and the positions within it
- Review job descriptions drafted by MCWD
- Systematically classify MCWD positions using the SAFE® method
- Complete a compensation survey evaluating MCWD positions against the market
- Recommend a revised classification and compensation structure for MCWD's restructure

### Goals:

MCWD's goals for its new classification and compensation structure include:

- Support the recruitment and retention of talent necessary to achieve MCWD's mission
- Being competitive with the regional market
- Reflect MCWD's unique strategic priorities
- Provide internal equity through consistent evaluation of positions and pay
- Reward employees on the basis of mission driven performance
- Maintain a plan that is clear and easy to communicate
- Comply with all laws and regulations

### Process:

The process for completing the Classification and Compensation Study included:

- MCWD Administrator drafting and review of position descriptions with staff
  - o Aligned with organizational chart, based on new strategic priorities
- Preliminary evaluation of position classification by MCWD using SAFE®
- Independent evaluation of position classification by Springsted using SAFE®

- Obtaining market data for comparable positions from benchmark organizations
- Aggregating and using market data to validate and correct SAFE analysis
- Review by MCWD Administrator, Leadership Team, Operations Manager, Springsted
- Review by MCWD Administrator, Board Liaisons, Springsted
- Final draft classification and pay structure development by Springsted
- Review on December 13, 2018 by Operations and Programs Committee

#### Results:

The results/deliverables from the Classification and Compensation Study include:

- MCWD position classification based on SAFE®
- Proposed MCWD Pay Structure
- Executive summary of market comparison of MCWD benefits

# Components of the SAFE® Job Evaluation System:

The Systematic Analysis and Factor Evaluation (SAFE®) System ensures a consistent and equitable method of evaluating jobs. The basis for the system is an arrangement of job groupings predicated on characteristics of work. A series of job factors are then applied to the work characteristics in order to determine a numerical value for each position.

The system ensures that each element of job responsibility and each work characteristic is given proper consideration. The total of the points assigned represents the rank of the position in relation to all other positions within the organization.

### Characteristics of Work:

Characteristics of work can be defined as the general character of the scope of the work performed by a position or a class of positions that distinguishes it from other positions. There are sixteen work characteristics – manual, semiskilled, skilled trades, technical, skilled technical, advanced technical, human support, skilled human support, advanced human support, protective services, advanced protective services, administrative support, skilled administrative support, administrative, professional, executive. The work characteristics are grouped into six skill levels. The skill levels are then used in conjunction with job factors to determine the value of a position as it relates to other positions within the organization.

#### Job Factors:

There are nine job factors which detail components of work that are present in most job classes. These factors are:

Training and Ability: includes education and specialized training, licenses, certifications, and registrations

which are required of the position.

Experience: the time usually required for a person with the required training and ability to develop the

necessary skills and abilities to perform the job.

Level of Work: distinguishes between entry level, intermediate level, advanced/supervisory, or a

mastery/managerial level of the type of work performed.

Human Relations: the responsibility of working with or through other people, and the extent, frequency, and

purpose of the contacts.

Physical Demands: the job requirements which induce physical fatigue through exertion or strain.

Working Conditions: the extent of disagreeable or hazardous environmental or physical conditions or mental

effort and/or stress and the frequency of the undesirable conditions.

Independence: how much freedom or independence is allowed or required of the position.

End Impact: the extent to which the job directly influences and affects actions impacting the end

results, i.e. how much do the decisions or actions of the employee impact the

organization.

Supervision: the responsibility for oversight or supervision over other employees.

### Benchmark Organizations:

The following benchmark organizations were used by Springsted to match MCWD positions, based on content (essential functions and minimum qualifications), with market comparable positions: Bloomington, Carver County, Edina, Hennepin County, Mississippi WMO, State of MN, Scott County, St. Louis Park, Three Rivers Park District, Private Sector.

# Pay Structure:

Attachment A outlines the pay structure proposed by Springsted, based on a statistical analysis of market data for comparable positions from the aforementioned benchmark organizations which was then used to validate the SAFE® classification.

Two positions within this structure are labeled with an asterisk, the Policy Planning Manager and the Operations Manager. These positions are recommended to be placed to better reflect MCWD's mission driven strategic priorities, size and organizational structure, rather than only reflect market data. Market driven placement would have these position's placement flipped.

Discussion through the analysis process (staff vetting with Springsted, discussion with the District's HR Liaisons, and the December 13, Operations and Programs Committee) outlined the rationale for these placements. Principally, capital project implementation and policy development are the MCWD's two top strategic priorities. Per the 2017 Strategic Alignment Plan, all other program functions at MCWD serve in support of those priorities.

The Policy Planning Manager will work closely with the Administrator to evaluate and maintain internal strategic alignment, develop directional budget priorities, manage the District's "responsive program" to evaluate threats and opportunities and recommend resource distribution to communities, and oversee MCWD's policy programs. Market comparables undervalued this position with respect to organizational significance this position plays within MCWD's organizational structure.

Conversely, market comparables for the Operations Manager position overestimate the end impact this position has within the organizational structure of MCWD. Matches included positions for larger, more complex public sector organizations that inherently place significantly more span of control under operations positions than does MCWD based on its size, mission driven strategic priorities, and organizational structure.

Based on these unique differences between the market and MCWD's strategic priorities, it is recommended that the Board of Managers place these positions as outlined in the proposed pay structure.

#### Benefit Comparison:

Attachment B provides an executive summary of MCWD's benefits compared to benchmark organization's surveyed. Benefits evaluated included (leave, health, dental, life insurance).

MCWD renews its health benefits annually in May-June. The MCWD Board intends to further evaluate its current health benefits in 2019 against the market, and determine a long-range position on employee health benefits that is market competitive, fiscally responsible and supports the District's overarching goals of remaining competitive the in regional talent market to be able to recruit and retain the personnel it needs to accomplish its mission.

# **ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1. Attachment A Draft pay structure
- 2. Attachment B Executive summary of benefit survey

#### RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NUMBER: <u>18-126</u>

TITLE: Acceptance of 2018 Classification and Compensation Study Results; and Adoption of MCWD Pay Structure

WHEREAS, on October 8, 2015 the MCWD Board of Managers approved a strategic planning process to evaluate and align MCWD programs (Resolution 15-005); and

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of that planning process, on February 9, 2017 the MCWD Board of Managers approved a Strategic Alignment Plan (Resolution 17-007), and directed the Administrator to incorporate and implement the realigned organizational priorities into the District's operational structures through the development of a human resources (HR) plan; and

WHEREAS, to advance this directive, on November 17, 2016 the MCWD Board of Managers authorized a contract with Springsted Inc., to restructure and align the District's human resources around its strategic priorities (Resolution 16-082); and

WHEREAS, as a result of that human resource planning effort, on August 24, 2017 the MCWD Board of Managers approved a Human Resources Plan which included a revised organizational chart; and

WHEREAS, on January 11, 2018 District staff outlined a plan for implementing the adopted organizational restructure, and provided a roadmap for complementary and ongoing human resource development, including developing a classification and compensation structure; and

WHEREAS, on February 9, 2018 the MCWD Board of Managers authorized a contract with Springsted Inc., to assist the District in implementing the organizational restructure, focused on appropriately classifying MCWD's positions, and determining a market competitive pay structure that accomplishes the following goals (Resolution 18-011); and

- Support the recruitment and retention of talent necessary to achieve MCWD's mission
- Provide compensation that is competitive with the regional market
- Reflect MCWD's unique strategic priorities
- Provide internal equity though consistent evaluation of positions and pay
- Reward employees on the basis of mission driven performance
- Maintain a pay plan that is clear and easy to communicate
- Comply with all laws and regulations;

WHEREAS, Springsted Inc. has worked with District staff and the MCWD's HR Liaisons to:

- Understand the goals of the organizational restructure, and the positions within it
- Review job descriptions drafted by MCWD
- Systematically classify MCWD positions using the SAFE® method
- Complete a compensation survey, evaluating MCWD positions against the market
- Recommend a classification and compensation framework to support MCWD's restructure:

WHEREAS, the results of this study were presented on December 13, 2018 to the MCWD Operations and Programs Committee; and

| Secretary      |  | _ Date: December 20, 2018                    |
|----------------|--|--|
| Motion to adop | ot the resolution ayes, nays,abstentions.  |  |
| Resolution Nu  | mber 18-126 was moved by Manager   | , seconded by Manager                        |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
|                |  |  |
| BE IT FURTH    | ER RESOLVED that the MCWD Board of Managers he Attachment A.   | ereby adopts the pay structure identified in |
|                | FORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MCWD Board of Mand compensation study findings; and                              |  |
|                | human resource plan goals;   |  |
| WHEREAS,       | the MCWD Board of Managers finds that the classification product of a robust, objective, market based process, |  |

# DRAFT MCWD PAY STRUCTURE

| Title                                   | Grade | Min       | Mid         | Max        |
|---|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| District Administrator                  | 21    | 96,106.84 | 115,328.21  | 134,549.57 |
|   |       |           |             |            |
| Project Planning Manager                | 19    | 83,943.43 | 100,732.12  | 117,520.81 |
| Policy Planning Manager *               | 18    | 78,451.81 | 94,142.17   | 109,832.53 |
| Toney Hamming Manager                   | 10    | 70,131.01 | 3 1,1 12.17 | 103,032.33 |
| Research and Monitoring Program Manager | 17    | 73,319.45 | 87,983.34   | 102,647.23 |
| Communications and Education Manager    | 17    | 73,319.45 | 87,983.34   | 102,647.23 |
| Operations Manager *                    | 17    | 73,319.45 | 87,983.34   | 102,647.23 |
| Permitting Program Manager              | 17    | 73,319.45 | 87,983.34   | 102,647.23 |
| Project and Land Manager                | 17    | 73,319.45 | 87,983.34   | 102,647.23 |
| Planner-Project Manager                 | 16    | 68,522.85 | 82,227.42   | 95,931.99  |
| riailliei-rioject ivialiagei            | 10    | 00,322.03 | 02,227.42   | 33,331.33  |
| Aquatic Ecologist                       | 15    | 64,040.04 | 76,848.05   | 89,656.06  |
|   |       |           |             |            |
| Policy and Grants Coordinator           | 14    | 59,850.51 | 71,820.61   | 83,790.71  |
| Project and Land Management Technician  | 13    | 55,935.05 | 67,122.07   | 78,309.08  |
|   |       |           |             |            |
| Permitting Technician                   | 12    | 52,275.75 | 62,730.90   | 73,186.05  |
| Research and Monitoring Coordinator     | 12    | 52,275.75 | 62,730.90   | 73,186.05  |
| Education and Engagement Coordinator    | 12    | 52,275.75 | 62,730.90   | 73,186.05  |
| Operations Coordinator                  | 11    | 48,855.84 | 58,627.01   | 68,398.18  |
| Research and Monitoring Technician      | 11    | 48,855.84 | 58,627.01   | 68,398.18  |
| Communications Coordinator              | 11    | 48,855.84 | 58,627.01   | 68,398.18  |
| GIS Technician                          | 11    | 48,855.84 | 58,627.01   | 68,398.18  |
| dis recimician                          |       | 10,033.01 | 30,027.01   | 00,330.10  |
| Accounting Clerk                        | 9     | 42,672.59 | 51,207.10   | 59,741.62  |
| Permitting Assistant                    | 9     | 42,672.59 | 51,207.10   | 59,741.62  |
| Research and Monitoring Field Assistant | 8     | 39,880.92 | 47,857.11   | 55,833.29  |
| Administrative Assistant                | 8     | 39,880.92 | 47,857.11   | 55,833.29  |

<sup>\*</sup> Grade placement determined by District policy decision/administrative direction

### **Executive Summary of Benefit Survey**

As part of the MCWD's 2018 Classification and Compensation Study, a survey was distributed to benchmark organizations regarding employee benefits. That information is provided in an executive summary form below. This information will be used by the Board of Managers to determine the District's position regarding employee benefits. Health benefits are renewed annually in May.

### Leave Summary:

Number of Holidays per year

MCWD: 11 Average: 11 Low: 10 High: 12

Leave Days - Max Accumulation

MCWD: 30 days Average: 52.79 days Low: 30 days High: Unlimited

Leave Day - Compensated for leave lost after max accrual

MCWD: Yes (convert to 457b or HSA)

Average: No

Low: 8 No responses High: 1 Yes response

Sick Leave – Accrual per year

MCWD: 9 days Average: 12 days Low: 12 days High: 13 days

Sick Leave – Max Accrual

MCWD: 90 days Average: 125 Low: 125 High: Unlimited

Sick Leave – Paid at Termination

MCWD: Yes (percentage based)

Average: Yes Low: 1 No response High: 5 Yes responses

# <u>Life/Disability Insurance:</u>

MCWD: \$522

Average Market: \$314

# *Life Insurance – % Employer Paid*

MCWD: 100% Average: 100% Low: 100% High: 100%

### AD&D -% Employer Paid

MCWD: 100% Average: 57% Low: 0% High: 100%

# Short Term Disability - % Employer Paid

MCWD: 100% Average: 33% Low: 0% High: 100%

# Long Term Disability - % Employer Paid

MCWD: 100% Average: 89% Low: 0% High: 100%

# Health Insurance Summary:

MCWD Health Insurance Plan Overview

- Employees have one option for Health Insurance
- The plan is a high deductible plan Single Deductible: \$2,000 Family Deductible: \$4000
- Premiums are age bracketed and are paid per person on the plan (up to 3 children)
- Employee funded HSA offered
- Employer funded HRA offered (\$650 Single / \$1300 Family)

# Average Annual Health Insurance Cost per FTE

MCWD: \$10,796

Average Market: \$12,963

### *Health Insurance -% Employer Paid –Employee Only (LDP / HDP)*

MCWD: 100% Average: 93% / 96% Low: 80% / 89% High: 100% / 100%

### Health Insurance - % Employer Paid Employee/Spouse (LDP / HDP)

MCWD: 100% Average: 80% / 85% Low: 62% / 74% High: 100% / 100% Health Insurance - % Employer Paid Employee/Family (LDP / HDP)

MCWD: 100% Average: 75% / 82% Low: 65% / 75% High: 85% / 100%

Health Insurance – Supplemental Program for HDP

MCWD: Yes (HSA/HRA) HRA 100% employer funded

Responses: 4 HRA/VEBA/HSA

5 None

# **Dental Insurance Summary:**

Average Annual Dental Insurance Cost per FTE

MCWD: \$828

Average Market: \$539

Dental Insurance - % Employer Paid Employee Only

MCWD: 100% Average: 81% Low: 40% High: 100%

Dental Insurance - % Employer Paid Employee/Family

MCWD: 100% Average: 0% Low: 0% High: 0%