



CITY OF  
BLOOMINGTON  
SPECIAL SESSION  
COUNCIL MEETING  
DECEMBER 11, 2017

# AGENDA



**SPECIAL SESSION MEETING AGENDA  
OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
109 E. OLIVE STREET, BLOOMINGTON, IL 61701  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2017; 5:15 P.M.**

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call of Attendance
3. Public Comment
4. Consideration of approving the minutes of the Special Meeting of November 27, 2017. *(Recommend the Minutes be approved and dispensed as presented.)*
5. Closed Executive Session Meeting
  - A. Review of Minutes - Section 2 (c) (21) of 5 ILCS 120/2) (5 minutes)
  - B. Personnel - Section 2 (c) (11) of 5 ILCS 120/2) (10 minutes)
  - C. Land Acquisition - Section (c) (5) of 5 ILCS 120/2) (10 minutes)
6. Adjourn Closed Executive Session
7. Return to Open Special Session Meeting
8. Presentation on the Downtown Wayfinding Design Concept. *(Presentation and Discussion only.) (Presentation by Steve Rasmussen, Interim City Manager, Barbara Martin and Beth Whisman with KMA, 10 minutes, Council discussion 20 minutes.)*
9. Presentation and discussion of the Employee Satisfaction Survey Results. *(Recommend the 2017 Employee Satisfaction Survey results be reviewed.) (Presentation by Nicole Albertson, Human Resource Director and Dr. J. Lust from Illinois State University 15 minutes, Council discussion 15 minutes.)*
10. Adjourn (approximately 6:45 PM)



**SPECIAL SESSION MEETING  
AGENDA ITEM NO. 4**

FOR COUNCIL: December 11, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Consideration of approval the minutes of the Special City Council Meetings for November 27, 2017.

**RECOMMENDATION/MOTION:** That the reading of the minutes be dispensed and approved as printed.

**STRATEGIC PLAN LINK:** Goal 1. Financially sound City providing quality basic services.

**STRATEGIC PLAN SIGNIFICANCE:** Objective 1d. City services delivered in the most cost-effective, efficient manner.

**BACKGROUND:** The Special City Council Meeting Minutes have been reviewed and certified as correct and complete by the City Clerk.

In accordance with the Open Meetings Act, Council Proceedings are made available for public inspection and posted to the City's web site within ten (10) days after Council approval.

**COMMUNITY GROUPS/INTERESTED PERSONS CONTACTED:** Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted for Council consideration.

Prepared by: Cherry L. Lawson, C.M.C., City Clerk

Recommended by:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Steve Rasmussen". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Steve Rasmussen, Interim City Manager

**Attachments:**

- November 27, 2017 Special Session Meeting Minutes

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL SESSION  
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF  
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2017; 5:30 PM

The Council convened in Special Session in the Council Chambers, City Hall Building at 5:30 p.m., Monday, November 27, 2017. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Renner.

The Meeting was called to order by Mayor Renner who directed City Clerk Cherry Lawson to call the roll and the following members of Council answered present:

Aldermen Joni Painter, Diana Hauman, Mboka Mwilambwe, Jamie Mathy, Scott Black, Kim Bray, Karen Schmidt, David Sage, Amelia Buragas and Mayor Tari Renner.

Staff present: David Hales, City Manager; Steve Rasmussen; Assistant City Manager; Jeffrey Jurgens, Corporation Counsel; and Cherry Lawson, City Clerk, Nicole Albertson, Human Resource Director.

Public Comment

Mayor Renner opened the meeting to receive public comment. No comments were offered.

**Consideration of approving the minutes of the Special Meeting of October 23, 2017.**  
*(Recommend the minutes be approved and dispensed as presented)*

Mayor Renner asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

**Motion by Alderman Schmidt second by Alderman Bray to approve the minutes. Ayes: Aldermen, Painter, Schmidt, Black, Mwilambwe, Buragas, Mathy, Sage and Bray.**

**Nays: None Motion Carried.**

Closed Executive Session Meeting

- A. Review of Minutes - Section 2 (c) (21) of 5 ILCS 120/2 (5 minutes)
- B. Pending Litigation - Section 2 (c) (11) of 5 ILCS 120/2 (25 minutes)

C. Land Acquisition – Section (c) (5) of 5 ILCS 120/2) (10 minutes)

Adjourn Closed Executive Session

Return to Open Special Session Meeting

**Discussion regarding Local Government Wage Increase Transparency Act on disclosable payments to Marsha Ulrich. (Recommend: Informational only, as required pursuant to the Local Government Wage Increase Transparency Act, 50 ILCS 155II.) (Presentation by Josh Hansen, Compensation and Benefits Manager, 5 minutes, Council discussion 15 minutes.)**

Mayor Renner provided a brief overview and stated, any employees who were hired from 2012 on are not eligible for this, but we are required by law to report this.

Mr. Hansen stated, he would provide more information in regards to the sick leave buyback payout that will actually be in process very shortly for Ms. Ulrich as pursuant to the local government wage increase transparency act of July 2016. This is the second employee that we have done a similar process for last year. Of course, as you'll remember, Laurie Wollrab was the first employee. Specific to Marsha, she is an office manager in our police area, and actually, because of our past practice where all of the sick leave that she's accrued will be paid out to her into her retiree health savings account, she will receive a little over \$28,000 in payments. Those payments will be structured over a three-month period at the end of this month, again, in December.

Mr. Hansen continued, the funds are passed over to our retirement health savings account vendor, ICMA, and then those are available to her in retirement. The way that this is structured over a three-month period, does increase her pensionable wage that she receives. Ms. Ulrich will receive an additional \$165 per month in her pension. In order to account for those funds, we make enough from payment on behalf of the City so that we are able to account for that from an actuarial standpoint. The payment the City will make towards Ms. Ulrich will be \$22,453.39 after she retires.

Alderwoman Schmidt stated, this is not pension-spiking, or is it? I mean, we've received an email from somebody suggesting that this is pension-spiking.

Ms. Albertson stated, I don't refer to it as pension-spiking. It is a past practice where we have allowed employees who are retiring who were hired before the May 1st, 2012 date to take their payments over three months. What that results in then is an accelerated payment request from IMRF to pay ahead of time into their retirement. So I don't look at it as pension-spiking. I look at it as we're following a practice that's been in place for years.

Mayor Renner stated, so we need to pay more money upfront so we do not have then to pay more money later.

Alderwoman Schmidt stated, it's being paid into her health plan.

Mr. Hanson stated, from a pension perspective, there are a lot of different factors, of course, that go into the actuarial value. One is the age of the member, another is the gender. You know, women typically outlive men. Also, too, a person's marital status is a factor. There are all these different factors based on that information, then IMRF looks at the individual to say, "Okay, what is their rate of pay? How much are they receiving in sick leave buyback that will heighten the liability from an employer's standpoint that we may owe depending on their projected, you know, lifespan for the remainder of the years?" Then based on the current value of those funds that is what we make from an accelerated payment perspective. There are two different components here, one is the actual pay to the employee into their RHS based on sick leave that is almost, you know, a sideline aspect, but based on the way it's paid, it does increase the pension component.

Alderman Schmidt asked whether there anything else the City should be doing that would ameliorate any of this in the future in a way that obviously is legal to our employees and respectful of their work?

Mr. Hansen stated, when you look across our 600 employees, roughly about a third of the workforce is impacted. If there ever were to be any future changes that would be made, we'd have to really do a gut check from a talent perspective because depending on the department, you know, some areas have a higher tenure than others and you would have some potential risk in terms of service delivery to the city. There would need to be a lot of rigor in place an agreement across the board before any changes would be made.

Mr. Jurgens addressed the question of pension-spiking. Certainly, these policies have the effect of increasing your pension. Again, these are for grandfathered employees. But these policies are increasing the pensions beyond what their normal earnings were in their last years of service.

Mr. Hansen stated, we have discussed that internally and we are aware of that practice and we've actually run into it as well with some of our retirees who come back in the seasonal positions from an IMRF perspective on what funds are actually seen versus, you know, any sort of earnings that are not seen from the pension standpoint. Again, that's part of the work that we are continuing to do internally, long term.

Mayor Renner, a policy change that this council can make. Mr. Hansen stated, it would have to be a policy change across the board. Mr. Jurgens stated, the City is looking at the beginning of the year. We're working on the numbers some of those different policy possibilities and we're looking at bringing that back to the council at the beginning of the year to kind of further address this issue.

Mr. Jurgens stated, the interesting issue with Springfield is the Supreme Court did not decline to hear that appellate court case so that appellate court decision stands. The other issue in Springfield, however, is the fact that they did not bargain that benefit or bargain that change with their collective bargaining units so those labor unions there filed an unfair labor practice.

Adjourn (approximately 6:20 PM)

**Motion by Alderman Schmidt seconded by Alderman Hauman to adjourn. Time: 6:25 PM.**



**Motion carried (Viva Voce).**

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

ATTEST

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tari Renner, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cherry L. Lawson, City Clerk

**Motion by Alderman Hauman seconded by Alderman Schmidt to adjourn. Time: 6:45 PM.**

**Motion carried (Viva Voce).**

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

ATTEST

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tari Renner, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cherry L. Lawson, City Clerk



**SPECIAL SESSION MEETING  
AGENDA ITEM NO. 8**

FOR COUNCIL: December 11, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Presentation of the Downtown Wayfinding Design Concept

**RECOMMENDATION/MOTION:** Presentation and Discussion only.

**STRATEGIC PLAN LINK:** Goal 1. Financially Sound City Providing Quality Basic Services; Goal 2. Upgrade City Infrastructure and Facilities; Goal 4. Strong Neighborhoods; Goal 5. Great Place – Livable, Sustainable City; Goal 6. Prosperous Downtown Bloomington

**STRATEGIC PLAN SIGNIFICANCE:** Objective 1c. Engaged residents that are well-informed and involved in an open governance process; Objective 2d. Well-designed, well maintained City facilities emphasizing productivity and customer service; Objective 4d. Improved neighborhood infrastructure; Objective 5a. Well-planned City with necessary services and infrastructure; Objective 5b. City decisions consistent with plans and policies; Objective 5e. More attractive city: commercial areas and neighborhoods; Objective 6a. More beautiful, clean Downtown area; Objective 6b. Downtown Vision and Plan used to guide development, redevelopment and investments; Objective 6c. Downtown becoming a community and regional destination

**BACKGROUND:** On August 24, 2015, the Bloomington City Council adopted the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, which was developed from an intensive community engagement process. The Plan identifies Downtown Bloomington as a core attraction for employment, specialty retail, innovative mixed uses, and cultural and entertainment uses. The Plan highlights many strengths of Downtown Bloomington including its history, architecture, and nightlife. However, a salient theme emerged during the outreach process: *there is a clear lack of understanding in the community regarding the boundaries of Downtown.* The Plan recommends unified marketing and branding for the Downtown district and the creation of signage and wayfinding installations.

On August 22, 2016 the City Council approved a contract with Kerestes Martin Associates Inc. (aka KMA Design), a reputable design firm from Pittsburg, PA, in the amount of \$62,190.00 (PO 20170182-00) to provide wayfinding and branding design services focused on improving navigation to and around Downtown Bloomington. The Downtown Signage Committee, along with City staff, has met numerous times working with the consultant to develop a plan for wayfinding, branding and gateways for the downtown. KMA Design surveyed residents and determined strategic locations for wayfinding signage and gateway installations. The survey results aligned with the findings from the Comprehensive Plan specifically the need for a unified, clear message. Additionally, the survey reinforced Downtown Bloomington's biggest strengths as its history, architecture, nightlife and arts scene.

**COMMUNITY GROUPS/INTERESTED PERSONS CONTACTED:** Over the past two years, the Downtown Signage Committee, which was appointed by the Mayor and Council, has held numerous public meetings to develop the proposed design concept. On September 27, 2016, KMA Designs held a public meeting and open forum at the Bloomington Center for the Performing Arts. KMA also distributed surveys at the meeting and online. 70 residents and visitors responded to the survey. On November 1, 2017 another open house public meeting was held at the McLean County Museum of history to gather additional feedback on the three conceptual designs. In addition, the three options were on display at City Hall, Illinois Wesleyan University, The Snyder Companies main office, and the Monroe Building/Fox and Hounds public lobby during the month of November. This information was also made available on City's website. The concepts displayed at these locations will be shown with some different proposals during the presentation.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** Not applicable. Presentation and Discussion only. However, Wayfinding Signage has been budgeted in account (40100100-72620). Stakeholders can locate this in the FY 2018 Budget Book titled "Adopted Budget Other Funds" on pages 97, 293, and 309.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT:**

Link to Comprehensive Plan/Downtown Plan Goals:

D.2-3 Improve Wayfinding Downtown

D2-3a. Install wayfinding signage for parking garages and attractions.

D.2-3b. Develop consistent branding and iconography for wayfinding and gateways.

D.2-3c. Solicit cooperation from Downtown businesses to promote consistent wayfinding and branding messages.

**FUTURE OPERATIONAL COST ASSOCIATED WITH NEW FACILITY CONSTRUCTION:** N/A

Respectfully submitted for Council consideration.

Prepared by: Kevin Kothe, City Engineer  
Michael Hill, Public Works Administration

Reviewed by: Kevin Kothe, City Engineer

Financial & budgetary review by: Chris Tomerlin, Budget Analyst  
Scott Rathbun, Sr. Budget Manager

Legal review by: Jeffrey R. Jurgens, Corporation Counsel

Recommended by:



Steve Rasmussen  
Interim City Manager

**Attachments:**

- None



**SPECIAL SESSION MEETING  
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9**

FOR COUNCIL: December 11, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Presentation of the Employee Satisfaction Survey Results

**RECOMMENDATION/MOTION:** Information only.

**STRATEGIC PLAN LINK:** Goal No. 1 Financially Sound City Providing Quality Basic Services

**STRATEGIC PLAN SIGNIFICANCE:** Objective 1d. City services delivered in the most cost-effective, efficient manner

**BACKGROUND:** The City's Human Resource Department is excited to announce it has completed the second City-wide Employee Satisfaction Survey. This year's Employee Survey results will help City Staff identify key areas of concern, as well as key areas of great strength and ability. Action plans will be discussed to address any areas of great concern.

**Methodology**

The City partnered with Dr. John Lust, with the College of Business at Illinois State University to assist us with data collection, insuring statistical validity of the data, as well as reporting of the results. These confidential surveys were offered to employees in an on-line format via web-link to the Qualtrics software program used at ISU.

**Communication**

It is important to note this year's survey was conducted in two separate parts. Part I was for SEASONAL employees only, where Part II was for all FULL-TIME. Both parts were offered to employees in every department across the City. Multiple methods were used to communicate and encourage employees to participate in the survey via city e-mail, personal e-mail, employee digital newsletter, verbal communications, and staff meetings. Flyers were distributed prior to the survey to be posted in break rooms, by time clocks, etc. and copied to hand out to staff who may not have access to e-mail.

**Participation**

It was important to aim for a high participation rate City-wide, so the City could be sure the results reflected the attitudes of our entire workforce. Of the 485 total seasonal employees, 79 participated, giving us a response rate of 16%. Of the 648 total full-time employees, 222 employees participated, giving us a response rate of 34%.

**Sharing of Results**

Directors received a packet of the survey results that included not only a summary sheet showing results City-wide, but also data sheets that showed results specific to their department. Results have also been shared with employees via a direct mail piece mailed directly to their homes that highlights for them the positive and the negative results and plans to work with both.

**COMMUNITY GROUPS/INTERESTED PERSONS CONTACTED:** N/A

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** The financial impact to the City is minimal as expense was limited to cost of paper and material to distribute survey communication and results. Using the results to improve our overall employee job satisfaction will have a positive financial impact in the long-run.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT:** *(If applicable)*

**FUTURE OPERATIONAL COST ASSOCIATED WITH NEW FACILITY CONSTRUCTION:** *(If applicable)*

Respectfully submitted for Council consideration.

Prepared by: Nicole R. Albertson, Director of Human Resources

Reviewed by: (Department Director or designee name, title)

Financial & budgetary review by: Chris Tomerlin, Budget Analyst  
Scott Rathbun, Sr. Budget Manager

Legal review by: Jeffrey R. Jurgens, Corporation Counsel

Recommended by:



Steve Rasmussen  
Interim City Manager

**Attachments:**

- PowerPoint

# **RESULTS OF EMPLOYEE ATTITUDE SURVEYS**

**City of Bloomington**

**Fall 2017**

**Dr. J. Lust**



# SURVEY PROCESS

- If you remember, the last round of surveys was distributed to all City of Bloomington employees during Fall, 2015
- 1113 were distributed to all regular and seasonal employees employed at that time
- 371 were returned for a 33% response rate





# **AT THE TIME OF THAT SURVEY WE MADE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Redo the survey in about two years
  - This would allow time for any changes to have an impact
- Also recommend doing a survey for “full-time” employees and one for seasonal
  - That way we can better monitor return rates and results



# **SURVEY PROCESS CONT.**

## **We followed those recommendations here**

- The survey for seasonal employees was open from Sept. 1 to Sept. 15
  - We received 79 responses of 405 employees (20%)
- The survey for full-time employees was open from Sept. 25 to Oct. 9
  - We had 223 responses of 728 workers (30.6%)



# **SURVEY PROCESS CONT.**

Therefore we have a variety of potential comparisons that we can make

- The 2015 survey of seasonal and full-time employees
- The 2017 survey of seasonal employees
- The 2017 survey of full-time employees



# **SURVEY PROCESS CONT.**

The surveys had the same questions (a mix of quantitative and open-ended items) and was administered on-line via Qualtrics

- The primary difference is that the 2017 seasonal employee survey did not have questions on benefits since they are not available for this employee group
- The 2017 survey for full-time employees and the 2015 combined survey questions were the same



# THE GOOD NEWS!?!?

- Generally the responses that were strong in the 2015 survey remained strong here
- Following are some example items and we see many positive areas
- All 2017 means show FT employees first then seasonal employees



# SECTION 1: COMMUNICATION AND INVOLVEMENT (QUESTIONS 1 – 11)

I am committed to work with City management to make this organization a better place to work.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 19   | 12   | 0    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 62   | 33   | 12   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 280  | 171  | 66   |

2015 Mean = 4.03

2017 Means = 4.00 / 4.05



# SECTION 1 CONT.

I feel like my work is important.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 34   | 21   | 3    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 31   | 23   | 8    |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 296  | 174  | 67   |

2015 Mean = 4.06

2017 Means = 4.05 / 4.12



# SECTION 1 CONT.

I know who to contact when I have a problem or concern.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 27   | 15   | 4    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 23   | 24   | 4    |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 311  | 179  | 70   |

2015 Mean = 4.04

2017 Means = 3.97 / 4.19





# SECTION 1 CONT.

People are treated with respect and appreciation regardless of race, gender, position, etc.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 77   | 53   | 5    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 28   | 30   | 10   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 234  | 133  | 62   |

2015 Mean = 3.60

2017 Means = 3.49 / 4.06



# SECTION 2: SUPERVISION & TRAINING

## (QUESTIONS 13 – 26)

I am willing to report any wrongdoings against citizens to my supervisor.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 15   | 12   | 2    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 39   | 35   | 8    |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 306  | 169  | 68   |

2015 Mean = 4.07

2017 Means = 3.99 / 4.08



# SECTION 2 CONT.

I trust my supervisor.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 70   | 39   | 5    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 46   | 27   | 8    |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 256  | 150  | 65   |

2015 Mean = 3.81

2017 Means = 3.74 / 4.22



# SECTION 2 CONT.

I am comfortable suggesting ways of improving work processes to my direct supervisor.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 54   | 36   | 9    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 29   | 25   | 9    |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 277  | 153  | 60   |

2015 Mean = 3.83

2017 Means = 3.75 / 3.88



# SECTION 2 CONT.

My job responsibilities are clearly defined.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 61   | 36   | 7    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 53   | 34   | 9    |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 247  | 145  | 62   |

2015 Mean = 3.65

2017 Means = 3.67 / 3.99



# SECTION 4: WELLNESS AND SAFETY

## (QUESTIONS 32 – 41)

I have the materials and equipment I need to work safely.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 39   | 27   | 3    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 39   | 24   | 10   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 284  | 165  | 65   |

2015 Mean = 3.82

2017 Means = 3.83 / 4.01



# SECTION 4 CONT.

- Supervisors promote and support Wellness and Safety here at work.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 45   | 39   | 2    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 66   | 44   | 17   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 249  | 132  | 59   |

2015 Mean = 3.69

2017 Means = 3.51 / 4.01



# SECTION 4 CONT.

- My supervisor truly cares about my safety.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ■ 1 & 2 | disagree | 25   | 24   | 4    |
| ■ 3     | neutral  | 65   | 36   | 14   |
| ■ 4 & 5 | agree    | 271  | 156  | 60   |

2015 Mean = 3.91

2017 Means = 3.83 / 4.01





# SECTION 4 CONT.

- Finally, note that we changed the wording on the last question in this section (so no comparison to 2015)
- To what degree do you feel that safety is a priority of the City?

|         |               | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|---------------|------|------|
|         |               | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | low priority  | 35   | 2    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral       | 69   | 13   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | high priority | 112  | 63   |

2017 Means = 3.40 / 4.01



# SECTION 5: PAY & BENEFITS (QUESTIONS 42 – 64)

- There are four areas which impact pay satisfaction:
  - Pay level
  - Raises
  - Benefits
  - Other (including communication, work conditions, etc.)



# SECTION 5: BENEFITS

- **The benefit items remain very strong:**

- Sick Leave:

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 23   | 29   |
| ▪ 3     | neutral      | 70   | 25   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 237  | 162  |

2015 Mean = 3.90

2017 Mean = 3.78



# SECTION 5: BENEFITS (CONT.)

## ■ Vacation Pay.

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   |
| ■ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 37   | 27   |
| ■ 3     | neutral      | 61   | 41   |
| ■ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 227  | 147  |

2015 Mean = 3.76

2017 Mean = 3.68



# SECTION 5: BENEFITS (CONT.)

- My Retirement and Pension Program.

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   |
| ■ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 27   | 17   |
| ■ 3     | neutral      | 73   | 39   |
| ■ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 217  | 154  |

2015 Mean = 3.78

2017 Mean = 3.78



# SECTION 5: BENEFITS (CONT.)

- Health Benefits – The current network of Doctors/Hospitals.

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 20   | 22   |
| ▪ 3     | neutral      | 72   | 52   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 241  | 134  |

2015 Mean = 3.81

2017 Mean = 3.66



# SECTION 5: SUMMARY

- Overall satisfaction with my Health Insurance Benefit.

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 24   | 31   |
| ▪ 3     | neutral      | 85   | 50   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 199  | 127  |

2015 Mean = 3.72

2017 Mean = 3.54



# UNFORTUNATELY A FEW ITEMS SLIPPED FROM THE 2015 LEVEL

- **Section 1:** I am kept informed about what is going on in the City.

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 125  | 114  |
| ▪ 3     | neutral      | 66   | 46   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 170  | 60   |

2015 Mean = 3.08

2017 Mean = 2.68





# ITEMS WITH LOWER RESPONSE (CONT.)

- **Section 1:** Overall, I am satisfied with communication and involvement in the City.

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 138  | 115  |
| ▪ 3     | neutral      | 111  | 54   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 113  | 47   |

2015 Mean = 2.85

2017 Mean = 2.57



# ALTHOUGH NOTE SOME GOOD NEWS – SEASONAL EMPLOYEES ARE POSITIVE

- **Section 1:** Overall, I am satisfied with communication and involvement in the City.

|         |              | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|--------------|------|------|------|
|         |              |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | dissatisfied | 138  | 115  | 13   |
| ▪ 3     | neutral      | 111  | 54   | 21   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | satisfied    | 113  | 47   | 44   |

2015 Mean = 2.85

2017 Mean = 2.57 / **3.54**



# ITEMS WITH LOWER RESPONSE (CONT.)

- **Section 2:** Conflicts get resolved promptly and appropriately.

|                  |          | 2015             | 2017 |
|------------------|----------|------------------|------|
|                  |          |                  | FT   |
| ▪ 1 & 2          | disagree | 129              | 102  |
| ▪ 3              | neutral  | 102              | 54   |
| ▪ 4 & 5          | agree    | 131              | 60   |
| 2015 Mean = 2.93 |          | 2017 Mean = 2.67 |      |



# AGAIN – SEASONAL EMPLOYEES ARE MORE POSITIVE

- **Section 2:** Conflicts get resolved promptly and appropriately.

|         |          | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 |
|---------|----------|------|------|------|
|         |          |      | FT   | Sea. |
| ▪ 1 & 2 | disagree | 129  | 102  | 8    |
| ▪ 3     | neutral  | 102  | 54   | 24   |
| ▪ 4 & 5 | agree    | 131  | 60   | 46   |

2015 Mean = 2.93

2017 Mean = 2.67 / **3.60**



# THE PATTERN CONTINUES – SEASONAL EMPLOYEES ARE OFTEN MORE POSITIVE

- **Section 2:** My department head is good at providing support and guidance to his/her employees.
  - 2015 Mean = 3.42                      2017 Means = 3.21 / **3.78**
- **Section 2:** Overall, I am satisfied with supervision in the City.
  - 2015 Mean = 3.05                      2017 Means = 2.85 / **3.82**



# THE PATTERN CONTINUES (CONT.)

- **Section 3:** Employees are treated with courtesy and respect.
  - 2015 Mean = 3.10                      2017 Means = 3.06 / **3.73**
- **Section 3:** My employer cares about me.
  - 2015 Mean = 2.91                      2017 Means = 2.75 / **3.74**
- **Section 3:** Overall, I am satisfied with the Culture and Image of the City.
  - 2015 Mean = 2.71                      2017 Means = 2.63 / **3.71**



# THOUGHTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- To put the results in context, remember that there were 8 union contracts negotiated in the Spring with several still pending
  - This timing was not the best if one wanted to find the only positive results
  - The fact that we see consistent positives is important



# RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT.)

- The employee advisory group is looking at several items:
  - Response rate and steps to improve it
  - Reasons that seasonal employees might be more positive than FT
  - Questions with lower satisfaction levels





# RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT.)

- Based on the recommendations of this group it might be worth doing a short survey in May or June
  - That is, if the group identifies two or three possible actions to take in the Spring, it might be worth checking to see if there is movement in the right direction



# RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT.)

- In summary, I would close with the same comment as in 2015:
  - These survey results are very positive  
Most certainly there are a few areas to think about but overall the results are strong
- These results indicate as positive a work environment as one might hope for

