



Sylvia Coronado-Romero
Human Resources Director

MEMORANDUM

To: Finance and Personnel Committee Members

From: Sylvia Coronado-Romero, Director of Human Resources *SCR*

Date: April 20, 2006

Re: History and Justification for the Proposed Change in Salary Range Placement of the Classifications of Deputy Chief (Police Department), Deputy City Attorney (City Attorney's Office) and Assistant Commissioner/Engineering (Public Works Department)

I respectfully request an appearance before the Finance and Personnel Committee to discuss the request to change the placement of the following non-represented classifications in the current salary range structure from R-18 to R-17:

Deputy Chief (Police Department)

Deputy City Attorney (City Attorney's Office)

Assistant Commissioner/Engineering (Public Works Department)

History of Range Placement of the Current Positions of Deputy Chief (Police Department), Deputy City Attorney and Assistant Commissioner/Engineering

Police Department

The PAR Group completed a study in October 2004 of the Police Department in which changes were recommended to the organizational structure of the Department. One of the recommendations of the study was to abolish three classifications; that of Assistant Police Chief, Inspector and Captain. The study recommended that the City create a new classification of Deputy Chief as a combination of the three previous classifications.

The PAR study indicates that the three positions in the Police Department were at different levels but with similar functions and scope of responsibility. For example, the Captains, the Inspector and the Assistant Police Chief were each in charge of similar activities performed in various divisions. Additionally, functions were inefficiently organized in such a manner as to necessitate more supervisory personnel.

The Assistant Police Chief position was in Range 18 (\$69,737 to \$94,144; 2004 salary scale), the Inspector position was in Range 17 (\$62,470 to \$84,333; 2004 salary scale) and the Captain position is a represented one with a 2004 starting salary of \$71,406.40 and a 6 months salary of \$73,611.20.

When the positions and corresponding responsibilities were reorganized, the new position of Deputy Chief was not reviewed for placement in the salary range system; it was simply left at the highest level of the three combined classifications, Range 18.

A review of the new classification of Deputy Chief, which is a combination of duties and responsibilities that were previously at three different levels, proposes that the Deputy Chief classification be placed at Range 17. Moving the position of Deputy Chief to Range 17 from Range 18 does the following: 1) addresses the streamlining of the three supervisory classifications previously in three different salary ranges into one; 2) places the new classification of Deputy Chief at a range commensurate with the new duties and responsibilities; and 3) avoids "department creep". Additionally, the placement of the new classification of Deputy Chief into Range 17 does not affect the current salary of the incumbents.

City Attorney's Office

Prior to 1997, the City had a structure in the City Attorney's Office that consisted of a separate classification for the position of City Attorney, Deputy City Attorney and Assistant City Attorney. The Deputy City Attorney classification was represented by the Racine Professional Employees Association (RPEA) and the Assistant City Attorney was a non-represented position. In 1997 the City and the Union agreed to eliminate the Deputy City Attorney classification from the RPEA unit in exchange for placing the classification of Assistant City Attorney in the bargaining unit.

In 1997 the City had a different salary range system for the non-represented positions that included 28 ranges from NR-4 to NR-31. The non-represented position of Assistant City Attorney was classified in range NR-24 and NR-26 depending on the specialization

or additional responsibilities. The position of Assistant City Attorney was moved to range NR-28 at some point before the range system changed to what the City currently has. The other positions in NR-28, at the time, are the position of Assistant Police Chief and the Personnel Director. The position of City Attorney is at NR-30 and only the Public Works Commissioner position is in the highest range, NR-31.

The classification of Deputy City Attorney appears in the non-represented range system in 1998 and is listed in Range 18 where the City Attorney is listed in Range 19. A study done by Carlson Dettmann Associates in 2001 points out that the position of Deputy City Attorney, as well as a few other positions, has a salary at least 10% above the market.

The recommendation to move the Deputy City Attorney classification to Range 17 places the classification in a range commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of similarly placed or recommended to be placed classifications. The position does not have supervisory responsibilities and therefore is similarly grouped in Range 17 with other professional and specialized positions. The incumbent was hired recently and therefore there is no impact on the salary or earning potential for many future years as the range has a spread of more than \$20,000. Additionally, salary ranges are adjusted for cost of living changes in an effort to keep up with relevant markets.

Public Works Department

When the employee in the position of City Engineer retired at the end of 2005, the classification was eliminated. Prior to the retirement of the City Engineer, the management team was comprised of the following:

Commissioner of Public Works	Range 19
City Engineer	Range 18
Assistant Commissioner	Range 17
Assistant City Engineer	Range 16

The four levels were reorganized to the current two levels.

When the City Engineer retired some of the duties and responsibilities of the position were assumed by the Commissioner of Public Works and some were assigned to the Assistant City Engineer. The incumbent in the position of Assistant City Engineer was given recognition for the additional responsibilities, was reclassified to the higher level position of Assistant Commissioner and was placed in one range above, Range 17. The classification of Assistant Commissioner/Public Works existed prior to the reclassification of the Assistant City Engineer to Assistant Commissioner/Engineering. The two positions are comparable in scope of duties and responsibilities and should therefore be placed in the same salary range.

The Mayor has expressed that he would like to reserve the two highest salary ranges, Range 18 and Range 19, for Directorships, given the scope and level of responsibility. The Assistant positions generally report to at least one higher level of authority. The salary of the incumbents in the three classifications addressed with this request will not be affected; the incumbents will not have a salary reduction.

Several audits and studies have been performed for the City since 1997. The studies have been done by at least 2 different outside companies who have not utilized the same format, system or benchmarks in their studies. A continuum of analysis is not evident and it is therefore very difficult to evaluate the impact of the recommendations. Additionally, organizations do not stop all their processes during and after the study is completed. At this time the City is in an Interim period where organizational changes necessitate decisions on classification titles, compensation comparisons for internal and external equity and the consequent placement of new classifications in the current salary system. I anticipate that in the future a more comprehensive evaluation will be done so that any inequities may be addressed and resolved to ensure the credibility of the City's compensation system and internal relationship of positions.