

SUBJECT: MBL Salary Study Questions

Presented to Council

Date 2/14/00

REQUESTED BY: Council

Verified by Jr.

PREPARED BY: J. Newman, Employee Committee Member DATE: February 9, 2000

FOR AGENDA OF: February 14, 2000

SUMMARY:

At the January 24, 2000 council meeting the Employee Committee requested a copy of all the comparatives used to determine the placement of positions on the Salary Grades and Ranges chart proposed by the MBL Group. The council directed administration to provide the information by Friday, January 28, 2000 and to provide the committee with any additional information they requested.

Below is a chronological outline of the questions we have submitted to Administration and the date responses were received.

• Request submitted on January 24, 2000

1) To provide a copy of all the comparatives used to determine the placement of positions on the Salary Grades and Ranges chart proposed by MBL.

Information Received Wednesday, February 2, 2000 at 4 p.m. The packet was copied and distributed to Employee Committee Representatives on Thursday, February 3rd.

• Request submitted on February 4, 2000.

1) To provide a copy of all Wasilla job descriptions submitted to MBL (the originals which MBL then reformatted) from COW.

2) To provide a written catalog of all instruction (both in writing and those given verbally) given to MBL from Administration.

3) A written explanation with specific detail as to why some positions were compared to more than one job description and other positions were compared to less. In some cases people seemed to be compared to job title and if a match to job title could not be found, several matches were used. If you look at job descriptions for all positions, several comparatives could have been used in all cases. Why do comparisons appear so arbitrary? Did COW have any input with the comparisons selected or was this done entirely by MBL? Was there any verbal or written contact with COW and MBL to make these determinations? If so, please provide written detail.

4) A written explanation with specific detail as to why MBL used the studies they did rather than the studies used by C&L. As we are all aware many data sources exist and are available. Why these selections? Was this a directive from COW?

No response to date.

• **Request submitted on February 8, 2000.**

1) Provide copies of all job descriptions sent to MBL for reformatting and then the ones MBL sent back.

Please refer to the City of Wasilla - Survey Input Spreadsheet Instructions to answer the following questions:

2) MBL stated in their executive summary (page 5) that in addition to AML and the Alaska Cross Industry Survey, they also used two Pacific Northwest Salary Surveys, however, you state under Column Heading Description B, to ignore references to other salary surveys because they were not used in the final determination of Wasilla's proposed grades and ranges. Why the contradiction? Who made and at what point was the decision made to only use AML & Alaska Cross Industry Survey?

3) MBL stated in their executive summary (page 4) that the primary Alaska survey used for the 1999 Compensation review was AML, MBL further stated that they compiled three distinct sets of data analysis based on 1) **All Alaska**, 2) By Geography (Fairbanks to Kodiak), 3) By population of municipalities of 1000 or more. Again why the contradiction? Who made and at what point was the decision made to only use geography and population?

4) Understanding at how you arrive at weighted averages, please provide the calculation used to determine the final placement of positions on the salary grades and ranges. Please use the position of administration assistant on page 4 of the survey spreadsheet to illustrate this. In column O you have \$15.28 in bold, which is the weighted average by geography/population for the AML Administrative Assistant match. Also referenced are AML Executive Secretary, AML Sr. General Clerical, and AK Cross-Industry position number 1.3, General Clerk-Sr., but you do not indicate the weighted average in column O. Please do so and then show the calculation used to average those four sources. I would assume at this point you would do a "simple average." If not, how do you arrive at the mid point dollar amount for that position?

No response to date.

FISCAL IMPACT: No Yes, amount requested: \$

Fund:

CLERK'S RECOMMENDED ACTION: Information Only.

Administration Initial: JWC