



SYRACUSE CITY

Syracuse City Council Work Session Agenda

May 12, 2020 – immediately following the City Council Business Meeting, which begins at 6:00 p.m.

Electronic via Zoom Meeting

Streamed on Syracuse City Utah YouTube Channel

Public meeting will be held electronically in accordance with Executive Order 2020-1 issued by Governor Herbert on March 18, 2020 Suspending the Enforcement of Provisions of Utah Code 52-4-202 and 52-4-207 due to Infectious Disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. No physical meeting location will be available. The YouTube live stream of the meeting can be found at the following [link](#).

Connect to the meeting using:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85747496810>

Meeting ID: 857-4749-6810

Connect via telephone: +1-301-715-8592 US

Meeting ID: 857-4749-6810

- a. Meeting called to order.
- b. Review and discussion of Syracuse City Recruitment and Retention Policy review. (30 min.) *Council discussion, if necessary, will commence with Councilmember* .
- c. Adjourn.

~~~~~

In compliance with the Americans Disabilities Act, persons needing auxiliary communicative aids and services for this meeting should contact the City Offices at 801-825-1477 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

#### **CERTIFICATE OF POSTING**

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted within the Syracuse City limits on this 7<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2020 at Syracuse City Hall on the City Hall Notice Board and at <http://www.syracuseut.com/>. A copy was also provided to the Standard-Examiner on May 7, 2020.

CASSIE Z. BROWN, MMC  
SYRACUSE CITY RECORDER



# COUNCIL AGENDA

## May 12, 2020

### Agenda Item “b”                      Review of Recruitment and Retention Policy

#### ***Background***

- Any question regarding this agenda item may be directed at City Manager Brody Bovero.
- Please see attached copy of the adopted recruitment and retention policy, which also contains highlighted areas of focus for the discussion.
- The City’s Recruitment and Retention Policy was adopted in December of 2016. The policy’s aims are to attract and retain the best talent possible in order to ensure quality services to our residents, and to optimize efficiency of operations by eliminating excessive turnover.

#### ***Policy Review***

- Based on discussion at the Council’s April budget retreat, parts of this policy were called into question for examination, to determine if any changes needed to be made.
- In focusing the discussion, the following items in the policy were asked to be reviewed by the Council:
  - Setting the wage scale. (Pg 4 of the policy)
  - Advancements (Pg 6 of the policy)
  - Biennial and Quadrennial Departmental Reviews (Pg 7 of the policy)
- Other items for review
  - Not adjusting an employee’s wage with a quadrennial review if they have been hired within the last 24 months (Pg 8 of the policy)
  - Administration of the merit increases pursuant to directives from the Council all for an increase only after the employee has completed at least one full year of service. Merit increases are only given at the beginning of the fiscal year (July) and are based on the employee’s performance during the previous calendar year. Due to budgetary cycles, some employees will not see a merit increase for over 2 calendar years. For example, an

employee hired in February 2020 does not qualify for a merit increase on July 2020. Their annual evaluation is based on the 11 months they worked in 2020. Since they did not work a full year in 2020, they would not receive a merit in July of 2021. When they get their increase in July 2022, it is prorated for the first year, so they get a full increase for calendar year 2021, and 11/12<sup>th</sup> of an increase for calendar year 2020. This item is not specifically in the policy but was a by-product of the administrative direction given by the Council when the policy was adopted.

### ***Discussion Goals***

The following outlines the goals of this discussion:

1. Review the Recruitment and Retention Policy.
2. Discuss relevant parts of the policy that need examination.
3. Provide guidance to the administration on any parts that need to be amended, if any.



## **RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND COMPENSATION POLICY**

### **1. PURPOSE**

- a. The purpose of this policy is to establish a planned approach to ensure that Syracuse City attracts the best talent possible, and motivates and retains that talent for the overall benefit of the citizens.
- b. It is essential that Syracuse City recruits and retains the best talent possible to ensure the most efficient use of City resources. Excessive turnover and any lack of direction provided by City leadership will produce inefficiencies that waste City resources, and will degrade the quality of service provided to the citizenry.

### **2. COMPONENTS OF THE POLICY**

#### **a. Leadership & Responsibility**

- i. As the Executive/Administrative branch of Syracuse City, the leadership and responsibility for creating an environment that breeds productive, dedicated, and engaged employees lies primarily with the City Manager, and ultimately with the Mayor, with the support of the department heads and the City Council. The City Council will be tasked with reviewing programs and policies proposed by the City Manager, and proposing policies that align with the purpose of this policy.

#### **b. Employee Compensation Plan**

It is the general policy of Syracuse City that it will compensate its employees on a merit based system in a manner that is competitive with the market. Overcompensating does not ensure the best service, and undercompensating erodes the City's ability to attract and retain quality employees.

i. Benchmark Cities

1. The purpose of benchmarking in this policy is to establish an estimate of the local and regional market for municipal employees. When deciding which cities to compare with, there needs to be consideration of various characteristics of city structure (size, land use, revenue, tax base, etc) and logistical competition (geographic proximity, type of community, etc). Benchmarks serve as a market indicator and checkpoint, but will not be used as the sole determining wage scale indicator. The City Council reserves the right to adjust the wage scales to a level where it feels appropriately represents the market.
2. Based on location, it is reasonable to expect that all of Davis County and Weber County would be the primary market location for Syracuse employees. While other areas along the Wasatch Front also compete for employees, the cities in Davis and Weber counties will carry higher weight in the benchmark analysis due to their proximity to Syracuse City.
3. Within the primary market location (Davis/Weber County), there are certain cities that are significantly different than Syracuse City. The Council may decide to withdraw or include such cities from the market analysis.
4. Based on all the factors listed above, the City Manager will propose, and the City Council will have final approval of a list of cities that will constitute the benchmark for comparison of wage scales.
5. The following chart outlines the cities that will be included in the benchmarking process:

**Benchmark Cities**

| <b>Primary Market</b> |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Bountiful             |     |
| Centerville           |     |
| Clearfield            |     |
| Clinton               |     |
| Davis County          |     |
| Farmington            |     |
| Fruit Heights         | New |
| Herriman              | New |
| Highland              | New |
| Kaysville             |     |

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Layton                    |     |
| North Davis Fire District |     |
| North Salt Lake           |     |
| North Ogden               |     |
| Plain City                | New |
| Pleasant View             | New |
| Riverdale                 |     |
| Roy                       |     |
| Saratoga Springs          | New |
| South Davis Fire District |     |
| South Ogden               |     |
| South Weber               | New |
| Washington Terrace        |     |
| Weber County              |     |
| West Bountiful            | New |
| West Point                |     |
| Weber Fire District       |     |
| Woods Cross               |     |

| <b>Alternate Benchmark Cities</b> |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Alpine                            |  |
| Bluffdale                         |  |
| Cedar Hills                       |  |
| Eagle Mountain                    |  |
| Elk Ridge                         |  |
| Farr West                         |  |
| Harrisville                       |  |
| Lehi                              |  |
| Mapleton                          |  |
| Marriott-Slaterville              |  |
| South Jordan                      |  |
| Sunset                            |  |
| Vineyard                          |  |
| West Haven                        |  |
| Woodland Hills                    |  |

ii. Setting Position Wage Scales

1. The minimum and maximum wage for any given position will be determined by calculating the percentile specified by the Council for each position's wage scale from the list of benchmark cities. Wage scales will not be set lower than the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of the market. Based on inability to attract an acceptable applicant pool, or due to a change in the labor market for any given position, the Council may adjust the wage scale to a higher percentile.
2. Due to the uniqueness of each city, some cities may be added or deleted from the wage scale benchmark of a position to ensure a more accurate comparison of duties and responsibilities.

iii. Other Benefits

The City will strive to provide other benefits, such as medical/dental/vision, retirement, and paid time off, at a level that reasonably competes with the benchmark cities. The City Manager will propose, and the City Council will have final approval of the benefit package to be offered.

iv. Setting Individual Wages

1. In determining the wage for individual employees, the City Manager shall consider relevant factors such as experience, education, skills, performance, and training obtained by the employee. For new hires, the City Manager may use these factors to set the new employee's wage up to the mid-point of the wage scale, assuming budgetary allowance to do so. If the City Manager determines that the new hire should start above the mid-point of the wage scale, he/she must first get approval from a majority of the City Council.
2. For existing employees, if the City Manager determines that an employee should receive an increase in wages above that allowed within this policy, then he/she must first get approval from a majority of the City Council.

v. Merit Increases

1. Syracuse City has adopted a "pay for performance" ethic, and therefore does not use programmed step increases or cost of living increases based on time of service. A merit-based system is created

to encourage continuous improvement of employees, for the overall benefit of the City. Commensurate with employee performance and improvement, the City Manager will administer a system that provides a path for employees to progress through the salary and wage scale for each position. It is the policy of Syracuse City that it will not participate in collective bargaining.

2. An evaluation system with scores ranging from 0 to 5 (5=highest) will be utilized for employee performance evaluations. Administration of merit increases will be based on employee evaluation scores, and is performed by the City Manager under direction of the Mayor, subject to the amount budgeted by the Council. The City Manager will ensure that all evaluations are reviewed and checked for quality to ensure the evaluation program is effective.
3. In order to determine the budgeted amount for merit increases, the Council will:
  - a. Calculate the moving average of wage increases for the last 3 years of benchmark cities/companies.
  - b. Set aside a minimum of 25% of the net increase in combined sales tax, property tax, and franchise tax from the previous fiscal year for purposes of funding the merit increases.
  - c. Decide to either increase, decrease, or maintain the set-aside amount in order to stay competitive with the market.
4. Each department will be allotted a proportional share of the budgeted merit increase dollars based on the following formula:

Dept Share of Budgeted Merit Increase Dollars= (Total budgeted dollars approved by Council for merit increases/Total city-wide payroll dollars) X Total payroll of the department  
Note: Department heads will be considered a separate department for these purposes.
5. For each department, the Average Merit Increase will be calculated using the following formula:

AVG Merit Increase = Dept Share of Budgeted Merit Increase Dollars / Total payroll of the department.
6. For each department, the average evaluation score will be calculated. The average score will be targeted to receive the Average Merit Increase. Scores above the average evaluation will be provided a higher merit increase, and scores below the average will be provided a lower merit increase. Nevertheless, in no case shall the highest merit increase be higher than 50% above the average, unless

approved by the City Council. Any score below a 3 will not be eligible for a merit increase.

7. The City Council may, in its sole discretion, grant a merit increase not to exceed five percent (5%) of an employee's gross pay to an employee who has been paid at or above the range maximum for a minimum of five (5) years, provided the employee has received a successful or outstanding performance rating in the last year and has been employed by Syracuse City for at least eight (8) years. An employee whose salary exceeds the range maximum is eligible to receive a merit adjustment no more frequently than every five (5) years after the initial adjustment. Any subsequent increase above the range maximum shall not exceed five percent (5%) of the employee's gross pay. An employee is eligible to receive a maximum of five (5) successive adjustments beyond the range maximum. As an alternative to the annual merit increase, an employee who is being paid at or above the range maximum may receive an annual bonus in the amount equivalent to the wage/salary adjustment. No adjustment is made to the base wage/salary when a bonus is given.

vi. Advancements

1. Some positions are eligible for Advancements (e.g. Police Officer I and II, Water Maintenance Worker I and II, etc.) An Advancement is defined as a movement to a higher position due to improved skill, knowledge, or capability, but does not significantly increase the employee's responsibilities and/or supervisory duties.
2. Employees that advance to a higher position will move to the bottom of the new wage scale, but at least a 5% increase. Employees that advance are not eligible for a merit increase for the same year of advancement.

vii. Promotions

Promotions are defined as a movement to a higher position that significantly increases the employee's responsibilities and/or supervisory duties. An employee who is promoted will receive an increase to the minimum wage of the entering wage scale, but at least a 5% increase. Employees that promote will be eligible for a pro-rated annual merit increase for the months at the lower position and the months at the higher position.

**c. Ongoing Review and Periodic Market Adjustments**

i. Biennial Review

Every 2 years, the City Council will conduct an in-depth review of each department. The primary purpose of the in-depth review is to discuss the operations, issues, overall direction of the department, and the goals of the City Council. The biennial in-depth review will also be a time to discuss any wage abnormalities or other special adjustments that the administration feels is needed.

The departments will be reviewed on a rotating basis as follows:

Yr 1: Police, Fire, Park & Rec

Yr 2: PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance

ii. Quadrennial Market Review

1. Every other Biennial Review (every 4 years), the City Council will review the compensation levels for each position in the City and, if needed, make the necessary wage scale and/or individual wage adjustments to ensure the City remains competitive in its compensation. Issues such as wage compression may also be addressed at this time. The positions in the City will be divided into two groups based on department as follows:

*Group 1:* Police, Fire, Park & Rec

*Group 2:* PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance

2. Below is the schedule of the biennial department reviews and quadrennial market reviews:

*Year 1:* In-depth review and benchmark of Police, Fire, Park & Rec

*Year 2:* In-depth review and benchmark of PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance

*Year 3:* In-depth review of Police, Fire, Park & Rec

*Year 4:* In-depth review of PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance

*Year 5:* In-depth review and benchmark of Police, Fire, Park & Rec

*Year 6:* In-depth review and benchmark of PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance

3. The analysis of wage scales will be conducted in the same method as explained above in evaluating Benchmark Cities, and Setting Position Wage Scales (See Section 2.b.i & ii). If the City Council determines that wage scales need to be adjusted to better reflect market conditions, they will make such adjustments effective at the beginning of the upcoming fiscal year. The Council has full discretion on wage scale adjustments, but generally will only make adjustments if a position's wage scale has changed 2.5% or more since the last adjustment. A change in wage scale does not automatically trigger a change in individual wages.
4. With each quadrennial market review, individual wages may be adjusted if a majority of the City Council approves. This market wage adjustment will be in the form of an additional percentage that the employee is eligible to receive in the annual merit increase evaluation, based on performance over the previous 4 years. Unless the City Council approves, an employee's wages will not be adjusted due to the market review if the employee has been hired within the previous 24 months.
5. In order to determine whether individual wages will be adjusted due to the market review, the Council may consider any of the following:
  - a. A comparative study of individual wages from the benchmark cities obtained through an independent contract that has been subject to the RFP process and be conducted under the direction of the city council and city manager.
  - b. Using Technet or similar shared database, the City can provide an analysis of changes in wage scales and wages over the previous 4 years. If a majority of the Council determines the information from Technet/similar shared database appears to show an anomaly or otherwise appears to be incomplete or inaccurate, a more detailed comparative study of that position may be conducted.
  - c. Any other economic data that a majority of the Council deems relevant.