



Clerk of the Circuit Court

Brevard County, Florida

400 SOUTH ST., P.O. Box 999, Titusville, Florida 32781

<http://www.brevardclerk.us>

Scott Ellis, Clerk

April 21, 2006

Scott Ellis
Clerk of Courts
400 South Street
Titusville, FL 32781

RE: Internal Review and Analysis
Classification and Salary Study
Cody & Associates, Inc. dated February 9, 2006

Mr. Ellis:

Pursuant to your request, we have conducted an internal review and analysis of the Classification and Salary Study prepared by Cody & Associates, Inc. The following is a report of findings and recommendations.

Thank you,

Carie E. Exline, CPA
Internal Auditor

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the internal review and analysis was to analyze the Classification and Salary Study (hereinafter referred to as “Study”) prepared by Cody & Associates (hereinafter referred to as “Cody”) and make recommendations of its implementation to the Brevard County Clerk of the Circuit Court.

Finding 1: Positions by Pay Grade

The study recommended a number of positions be increased two to five (2-5) pay grades. This increases the minimum salary five to 10 percent (5-10%) per pay grade which increased the minimum salary ten to twenty-five percent (10-25%) for the positions effected. See Exhibit I & II. The Clerk Suggests, before a position’s “pay grade” is increased the manager responsible for the position, should compare “actual” requirements and responsibilities of that position to the “new” job description. Then the Director of Human Resources should evaluate all positions, county-wide, and their ranking on the pay scale. Moreover, the Director of Human Resources should provide written justification for each position that moved more than one (1) pay grade.

Finding 2: Senior Director Positions

All Senior Director’s Positions are at the same top “pay grade” (820). Most of these employees are projected to receive the largest dollar increase. This increase is due in part to their movement to this top “pay grade”. “Pay grade” placement is based on educational requirements, experience, level of responsibility, size of department, scope, and other factors. Other Counties that used the Cody Study placed their Senior Director’s positions in the top two to three (2-3) “pay grades” and used factors supplementing the Cody Study to determine their salary adjustment.

Finding 3: Individual Employees Positions

Each employee’s “Position” was based on their “current job title”, and not on the “actual” work they perform. The Study has yet to complete the “new” job descriptions as required in their contract. The “new job descriptions” may include additional requirements. These “new” job descriptions, when completed, should be compared to the “actual” work performed by each employee to determine their “new” position (job title). This analysis should be done by a manager and/or supervisor with direct knowledge of the “actual” work of that employee and under the direction of the Director of Human Resources using the “new” job descriptions.

Finding 4: Years of Experience at the Position

Each employee’s new salary (where they fall within the minimum and maximum of their new pay grade) is based on the years at their “current job title” and not the years the employee has functioned at the “new” job description. Each employees “actual” years functioning at that position needs to be recalculated. This should be done by a manager and/or supervisor with direct knowledge of that employee’s “actual” work, and under the direction of the Director of Human Resources.

Finding 5: Alternative Implementation Options

The only recommendation presented by Human Resources, by and through the County Manager, to County Commission, at the February 21, 2006, meeting was full implementation of all pay

increases as recommended by the Study. No other alternative options were presented. Per our analysis, no of the other county and local municipality, that used Cody for their pay study, implemented the full recommendation proposed by Cody. The Director of Human Resources should offer other suggestions on implementation and provide the costs of each option. These options should be presented jointly by the County Manager and Director of Human Resources to the County Commissioners for their consideration.

Finding 6: Reasons Employees Leave

The Study failed to address other reasons (other than salary) why employees leave their position with the County. It has been alleged that Brevard County has a higher than normal employee turnover rate due to perceived below market salaries. This was the main rationale given for authorization of the Study. Our analysis of the Exit Interview Questionnaires (See Exhibit III) reveals that former employees were more dissatisfied with promotional opportunities and the resolution of complaints and grievances, than salary issues. A review of the written comments reveals that salary was not the number one reason for leaving. In most cases, the actual job tasks and the working environment were the main reasons for leaving the County.

Finding 7: Position Applications

The Study failed to address “hard to fill” positions. It has been alleged that the “below market” salaries have increased the difficulty in attracting qualified applicants for positions which are historically considered “hard to fill.” However, we have been unable to determine which positions are considered “hard to fill” and what criteria is used to denote a position as “hard to fill”. Before the Study, Human Resources identified the position of “Animal Enforcement Officer” as a “hard to fill” position and thus increased its “pay grade” which increased its starting salary. Thus, Human Resources demonstrated an ability to recognize a “hard to fill” position and corrected the situation.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the internal review and analysis was to analyze the Classification and Salary Study (hereinafter referred to as “Study”) prepared by Cody & Associates (hereinafter referred to as “Cody”) and make recommendations of its implementation to the Brevard County Clerk of the Circuit Court.

BACKGROUND

On August 9, 2005 the Brevard County Board of County Commissioners (hereinafter referred to as “BOCC”) awarded Proposal #P11/05/25, Salary and Benefits/Pay and Classification Study, to Cody. The motion was carried unanimously and so ordered. The approved cost of the study was forty-nine thousand dollars (\$49,000).

At the February 21, 2006 Commission Meeting the County Commissioners unanimously voted to approved the findings of the study and implement one-half (1/2) of the recommended salary increases beginning April 1, 2006, excluding all positions affected by the Firefighters Local Union 2969, due to ongoing labor negotiations. During discussions, the Commissioners decided, without a formal vote, that the second half, of the increase, would only be implemented in the next year (FY 06-07), if funds are available.

The Study was based on an analysis of each position (job title). Each position correlates with a related job description. The job description provides for education, certification and work experience requirements, as well as, a list of duties and responsibilities for each respective position. Based on the job description and the open market opportunities of the position, all positions are ranked and sorted into an overall pay grade. Each pay grade has a minimum and maximum salary with a mid point salary based on seven to eight (7-8) years of experience at that position.

SCOPE

We reviewed the Study prepared by Cody and the salary calculations for each individual county employee (excluding all positions effected by the Firefighters Local Union 2969), which were also prepared by Cody. We did not analyze job descriptions, pay grades, or the cost of implementation of the Sheriff’s Department salary adjustments.

We interviewed Frank Abbate, Director of Human Resources, and Nick Pellegrino, Principal Partner for Cody & Associates, Inc.

We reviewed the “Position Descriptions Questionnaires” that was requested by Cody as part of their field work. The questionnaires were completed by a large sample of county staff employees.

As a comparison we reviewed the pay plan studies that were prepared by Cody, from the City of West Melbourne, City of Satellite Beach, Pasco County, and Volusia County. In addition, we contacted all Florida Counties and local municipalities known to have used Cody within the past several years to discuss their respective general findings and process of implementation of the study.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Positions by Pay Grade

Findings 1: *The study recommended a number of staff positions be increased two, three, four and five (2, 3, 4, & 5) pay grades, with a minimum salary increase of five percent (5%) per pay grade. Therefore, employees in certain positions would receive a minimum increase of ten to twenty-five percent (10-25%). The study recommended a number of management positions be increased one or two (1 or 2) pay grades, with a minimum salary increase of ten percent 10% per pay grade and thus, managers at these positions would receive a minimum increase of ten to twenty percent (10-20%).*

A review of positions at the various pay grades reveals a number of positions that increased two, three, four and five (2, 3, 4, and 5) pay grades. Examples include:

1. Treatment Plant Operators (new job title - Skilled Tradeworker IV) increased 4 grades. This position is now at the same pay grade as a Heavy Equipment Operators III (new Job title - Vehicle Operator VI), and Plumber II (new job title - Skilled Tradeworker IV), increased 3 grades.
2. Mosquito Control Technicians (new job title - Skilled Tradeworker III) increased 3 grades which created salary increases of more than 30%.
3. Skilled Trade Worker II increased 5 grades and a Mechanic I increased 4 grades. Both positions are now at the same pay grade as the Animal Enforcement Officer whose pay grade did not change.
4. Positions for Heavy Equipment Operators I & II are both a Vehicle Operator II (new job titles). The Heavy Equipment Operator I increased 3 grades and Heavy Equipment Operator II increase 1 grade.
5. Large increases are for those at the 723 pay grades, such as Criminal Justice Officers who increase 2 pay grades and Librarian I who increased 4 pay grades. Accountants I stayed at the 720 pay grade with no increase in pay grade. All of these positions are entry level positions requiring a Bachelors Degree
6. There is no distinction between a Budget Analyst I & II. They are both considered Fiscal Specialist IV (new job title) at a new pay grade of 813, minimum salary of \$35,422. The Accountant II is also at this level, but the Accountant I is at pay grade 720 (no change) with a minimum Salary of \$30,202.
7. Large increases for Librarian II (new job title - Operations Supervisor II) who moved two (2) pay grades and is now at the same pay grade as the Library Director I (new job title - Management Specialist I) who stayed at the same pay grade.

8. Parks Maintenance Superintendents increased 2 pay grades (from 813 to 815), Facilities Maintenance Supervisor increase 3 levels (from 812 to 815). Most other positions that were originally at the 815 level remained at the 815 level.
9. Senior Director Positions are either an Administrative Officers IV or V (new job title) yet both of these new positions are at the same top pay grade 820.

Cody's field work included a review of the "Positions Descriptions Questionnaires" that were completed by a large sample of county employees. The purpose of the questionnaire was to gain insight as to the "actual" work performed by county employees. Using the questionnaires and the current job descriptions, Cody evaluated the positions to determine their increase in pay grade. No position went down a pay grade. A review of the "Positions Descriptions Questionnaires" reveals that most employees answered the questions based on their job descriptions and not "actual" work performed. Therefore, the questionnaire information would be unreliable in justifying pay grade changes.

Per our discussion with the Partner of Cody & Associates, the "New" Job Descriptions have not been completed. Therefore, the proper ranking of positions within pay grades cannot be finalized until the completion of the "new" Job Descriptions, and accordingly, our review and analysis is subject to change based on the "new" Job Descriptions.

Before a position's "pay grade" is increased the manager responsible for the position, should compare "actual" requirements and responsibilities of that position to the "new" job description. Then the Director of Human Resources should evaluate all positions, county-wide, and their ranking on the pay scale. Moreover, the Director of Human Resources should provide written justification for each position that moved more than one (1) pay grade.

Recommendation:

The implementation of the Study should be temporarily suspended until further analysis by the appropriate County Management staff is completed. The analysis should include the following:

1. A comparison of "actual" requirements and responsibilities of each position to the "new" job description. This analysis should be done by a manager knowledgeable of the "actual" requirements and responsibilities then reviewed by the Director of Human Resources.
2. A review, by the Director of Human Resources, of all the positions at the same "pay grade" to determine that each position is at the appropriate "pay grade".
3. A review, by the Director of Human Resources, of all the positions, county-wide, as to their ranking by "pay grade" to determine that all positions are appropriately ranked.
4. The Director of Human Resources should provide written justification for each position that moved more than one (1) pay grade. These changes should be approved by the County Manager.

Senior Director Positions

Finding 2: *Senior Director Positions are either an Administrative Officers IV or V yet both positions are at the same top "pay grade" (820). Most of these positions are projected to*

receive the largest dollar increase, which will result in a salary increase of twenty to forty percent (20-40%).

Discussions with other Florida Counties that used Cody for their pay studies reveals that they evaluate and rank their Senior Director Positions differently than staff positions. Most Counties rank the Senior Director Positions amount several (2-4) top pay grades. Their “pay grade” placement is based on educational requirements, experience, level of responsibility, size of department, scope, and other factors. These factors vary by County.

Some Counties renegotiate the salaries of Senior Directors with increases of no more than ten percent (10%). Others only provide for a two percent (2%) increase per year, as funds are available, and slowly bring these positions up to their market level.

Recommendation:

All Senior Director Positions should be ranked among the top three or four (3 or 4) pay grades. The ranking and salary adjustment should be done by the County Manager with the assistance of the Director of Human Resources to determine an appropriate pay grade for each position. The ranking of these positions should then be presented to the County Commissioners for approval.

Individual Employees Positions

Finding 3: *Each county employee’s “Position” was based on their “Current Job Title” and not on the “actual” work performed and compared to the “new” job description of the position.*

Cody has not completed the “new” Job Descriptions. Therefore, management cannot provide total assurance that each employee is at their proper “new” position.

The individual salary calculations, prepared by Cody are based on the employee’s “Current Job Title”. Since a large number of positions (both job title and pay grade) were changed, each employee’s “actual” work needs to be compared to the “new” Job Description to ensure each employee is at the correct “position”.

Accordingly, our review and analysis is subject to change depending upon the final Job Descriptions.

Recommendation:

The implementation of the Study should be temporarily suspended until:

1. The “new” job descriptions have been completed by Cody.
2. The “new” job descriptions have been analyzed and approved by the County Manager and the Director of Human Resources.
3. Each employees “actual” work requirements and responsibilities have been compared to the “new” job description. This analysis should be done by a manager and/or supervisor with direct knowledge of the “actual” work of that employee and under the direction of the Director of Human Resources.

Years of Experience at the Position

Finding 4: *Each employee's new salary (where they fall within the minimum and maximum of their new pay grade) is based on the years at their "current job title" and not the years the employee has functioned at the "new" revised position (per the "new" Job Description), which may include additional or deleted requirements. Employees with seven (7) or more years of experience will be paid above the fiftieth (50th) percentile within their pay grade.*

The Study recommends that *"for each year of service up to ten years in grade award the individual two and a half percent (2½%) per year times the recommended pay range minimum and two percent (2%) from 11 to 15 years time in grade."* This equates to a twenty-five percent (25%) increase above the minimum for ten (10) years of experience and a thirty-five percent (35%) increase above the minimum for fifteen (15) years of experience. The percent increase from the minimum to the maximum is thirty-five percent (35%) while the mid-point at seventeen and one half percent (17.5%) above the minimum.

The years of experience at a position commence when the employee was promoted to the position. Now that positions have changed due to revised (but not yet received) job descriptions, management needs to reevaluate each employee against their "new" job description and determine the "actual" years each employee has been functioning at that new position.

In addition the "new" job descriptions have not been completed by Cody. Accordingly, our review and analysis is subject to change depending upon the final version of the job description

Recommendation:

The implementation of the Study should be temporarily suspended until:

1. The "new" job descriptions have been completed by Cody.
2. The "new" job descriptions have been analyzed and approved by the County Manager and the Director of Human Resources.
3. Each employees "actual" work requirements and responsibilities have been compared to the "new" job description. This analysis should be done by a manager and/or supervisor with direct knowledge of the "actual" work of that employee, and under the direction of the Director of Human Resources.
4. Each employees "actual" years functioning at that position have been reevaluated and, if necessary, recalculated. This reevaluation and possible recalculation should be done by a manager and/or supervisor with direct knowledge of that employee's "actual" work, and under the direction of the Director of Human Resources.

Alternative Implementation Options

Finding 5: *The only recommendation presented by Human Resources, by and through the County Manager, to County Commission, at the February 21, 2006, meeting was full implementation of all pay increases as recommended by the Study. No other alternative options were presented.*

The Study recommends that *“for each year of service up to ten years in grade award the individual two and a half percent (2½%) per year times the recommended pay range minimum and two percent (2%) from 11 to 15 years time in grade.”* This equates to a twenty-five percent (25%) increase above the minimum for ten (10) years of experience and a thirty-five percent (35%) increase above the minimum for fifteen (15) years of experience. The percent increase from the minimum to the maximum is thirty-five percent (35%) while the mid-point is seventeen and one half percent (17.5%) above the minimum.

Discussions with other Counties and local Municipalities, that used Cody for their pay studies, reveal that none fully implemented the above recommendation proposed by Cody. Most entities used the Study to ensure that their employment positions are at their proper pay grade and that the minimum and maximum per pay grade are at market valuation. Most entities implemented the study in a step process over a period of two to four (2-4) years. All entities agreed that the first step is to bring employees to the minimum of their pay grade. Further steps for implementation varied among the entities. We found no entity increased an employee’s salary past the fiftieth (50th) percentile of their respective pay grade, irrespective of the recommendations contained within the respective Cody studies.

Examples of alternative options that could be implemented include, but not limited to the following:

1. Expenditures necessary to bring all employees up to the minimum in their respective pay grade.
2. Expenditures necessary to increase salaries from the minimum salary to the twenty-fifth (25th) percentile for employees with more than four (4) years of experience at their position.
3. Expenditures necessary to increase salaries from the twenty-fifth (25th) percentile to the fiftieth (50th) percentile for employees with more than seven (7) years of experience at their position.
4. For employees with more than seven (7) years of experience at their position, expenditures necessary to pay said employees within the range of fiftieth (50th) percentile to the seventy-fifth (75th) percentile, with the increase based on merit and performance.

Recommendation:

The Director of Human Resources should contact other counties for suggestions on implementation. Several options and their respective costs for implementation should be calculated and proposed. A step process for implementation of the salary increase, over several years, dependent on whether funds are available, should also be considered. These options should be presented jointly by the County Manager and Director of Human Resources to the County Commissioners for their consideration.

Reasons Employees Leave

Finding 6: *The Study failed to address other reasons (other than salary) why employees leave their position with the County.*

It has been alleged that Brevard County has a higher than normal employee turnover rate due to perceived below market salaries. In fact, the main rationale given for authorization of the Study was to determine the market level for salaries for all positions within the County and then use that information to increase salaries and hence, improve retention rates. However, the Study failed to address other equally important reasons employees leave their position with the County.

It is the practice of the Office of Human Resources to provide an Exit Interview Questionnaire to all employees upon their voluntary termination of employment with the County. The Questionnaire is mailed to the employee under a standard cover letter, accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. A copy of the standard cover letter and Questionnaire are attached hereto for reference. The Questionnaires are voluntary and are sent post-employment. Not all employees complete and return this form, and the Office of Human Resources was unable to provide the percentage of employees who do respond out of all of the Questionnaires sent out.

The Questionnaires provide the former employee an opportunity to describe their reasons for leaving, to rate certain elements of working for the County, to evaluate their supervisor and detail their likes and dislikes of their respective job duties and responsibilities. The first section asks the former employee to check all applicable reasons for leaving and includes options such as retirement, commute distance, career change, better wages, working conditions, among other selections. The next section asks the former employee to rate (excellent, good, fair or poor) certain elements of working for the County, which include salary, group health benefits, promotional opportunities and work schedule. The third category requests the former employee to rate the supervision they received (almost always, usually, sometimes or never) relative to certain practices such as followed policies and procedures, demonstrated fair and equal treatment, provided recognition on the job and resolved complaints and problems. The final section allows the former employee to provide written feedback as to what they liked most and least about their position. A summary of the responses received are provided in Exhibit III. Additionally, the final question asks the former employee whether they would like an exit interview with the Human Resources Director. The overwhelming majority of respondents check the “no” box and a few provide written comments.

Our analysis of the Questionnaires (See Exhibit III) reveals that the former employees were more dissatisfied with promotional opportunities and the resolution of complaints and grievances, than salary issues. Although approximately one-half (1/2) of the former employees who completed and returned the Questionnaires rated salary as fair to poor, eighty-six percent (86%) of the same employees rated health benefits and retirement as excellent to good. Regarding the Questionnaire section of reasons for leaving, former employees stated leaving for a better job was the number one reason followed by retirement, better wages and working conditions. Furthermore, a review of the written comments likewise reveals that salary was not the number one reason for leaving. In most cases, the actual job tasks and the working environment were the main reason for a former employee leaving the County.

Recommendation:

The Office of Human Resources should conduct a more thorough review and analysis of the Exit Interview Questionnaires in order to properly determine the actual and recurring reasons that

employees are leaving their positions with the County. Following which, this information should be incorporated within the Study in order to properly reflect the true reasons for employee turnover and to increase employee retention.

Although beyond the scope of our review, a related recommendation is to have the Office of Human Resources mandate an exit interview with the Director on the employee's last day of work. This interview could be conducted in conjunction with the other final task and paperwork which must be completed by the exiting employee. The proposed exit interview would be in addition to the current practice of mailing of the Exit Interview Questionnaires.

Position Applications

Finding 7: The Study fails to specifically address the “hard to fill” positions, and accordingly fails to provide meaningful data relative to these positions.

It has been alleged that the “below market” salaries have increased the difficulty in attracting qualified applicants for positions which are considered historically “hard to fill.” However, we have been unable to determine which positions are considered “hard to fill” and what criteria is used to denote a position as “hard to fill.” Moreover, the Study fails to specifically address the “hard to fill” positions, and accordingly fails to provide meaningful data relative to these positions.

We reviewed the 2006 closed Position Requisitions received by the Office of Human Resources and the data compiled by Human Resources detailing and evaluating the applications received. As used herein, “closed” Position Requisitions are defined as those positions which were either filled or withdrawn due to various reasons. We did not review Position Requisitions which are “open” and still accepting applicants. A review of the data compiled by Human Resources reveals that for 2006, few positions received no applicants (the data compilation does not distinguish between unqualified and qualified applicants). The number of applicants for any given position varies from one to over fifty (1-50+). The percentage number of applicants received per open position is provided below:

21%	1-3 applicants
17%	3-5 applicants
17%	6-10 applicants
25%	11-20 applicants
15%	21-30 applicants
6%	31+ applicants

As stated above, the data compilation provided by Human Resources does not delineate between qualified applicants and unqualified applicants. Accordingly, the numbers set forth above are subject to revision and a possible different interpretation when considering whether the applicant applying for the position is qualified, i.e. meets the minimum position requirements. For example, the third percentile, six to ten (6-10) applicants could fall to the second percentile, if two (2) applicants who applied did not meet the minimum criteria. Thus, in order to get a true

finding of whether a position is underpaid, disregarding all other equally important factors of a job choice, only qualified applicants should be considered.

Discussions with the Director of Human Resources revealed that they address of “hard to fill” positions on a regular basis. Nevertheless, again, no set criteria are available to determine whether a position is “hard to fill”, other than the length of time a position has remained open and whether there is a lack of qualified applicants. However, as acknowledged by the Director of Human Resources, there are many reasons why a position may remain open for a length of time including a lack of advertising, a lack of interest in the market as a whole, as well as, residential factors such as housing, traffic, etc. Notwithstanding, Human Resources did provide an example of a position which had been historically “hard to fill”, the position of “Animal Enforcement Officer.” Due to the historic difficulty in attracting qualified applicants, the Department increased the starting salary and pay grade for the position. This increased the number of applicants. Thus, Human Resources has demonstrated an ability to recognize a “hard to fill” position and has likewise demonstrated the ability to correct the situation.

Recommendation:

Further research and analysis should be done to determine which positions are repeatedly “hard to fill” and the reasons said positions are “hard to fill”, beyond just salary. Human Resources has demonstrated the ability to recognize “hard to fill” positions and is the proper resource to conduct further research and analysis.

Exhibit I
Classification and Pay Plan Study by Cody & Associates, Inc 2/9/06
Positions - Analysis of Current to Proposed Pay Ranges

	CURRENT			PROPOSED						
	Min	Max	% Increase to Next Level	Min	Max	% Increase to Next Level	Increase Min	Increase Max	% Inc Min	% Inc Max
820	67,082	115,090	10.00%	77,407	124,203	21.00%	\$ 10,325	\$ 9,113	15.4%	7.9%
819	60,983	104,627	10.00%	63,973	108,689	10.00%	\$ 2,990	\$ 4,062	4.9%	3.9%
818	55,440	95,116	10.00%	58,158	98,809	10.00%	\$ 2,718	\$ 3,693	4.9%	3.9%
817	50,399	86,469	10.08%	52,870	89,827	10.08%	\$ 2,471	\$ 3,358	4.9%	3.9%
816	45,786	78,553	10.03%	48,030	81,603	12.14%	\$ 2,244	\$ 3,050	4.9%	3.9%
815	41,614	71,396	9.93%	42,830	74,169	9.91%	\$ 1,216	\$ 2,773	2.9%	3.9%
814	37,854	64,945	10.01%	38,968	67,467	10.01%	\$ 1,114	\$ 2,522	2.9%	3.9%
813	34,410	59,067	10.00%	35,422	61,330	10.00%	\$ 1,012	\$ 2,263	2.9%	3.8%
812	31,282	53,670	10.00%	32,202	55,754	10.00%	\$ 920	\$ 2,084	2.9%	3.9%
811	28,438	48,790	10.02%	29,275	50,685	10.03%	\$ 837	\$ 1,895	2.9%	3.9%
810	25,848	44,346		26,607	46,068		\$ 759	\$ 1,722	2.9%	3.9%
729	42,515	68,494	5.00%	42,515	68,494	4.98%	\$ -	\$ -		
728	40,491	65,237	5.00%	40,498	65,229	5.02%	\$ 7	\$ (8)		
727	38,563	62,130	4.98%	38,563	62,130	4.98%	\$ -	\$ -		
726	36,735	59,164	5.00%	36,733	59,176	4.99%	\$ (2)	\$ 12		
725	34,986	56,347	5.06%	34,986	56,347	5.06%	\$ -	\$ -		
724	33,301	53,664	5.12%	33,301	53,664	5.12%	\$ -	\$ -		
723	31,678	51,022	4.89%	31,678	51,022	4.89%	\$ -	\$ -		
722	30,202	48,672	5.07%	30,202	48,672	5.07%	\$ -	\$ -		
721	28,746	46,301	4.88%	28,746	46,301	4.86%	\$ -	\$ -		
720	27,409	44,161	5.00%	27,414	44,200	5.02%	\$ 5	\$ 39		
719	26,104	42,058	5.37%	26,104	42,058	5.02%	\$ -	\$ -		
718	24,773	39,957	4.84%	24,773	39,957	4.84%	\$ -	\$ -		
717	23,629	38,106	4.99%	23,629	38,106	4.99%	\$ -	\$ -		
716	22,506	36,296	4.84%	22,506	36,296	4.84%	\$ -	\$ -		
715	21,466	34,611	5.29%	21,466	34,611	5.09%	\$ -	\$ -		
714	20,387	32,884	5.00%	20,426	32,906	5.26%	\$ 39	\$ 22		
713	19,416	31,318	5.00%	19,406	31,283	4.95%	\$ (10)	\$ (35)		
712	18,491	29,827	4.53%	18,491	29,827		\$ -	\$ -		
711	17,690	28,501								
690	15,226	24,502		15,226	24,502		\$ -	\$ -		
L34	35,277	53,893	4.93%	35,277	53,893	5.02%	\$ -	\$ -		
L33	33,619	51,368	5.00%	33,592	51,355	4.87%	\$ (27)	\$ (13)		
L32	32,018	48,922	5.00%	32,032	49,005	5.05%	\$ 14	\$ 83		
L31	30,493	46,592	5.01%	30,493	46,592	5.01%	\$ -	\$ -		
L30	29,037	44,387	4.73%	29,037	44,387	4.73%	\$ -	\$ -		
L29	27,726	42,370	5.29%	27,726	42,370	5.29%	\$ -	\$ -		
L28	26,333	40,269	5.06%	26,333	40,269	5.06%	\$ -	\$ -		
L27	25,064	38,314	4.92%	25,064	38,314	4.87%	\$ -	\$ -		
L26	23,889	36,525	4.98%	23,899	36,525	5.03%	\$ 10	\$ -		
L25	22,755	34,798	4.99%	22,755	34,798	4.99%	\$ -	\$ -		
L24	21,674	33,134	5.25%	21,674	33,134	5.25%	\$ -	\$ -		
L23	20,592	31,491	4.87%	20,592	31,491	4.87%	\$ -	\$ -		
L22	19,635	30,014	5.03%	19,635	30,014	4.77%	\$ -	\$ -		
L21	18,695	28,588		18,741	27,227		\$ 46	\$ (1,361)		

Exhibit II
Classification and Pay Plan Study by Cody & Associates, Inc 2/9/06
Projected Positions Minimum to Increase of More Than \$2,000

Position	Current Pay Grade	Proposed Pay Grade	Grade Increase	Current Min	Proposed Min	Amount Increase	% Increase
Administrative Officer V	820	820	0	67,082	77,407	10,325	15.4%
Fiscal Specialist VI - new	814	816	2	37,854	48,030	10,176	26.9%
Operations Spec. VI - new	724	729	5	33,301	42,515	9,214	27.7%
Operations Supervisor II	811	813	2	28,438	35,422	6,984	24.6%
Operations Supervisor I	810	812	2	25,848	32,202	6,354	24.6%
Skilled Trade Supervisor I	810	812	2	25,848	32,202	6,354	24.6%
Supervisor I	716	721	5	22,506	28,746	6,240	27.7%
Mechanic IV	L28	L32	4	26,333	32,032	5,699	21.6%
Mechanic III	L27	L31	4	25,064	30,493	5,429	21.7%
Secretary III	718	722	4	24,773	30,202	5,429	21.9%
Supervisor II	718	722	4	24,773	30,202	5,429	21.9%
Vehicle Operator VI - new	L27	L31	3	25,064	30,493	5,429	21.7%
Operations Spec. V	724	727	3	33,301	38,563	5,262	15.8%
Mechanic II	L26	L30	4	23,889	29,037	5,148	21.5%
Operations Spec. IV	723	726	3	31,678	36,733	5,055	16.0%
Fiscal Specialist V	814	815	1	37,854	42,830	4,976	13.1%
Mechanic I	L25	L29	4	22,755	27,726	4,971	21.8%
Skilled Trade worker VII	L31	L34	3	30,493	35,277	4,784	15.7%
Fiscal Specialist IV	813	814	1	34,410	38,968	4,558	13.2%
Mechanic V	L30	L33	3	29,037	33,592	4,555	15.7%
Secretary IV	721	724	3	28,746	33,301	4,555	15.8%
Skilled Trade worker VI	L30	L33	3	29,037	33,592	4,555	15.7%
Supervisor III	721	724	3	28,746	33,301	4,555	15.8%
Technician V - new	721	724	3	28,746	33,301	4,555	15.8%
Skilled Trade worker V	L29	L32	3	27,726	32,032	4,306	15.5%
Skilled Trade worker IV	L28	L31	3	26,333	30,493	4,160	15.8%
Fiscal Specialist III	812	813	1	31,282	35,422	4,140	13.2%
Skilled Trade Supervisor II	812	813	1	31,282	35,422	4,140	13.2%
Operations Spec. I	719	722	3	26,104	30,202	4,098	15.7%
Skilled Trade worker III	L27	L30	3	25,064	29,037	3,973	15.9%
Vehicle Operator V	L27	L30	3	25,064	29,037	3,973	15.9%
Skilled Trade worker II	L26	L29	3	23,889	27,726	3,837	16.1%
Secretary II	717	720	3	23,629	27,414	3,785	16.0%
Service Worker VI	L25	L28	3	22,755	26,333	3,578	15.7%
Skilled Trade worker I	L25	L28	3	22,755	26,333	3,578	15.7%
Vehicle Operator IV	L25	L28	1	22,755	26,333	3,578	15.7%
Legal Secretary III	723	725	2	31,678	34,986	3,308	10.4%
Staff Assistant V - new	715	718	3	21,466	24,773	3,307	15.4%
Operations Spec. III	722	724	2	30,202	33,301	3,099	10.3%
Operations Spec. II	721	723	2	28,746	31,678	2,932	10.2%
Fiscal Specialist II	720	722	2	27,409	30,202	2,793	10.2%
Legal Secretary II	719	721	2	26,104	28,746	2,642	10.1%
Legal Secretary I	715	717	2	21,466	23,629	2,163	10.1%
Secretary I	715	717	2	21,466	23,629	2,163	10.1%
Staff Assistant IV	715	717	2	21,466	23,629	2,163	10.1%
Staff Assistant III	714	716	2	20,387	22,506	2,119	10.4%

Exhibit III
Summary of Exit Interview Questionnaires
Provided by Brevard County Human Resources Department

Work Element

	2005 Ratings				2004 Ratings			
	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor
Promotional Opportunities	7%	38%	36%	19%	3%	36%	27%	34%
Resolutions of Complaints and Grievance	10%	40%	31%	19%	14%	39%	21%	25%
Department Training / Philosophy	11%	46%	26%	17%	15%	44%	24%	17%
Retirement Plan	21%	48%	15%	17%	17%	46%	10%	27%
Salary	5%	49%	35%	11%	11%	40%	37%	12%
Tuition Reimbursement	13%	49%	28%	10%	13%	48%	25%	15%
Orientation to Your Department	24%	48%	19%	9%	30%	37%	22%	11%
Other Training Opportunities	19%	43%	31%	8%	21%	34%	28%	17%
Use of Modern Equipment / Technology	14%	52%	27%	7%	9%	45%	26%	21%
Management Certification Program	18%	55%	21%	6%	17%	47%	26%	11%
Information on Job Openings	38%	51%	8%	3%	41%	41%	13%	5%
Orientation to County	38%	48%	11%	3%	39%	52%	5%	5%
Group Health Benefits	33%	53%	12%	2%	43%	42%	8%	8%
Vacation Leave Accrual	31%	56%	10%	2%	34%	52%	12%	2%
Sick Leave	31%	55%	12%	2%	31%	55%	14%	0%
Work Schedule	34%	51%	13%	2%	28%	46%	17%	9%

Reasons for Leaving

	2005		2004	
	No	%	No	%
Better Job	29	28%	19	29%
Retirement	27	26%	9	14%
Better Wages	19	18%	13	20%
Work Condition	18	17%	17	26%
Leave Area	13	12%	10	15%
Career Change	11	10%	6	9%
Continuing Education	11	10%	7	11%
Co Worker	9	9%	5	8%
Better Benefits	7	7%	6	9%
Other	7	7%	7	11%
Distance	5	5%	2	3%
Domestic	2	2%	1	2%
Health	2	2%	5	8%
Involuntary	2	2%	1	2%
Number of Respondents	105		65	

(some provided more than one reason)

Length of Employment

	2005		2004	
	No	%	No	%
1-12 Months	29	29%	19	29%
1-5 Years	37	37%	30	45%
6-10 Years	13	13%	5	8%
11-15 Years	4	4%	5	8%
10-20 Years	5	5%	6	9%
20+ Years	11	11%	1	2%
Total	99		66	

The Information provided is based on returned questionnaires only.