



 Segal Waters  
Consulting

# Classification and Compensation Study

Final Report Presentation  
May 13, 2019

**Webb County, Texas**

Presented by:

Ruth Ann Eledge, SPHR  
Vice President and Senior Consultant  
Lauralee Adams  
Associate

# Overview of the Study

---

What is included in the scope of the study?

- Job analysis of selected positions
- Compensation Survey
- Market comparisons
- Review of Investigator Career Ladder
- Updated Pay Structure
- Implementation Plan with cost scenarios
- Final Report documenting project methodology and findings
- Briefings and on-site presentation of Final Report

# Job Analysis

---

## A review of selected job classifications was completed

- Analysis of updated job descriptions
- Application of job evaluation to determine any changes in grade placement
  - Juvenile Supervision Officer I
  - Juvenile Supervision Officer II
  - Senior Juvenile Supervision Officer
  - Deputy District Clerk
  - Office Manager
- Addition of new positions
  - Assistant Budget Director
  - Budget Director
  - Criminal Investigator job family positions
- Changes in some job titles to better reflect work being performed

# Market Comparison

---

## Criteria for Selection of Peer Employers

- Competition for jobs/talent in the local market
- Proximity to the County
- Other criteria:
  - Preference for Counties located on the border
  - South Texas Counties
  - Similar challenges in recruitment and retention of employees

# Peer Employers

## SURVEYED EMPLOYERS

Peer Employers Surveyed	
Brazoria County, TX	√
Cameron County, TX	
City of Brownsville, TX	
City of Laredo, TX	√
City of San Antonio, TX	√
El Paso County, TX	√
Fort Bend County, TX	√
Galveston County, TX	√
Guadalupe County, TX	
Hays County, TX	√
Hidalgo County, TX	
Jefferson County, TX	√
Nueces County, TX	

√ = Responded to Survey

# Market Assessment

## Benchmark Job Identification

Selection of benchmark jobs:

- Sufficient number of benchmark jobs to statistically represent all County jobs
- Widespread representing all divisions
- All levels of the organization represented
- Reflects the workforce composition
- Includes representation of services provided

Resulted in:

- 98 job titles
- 50% of all incumbents represented

# Market Methodology

---

- Collected information on salary range minimums, midpoints, and maximums and actual
- Peers received a custom survey with job summaries and minimum qualifications describing each benchmark so matches to actual duties and qualifications, rather than title; Segal Waters followed up with peers to ensure appropriate matches
- Data was adjusted to reflect regional differences in cost of labor
- Overall, we found the County's pay ranges competitive with the market at the pay range minimum, midpoint, and maximum
- Base pay is lagging the market at 89% of the market average

# Market Methodology

## GEOGRAPHIC COST-OF-LABOR ADJUSTMENTS

Peer Employer	Comparator Location	Geographic Adjustment
Brazoria County	Angleton, Texas	-12.6%
Cameron County	Brownsville, Texas	1.4%
City of Laredo	Laredo, TX	0.0%
City of San Antonio	San Antonio, Texas	-6.1%
El Paso County	El Paso, Texas	0.1%
Fort Bent County	Richmond, Texas	-12.4%
Galveston County	Galveston, Texas	-13.8%
Guadalupe County	Seguin, Texas	-5.3%
Hays County	San Marcos, Texas	-9.6%
Hidalgo County	Edinburg, Texas	2.6%
Jefferson County	Beaumont, Texas	-9.7%
Nueces County	Corpus Christi, Texas	-5.6%



# Market Assessment

---

## WEBB COUNTY MARKET POSITION

<b>Webb County as a % of the Market Average</b>			
	<b>Pay Range Minimum</b>	<b>Pay Range Midpoint</b>	<b>Pay Range Maximum</b>
<b>Market Position</b>	95%	97%	98%

## Market Findings – Individual Benchmark Jobs

---

The County's market position varies by benchmark job

- Pay range midpoints were used to determine if individual benchmark jobs were at, above, or below market
- Jobs with midpoints below **95%** of market were identified as lagging market
- Jobs with midpoints above **105%** of market were identified as leading market
- **Twenty-three (23)** benchmark jobs have ranges that are **at market**
- **Twenty-seven (27)** benchmark jobs have range midpoints that are **below market**
- **Thirty-one (31)** benchmark jobs have range midpoints that are **above market**
- Seventeen (17) jobs did not have sufficient data for analysis

## Market Findings-Other Collected Data

---

- The majority of peers use market data as well as cost of living to determine increases to pay ranges
- Like Webb County, peers use cost of living adjustments for pay increases
- Like Webb County, all but one peer use a step and grade pay system
- Pay schedule increases by Webb County are lagging peers' increases
- Webb County is similar to peers for other surveyed pay practices
- Career ladders are commonly used for investigator and attorney positions
- Only two peers reported data for Medical Examiner positions therefore data is insufficient to make recommendations
  - El Paso County - \$303,678 minimum to \$439,816 maximum
  - Fort Bend County - \$122,000 minimum to \$172,831 maximum
- Pay Parity across the organization for attorney positions is used for five of the eight peers, with five of eight peers allowing outside work for supplemental income if no conflict of interest exists

# Market Findings- Elected Officials

## WEBB COUNTY ELECTED OFFICIALS MARKET POSITION BY BENCHMARK TITLE

Benchmark Title	Count of Matches	Benchmark Actual Pay	Market Average Actual Pay	Webb County as a % of Market
Commissioner	6	\$78,126	\$95,731	82%
Constable	6	\$79,391	\$77,983	102%
County Attorney	4	\$144,684	\$145,015	100%
County Clerk	6	\$108,839	\$94,406	115%
County Judge	6	\$96,909	\$117,398	83%
County Treasurer	5	\$108,839	\$92,931	117%
District Clerk	6	\$108,839	\$94,406	115%
Justice of the Peace	6	\$85,075	\$80,363	106%
Sheriff	6	\$121,963	\$122,489	100%
Tax Assessor Collector	6	\$116,027	\$97,090	120%
<b>Overall</b>		<b>\$104,869</b>	<b>\$101,781</b>	<b>103%</b>

# Collection of Investigator Data and Tier Review

---

- Data collected from Bell, El Paso, Fort Bend, Galveston, Hays, Hidalgo and Jefferson counties for Criminal Investigator/Investigator, Deputy Chief Investigator and Chief Investigator
- Using peer matches for Criminal Investigator and Investigator for levels I and II
- Used Deputy and Chief level data for their respective positions
- Evaluated proposed tier, revised tier based on market data, and current County pay structure to determine most effective approach for establishing pay ranges and administration of pay
- Established market competitive ranges for all positions and recommend placement of incumbents based on District Attorney's proposed criteria
- Use current County Pay Administration Guidelines including those for longevity pay

# Summary of Pay Structure and Classification Recommendations

---

- Retain current pay structure
- Reassign thirty-two (32) job titles to ranges that are competitive with market data and reflect internal equity
- Place four (4) new job titles into current pay structure
- For jobs being moved to a higher grade, ensure all employee pay is placed on closest step in the proposed new range with a minimum 5% increase
- Results in one hundred (100) employees proposed to receive adjustments

# Proposed Structure

Job Title	Market Average Pay Range Minimum	Market Average Pay Range Maximum	Proposed County Pay Range
Criminal Investigator Level I	\$46,610		Grade 19
Criminal Investigator Level II		\$66,690	Grade 20
Criminal Investigator III (Senior Investigator)	Insufficient Data		Grade 22
Deputy Chief Investigator	\$66,859	\$76,991	Grade 23
Chief Investigator	\$74,179	\$86,202	Grade 24

# Projected Cost

---

## Cost Summary

	# of Employees Receieving Adjustments	Current Base Salary	Pay Adjustment (\$)	% Increase over Current Cost
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$ 4,479,847.99</b>	<b>\$ 193,786.57</b>	<b>4%</b>



## Further Questions

**Questions**