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I. Introduction

CPS HR Consulting (CPS HR) was retained by County of Calaveras (County) to conduct a base salary study utilizing 200 benchmark classifications and to develop salary range recommendations for the County’s entire pay structure. The study’s objectives were to (1) determine the competitiveness of the County’s salaries within the labor market and (2) develop updated salary range recommendations in keeping with the County’s pay philosophy. To achieve this, a labor market of eight (8) comparable agencies were identified, and base salary data were collected and analyzed.

II. Project Scope and Work Plan

To complete the base compensation study, CPS HR Project Team completed the following tasks:

- Reviewed the County’s background materials including classification specifications, salary schedules, pay philosophy, and organizational charts.
- Developed a data collection method and survey instrument.
- Received confirmation from the County regarding the labor market agencies and benchmark classifications to be surveyed.
- The County determined the job matches in the comparable labor market agencies and collected the data after a training session conducted by CPS HR.

III. Compensation Study Parameters

The first step in conducting any base compensation survey is to determine the basic parameters for the survey. These parameters include:

- Labor market position
- Labor market agencies (comparable agencies)
- Survey classifications (benchmark classifications)

Labor Market Position

CPS HR provides a labor market data analysis based on the median of the market. The labor market median, which is described as the “middle” of the market, is the data point at which half of the complete range of data (excluding County data) is higher, and half of the complete range of data (excluding County data) is lower. The median is a common market position, particularly
in smaller data sets, because the data is less likely to be skewed by high and low payers in the market.

The labor market position provides a goal post in the data from which to set the desired labor market position. There are three labor market position options:

1. lead the market
2. meet the market
3. lag the market

Leading the market is the alignment of pay parameters and positions pay parameters higher than the market (i.e., 60th percentile or 70th percentile). Lagging the market is positioning pay parameters below the market (i.e., 40th percentile or lower). Meeting the market is positioning pay parameters at the median of the market (i.e., exactly at the 50th percentile).

Ultimately, the client selects the desired labor market position based on affordability, recruitment and retention goals, and business strategy.

**Labor Market Agencies**

The agencies surveyed comprise the eight (8) labor market agencies for all 200 benchmark classifications. The labor market agencies were researched by CPS HR and selected by County staff. The final labor market included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. County of Tuolumne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. County of Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. County of San Joaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. County of El Dorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. County of Yuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. County of Yolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. County of Amador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. County of Nevada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Classifications

The survey benchmark classifications for the study are presented below and on the following pages.

1. Accountant Auditor II
2. Accounting Technician II
3. Administrative Analyst II
4. Administrative Assistant II
5. Administrative Compliance Analyst II
6. Administrative Services Manager II
7. Administrative Services Officer II
8. AG Biologist Weights & MSRS Inspector II
9. AG Commissioner/Dir Weights & MSRS
10. AG Weights/Measures Technician
11. Air Pollution Control Specialist II
12. Airport Manager II
13. Animal Services Manager
14. Animal Services Officer II
15. Animal Shelter Assistant
16. Appraiser II
17. Assessment Analyst II
18. Assessment Technician II
19. Assessor
20. Assistant Auditor Controller
21. Assistant Chief Probation Officer
22. Assistant Clerk/Recorder
23. Assistant County Administrative Officer
24. Assistant Director - HHSA
25. Assistant District Attorney
26. Auditor/Controller
27. Behavioral Health Administrative Services Manager
28. Board of Supervisor Member
29. Building Inspector II
30. Business Administrator
31. Business Analyst II
32. Captain
33. Case Manager II
34. Chief Appraiser
35. Chief Building Official
36. Chief of Assessment Services
37. Chief Probation Officer
38. Clerical Assistant III
39. Clerk/Rec/Elections Coordinator II
40. Clinical Nurse II
41. Clinician II
42. Code Enforcement Officer
43. Community Health Assistant II
44. Community Service Liaison
45. Coroner/Public Administrator
46. Corporal
47. Correctional Cook II
48. Correctional Corporal
49. Correctional Officer
50. Correctional Sergeant
51. Correctional Technician
52. County Administrative Officer
53. County Archivist
54. County Clerk Recorder
55. County Counsel
56. County Librarian
57. County Veterans Services Officer
58. Crime Scene Specialist/Property Room Manager
59. Department Analyst
60. Deputy AG Commissioner
61. Deputy CAO-Chief Information Officer
62. Deputy CAO-HR/Risk Management
63. Deputy Clerk of the Board
64. Deputy County Counsel II
65. Deputy County Counsel IV
66. Deputy Director Clinical Services
67. Deputy Director Public Health
68. Deputy Director Public Works
69. Deputy Director Social Services
70. Deputy District Attorney II
71. Deputy Probation Officer II
72. Deputy Public Guardian II
73. Deputy Sheriff II
74. Deputy Treasurer Tax Collector
75. Director Cannabis Control
76. Director Economic & Community Development
77. Director Emergency Services
78. Director Health & Human Services Agency
79. Director of Integrated Waste
80. Director Planning
81. Director Public Health Nursing
82. Director Public Works & Transportation
83. Dispatch Clerk
84. District Attorney
85. District Attorney Investigator II
86. District Attorney Services Technician II
87. Election Clerk
88. Eligibility Specialist II
89. Eligibility Specialist Supervisor
90. Emergency Preparedness & Response Manager
91. Emergency Services Coordinator
92. Emergency Snow Plow Driver II
93. Employment Training Worker II
94. Employment Training Worker Supervisor
95. Engineer Technician II
96. Environmental Assessment & Enforcement Specialist
97. Environmental Health Manager
98. Environmental Health Specialist II
99. Environmental Health Technician II
100. Environmental Management Admin/APCO
101. Epidemiologist
102. Equipment Services Center Superintendent
103. Executive Director CMCAA
104. Executive Director First 5
105. Facilities Maintenance & Grounds Manager
106. Facilities Maintenance Engineer
107. Facilities Maintenance Worker II
108. Facilities Supervisor
109. Fire Prevention Inspector
110. Fiscal Services Manager
111. GIS Coordinator
112. GIS Technician II
113. Groundskeeper
114. Health Education Program Manager
115. Health Education Specialist II
116. HHSA Fiscal Administrator
117. HHSA Program Manager
118. Housing & Community Programs Manager
119. Human Resources Analyst
120. Human Resources Program Assistant II
121. Integrated Waste Engineer
122. Integrated Waste Equipment Operator
123. Integrated Waste Gatekeeper
124. Integrated Waste HH Haz Wst Technician
125. Integrated Waste Manager
126. Integrated Waste Operations Foreman
127. Integrated Waste Operations Supervisor
128. Integrated Waste Worker II
129. Investigative Assistant
130. IT Security Analyst
131. IT Support Technician II
132. Lead Custodian
133. Legal Clerk II
134. Library Assistant
135. Library Branch Assistant
136. Library Program Coordinator
137. Licensed Clinical Social Worker
138. Lieutenant
139. Literacy Community Liaison
140. Literacy Program Coordinator
141. Mechanic II
142. Medical Billing Specialist II
143. Medical Records Technician
144. MHSA Support Services Supervisor
145. Network Specialist II
146. Network Specialist Manager
147. Occupational Health Therapist II
148. Office Technician II
149. Paralegal
150. Paralegal Criminal
151. Permit Technician II
152. Physical Therapist
153. Planner II
154. Plans Examiner II
155. Principal Administrative Analyst
156. Probation Technician
157. Program Coordinator II
158. Program Supervisor
159. Psychiatric Technician II
160. Psychiatrist
161. Public Access TV Manager
162. Public Access TV Program Coordinator
163. Public Authority Manager
164. Public Health Nurse II
165. Public Works Analyst II
166. Public Works Inspector II
167. Public Works Project Manager
168. Quality Management Specialist
169. Recorder Clerk II  
170. Records Manager  
171. Road Maintenance Operations Supervisor  
172. Road Maintenance Worker II  
173. Road Superintendent  
174. Safety & Training Specialist  
175. Screener-Housing Program  
176. Senior Code Enforcement Officer  
177. Sergeant  
178. Sheriff  
179. Sheriff Recruit  
180. Sheriff Service Technician II  
181. Social Services Aide  
182. Social Services Supervisor II  
183. Social Worker II  
184. Staff Services Analyst  
185. Staff Services Specialist  
186. Substance Use Disorder Counselor II  
187. Supervising Building Inspector  
188. Supervising Clinician  
189. Supervising Deputy Probation Officer  
190. Supervising Plans Examiner  
191. Supervising Substance Use Disorder Counselor  
192. System Support Technician  
193. Tax Technician II  
194. Technical Training Specialist  
195. Transportation Officer  
196. Treasurer/Tax Collector  
197. Undersheriff  
198. Veteran's Service Representative  
199. Victim Witness Advocate II  
200. Victim Witness Coordinator

**Survey Data Collection Scope**

*Comparable Classifications – Classification Matching*

When conducting a salary survey, the intent is to provide general market trends by comparing the span of control, duties and responsibilities, knowledge, and skill and ability requirements to determine whether these are sufficiently comparable to utilize as a match. With a balanced labor market and the use of whole job analysis, it is reasonable to assume that while some matches will have slightly higher responsibilities and some matches will have slightly lower
responsibilities, the overall scope of duties and responsibilities of the combined matches will be balanced.

For this study, County staff conducted the job matching in the interest of cost and timeline savings. CPS HR provided tools to the County to notate each job match and the related salary information.

**Comparable Classifications – Required Number of Comparable Classifications**

CPS HR’s best practice is that benchmark positions must have a minimum of three (3) classification matches to be analyzed. In most studies, it is common to have some classes for which limited market data exists.

There are many reasons a benchmark class may not have enough comparable data including:

- Differences in the delivery of services
- Differences in span of control
- Differences in organizational structure
- Differences in operational size
- The classification is not commonly found in other agencies
- Agency does not provide that service

In this study, the following classifications did not result in a sufficient number of matches:

1. Coroner/Public Administrator
2. Corporal
3. Director Cannabis Control
4. Environmental Assessment and Enforcement Specialist
5. Executive Director CMCAA
6. Integrated Waste Engineer
7. Integrated Waste Equipment Operator
8. Integrated Waste Gatekeeper
9. Literacy Community Liaison
10. Program Supervisor
11. Public Access TV Manager
12. Public Access TV Program Coordinator
13. Public Authority Manager
14. Public Works Inspector II
**Labor Market Data Collected**

The County collected base salary in the labor market. The data collected for the study included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp Data Collected</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Comparable Classification Title** | County staff matched benchmark classifications to those in the labor market agencies.  
The term “No Comparable Class” is used when a comparable classification within an agency to a specific benchmark classification was not found. No compensation data will be presented for the benchmark classification for that agency. |
| **Minimum and Maximum Base Salary** | The minimum and maximum *monthly* base salary. |

**IV. Survey Results**

**Compensation Results**

CPS HR found the competitiveness of County benchmark classifications’ pay ranges were mixed as compared to its relevant labor market. In other words, some of the County’s job classifications fell below the labor market ranges while others were aligned with, or above, the labor market ranges.

Matching datasheets and market variance tables have been provided as a separate spreadsheet.

Key observations include:

- Approximately 60% of the base compensation of the 200 County of Calaveras benchmarks studied are **below** the comparator agencies’ ranges.
- Where the County was either lagging or leading the comparator agencies, **ranges are not consistent between each control point of the ranges** (minimum, midpoint, or maximum). For example, some job benchmarks may be close to the labor market in minimums and lagging in maximums of the market ranges.
- The County’s **use of a fixed pay structure contributes to the misalignment** of the County’s pay ranges with the pay ranges of comparator agencies.
There are inconsistent differentiations between pay levels within the County’s job families, which are also inconsistent with the relevant labor market. If not addressed, this may cause inequities and pay compressions.

Our recommendations to focus on these findings included the below:

1. **Address the variance from the labor market.** It is usually our recommendation to adjust pay ranges of the benchmarks that lag the labor market ranges by 5% or more. Adjusting these ranges will align the jobs with the labor market and achieve a more competitive position for the County.

2. **Review, discuss, and address the misalignment of the range control points** (minimum or step A and maximum or step E) with corresponding ranges of comparator agencies. In cases where the minimum and maximum control points are not equally lagging or leading the corresponding market range control points, the County should consider the possibility of changing grade range width and decide which control point is more important to be aligned with the comparator agencies’ ranges.

3. **Review, discuss, and update the pay structure and range parameters**, especially for professional- and management-series classifications. It is our observation that the typical range width for these classes may range from 30% to 50%. Narrow range widths may bring an incumbent in the management classification to the maximum of the range (or to step E) in four (4) years of employment and impede further personal and professional growth.

4. **Compare the market pattern of job leveling within the existing County structure.** The pay range assignments may need to be reviewed considering job relationships and leveling within classification families and series. Some pay range assignments may create compressions where lower-level classes assigned to the same grades with higher-level classes in the same job family.

Exhibits showcasing these observations are included in the following pages.
EXHIBIT 1. SUMMARY OF MARKET OBSERVATIONS

Summary of Labor Market Observations

- Benchmarks Below with Smaller Range Width than LM: 96
- Benchmarks with Same Range Width as LM: 89
- Benchmarks Above LM in Maximums*: 22
- Benchmarks Above LM in Minimums*: 34
- Benchmarks Below LM in Maximums*: 130
- Benchmarks Below LM in Minimums*: 113
- Benchmarks Studied**: 200
### EXHIBIT 2. BENCHMARKS WITH MARKET RANGE WIDTH OF 30%-50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Title</th>
<th>Client Range Width</th>
<th>LM Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Treasurer Tax Collector</td>
<td>21.53%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy CAO-Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>21.57%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Specialist Manager</td>
<td>21.51%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director Public Works</td>
<td>21.55%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Project Manager</td>
<td>21.56%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access TV Manager</td>
<td>21.54%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access TV Program Coordinator</td>
<td>21.64%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Waste Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>21.58%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director Social Services</td>
<td>21.56%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy AG Commissioner</td>
<td>21.44%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator II</td>
<td>21.69%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Analyst</td>
<td>21.44%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director Public Health</td>
<td>21.55%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Health &amp; Human Services Agency</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff Recruit</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>21.58%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Clerk of the Board</td>
<td>21.63%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant County Administrative Officer</td>
<td>21.58%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Manager II</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Librarian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXHIBIT 3. EXAMPLE OF LEVEL SEPARATION BETWEEN JOB WITHIN SERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmarks Studied</th>
<th>FLSA</th>
<th>A-Step</th>
<th>E-Step</th>
<th>Level Separation</th>
<th>CPS HR Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTANT AUDITOR I</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pay compression with Acc. Tech Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTANT AUDITOR II</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>Large separation between levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN I</td>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN II</td>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>Inconsistent separation between levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN III</td>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>Inconsistent separation between levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN IV</td>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>Inconsistent separation between levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN, SENIOR</td>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Pay compression with Auditor I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>