

COB - General Contact Form

08/18/2023 9:52 AM (MST)

AGENDA MATERIAL
DATE 8/21/23 ITEM NO. RA 14

Contact Us

Please use the form below to tell us how we can be of assistance.

****Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required and must be completed before submitting.****

First Name Concerned

Last Name Employee

Email

Please type the topic or subject of your message: Class & Comp Study Phase 2

3

Your Message

While I appreciate that the county is making an effort to give employees more competitive wages, there seems to have been an oversight within the plan in regards to employees already above the minimum of their grade and employees who have experience in their roles prior to accepting county employment. I implore you to revise the plan for Phase 2 and retention adjustments before implementation. More thought needs to be given to parts of the plan that have been overlooked to ensure that Pima County doesn't lose even more qualified staff to better paying jobs.

The current plan has no mention of how employees above the minimum in their salary range will progress in the future. I'll use myself as an example. I have been with the county for a little more than a year, which would give me one year of credited service in my new range during Phase 2. However my current salary without the 3% retention increase is already equivalent to ~2.5 years of service. With the retention adjustment, it will be equivalent to ~4.3 years of service. Would this mean that employees in my situation would not receive another adjustment until they reached additional years in their range, which in my case would be year five? I am sure I am not alone in saying that it does not sound appealing to stay in a position for five years before receiving a raise of approximately \$800 annually based on my salary grade. How does this contribute to the intended goal of employee retention?

The phase 2 plan includes a compression adjustment based on years with the county and years in current position. How does this apply to those of us who have several years in the same field prior to county employment? Again, using myself as an example, I have seven years experience prior to the county and one year with the county. Incorporating this into the salary calculation would increase my years of credited service to 6.25 rather than the 4.3 that the retention adjustment would provide. If this was implemented, it could contribute to the solution of the problem mentioned above, at least for some employees, since it would allow progression through a salary grade based on total years of experience in a position rather than just the years in that position with the county. Other employers (such as school districts) do this within their salary guides to credit previous experience and attract qualified candidates.

Another thing I would like to address is the 3% retention adjustment for those who do not benefit from the Phase 1 or 2 adjustments. The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that the Consumer Price Index (CPI) increased by 3.2% from July 2022 to 2023. By this, a 3% increase is actually a slight pay cut if adjusted for inflation. The CPI increased by 8.5% the year before that and Pima County employees received 3%, 5% or 8.5% for that year. Employees who did not receive the 8.5% are already receiving wages that are worth less than they were a year ago and many will still be in the same position with the 3%. Coupled with increases (even slight) in the cost of benefits, it is no wonder that the county has been losing employees. People are faced with increased costs but wages that aren't increasing at the same rate. It's essentially like taking a small pay cut year after year when staying at what is intended to be a stable, government job with the county.

Please consider the value of your workforce and make the changes necessary to allow the lower and middle grade workers to earn a livable wage; at minimum, make sure the wages are on par with inflation. I know myself and many others who were holding out hope for the results of the study. We want to stay in our jobs but will have to seek higher paying employment if the current plan is enforced - otherwise, we won't financially survive the year.

Would you like a response?

No

AGENDA MATERIAL

DATE 8/21/23 ITEM NO. RA16

Board of Supervisors,

My issue with the implementation of Phase 2 of the classification and compensation study is how it may negatively affect long-time Pima County employees who have been recently promoted. This issue does not concern me directly and will have no impact on my own compensation, as I have worked almost all of my tenure with Pima County in my current position. However, I feel compelled to speak up for anyone that it does affect.

For example, assuming no other time worked with the county, an employee who worked as an Administrative Assistant I (Grade 1) for 15 years and was just promoted to Administrative Assistant II (Grade 2) will be placed at an annual compensation of \$37,408 (the first quartile mark of the Grade 2 range). If they had not been promoted, they would have been placed at an annual compensation of \$41,360 (the third quartile mark of the Grade 1 range). This employee with 15 years of service at the lowest pay grade is being penalized and losing out on \$4,704 because they were promoted.

Depending on how long an employee worked in their previous position and what grade it was, employees who were just promoted 1 grade would lose out on the following amount of pay:

Grade	20 years	15 years	10 years	5 years
1	\$3,952	\$4,704	\$2,590	\$476
2	\$4,149	\$4,939	\$2,720	\$500
3	\$4,357	\$5,187	\$2,856	\$525
4	\$4,575	\$5,446	\$2,998	\$551
5	\$4,803	\$5,718	\$3,148	\$578
6	\$5,044	\$6,004	\$3,306	\$607
7	\$5,295	\$6,303	\$3,470	\$638
8	\$6,065	\$7,249	\$4,401	\$1,553
9	\$6,872	\$8,116	\$4,621	\$1,126
10	\$7,216	\$8,522	\$4,852	\$1,182
11	\$7,577	\$8,948	\$5,095	\$1,241
12	\$7,955	\$9,395	\$5,349	\$1,302
13	\$8,353	\$9,865	\$5,617	\$1,368
14	\$5,444	\$7,107	\$2,721	
15	\$5,989	\$7,818	\$2,995	
16	\$6,587	\$8,600	\$3,294	
17	\$4,670	\$7,447	\$2,174	
18	\$7,222	\$10,416	\$2,500	
19	\$8,305	\$11,978	\$2,875	
20	\$9,551	\$13,775	\$3,306	
21	\$10,983	\$15,841	\$3,802	
22	\$12,631	\$18,218	\$4,373	
23	\$8,595	\$16,330	\$1,719	
24	\$14,440	\$23,722	\$2,063	
25	\$3,094	\$14,697		

For grades 13 and under, even a 2-grade promotion can still cause lost pay:

Grade	20 years	15 years	10 years
1	\$2,081	\$2,871	\$795
2	\$2,186	\$3,015	\$835
3	\$2,295	\$3,166	\$877
4	\$2,409	\$3,324	\$920
5	\$2,530	\$3,490	\$966
6	\$2,656	\$3,664	\$1,014
7	\$3,293	\$4,478	\$1,821
8	\$3,458	\$4,702	\$1,913
9	\$4,135	\$5,441	\$2,009
10	\$4,342	\$5,714	\$2,109
11	\$4,559	\$5,999	\$2,214
12	\$4,787	\$6,299	\$2,325
13	\$1,699	\$3,362	

These amounts will vary some based on any other service for Pima County, and the amount of time an employee has been in their position since promotion. However, this is an issue with Phase 2 that disproportionately affects people in lower pay grades and those working the longest for Pima County. Employees should not be penalized for getting promoted, and their new pay should be adjusted to at least match what they would have gotten if they had not been promoted.

If this is not a widespread issue, then it will not be that costly for Pima County to address.

If it is a widespread issue, then Pima County should address it to avoid penalizing many of its most loyal employees for seeking promotion.

If this is something that is too complicated and cumbersome for HR to calculate and automate, then I recommend that it be codified as something that employees can file an appeal for, similar to how they can appeal what classification they were placed in. If there is not time to address this during Phase 2, it should be addressed during Phase 3.

Thank you for your consideration,

Matthew Chapman

Pima County RWRD Chemist Specialist