ICMA Benchmarking Project
FY 2005 Overview

Human Resources and Risk Management
David Etheridge, Human Resources
Purpose of Briefing

• Comparison of 2004 and 2005 data
  – Internally
    • Data collected for City of Dallas Department of Human Resources and Risk Management to measure changes over time within the Department
  – Externally
    • Data collected for comparison to other cities
Human Resource Function

Background

• Total of 114 respondents/jurisdictions

• Peer Cities
  • San Antonio
  • Austin
  • Phoenix
  • Over 100,000 in population
Comparative Position for FY 2004-05

- **HUMAN RESOURCES FUNCTION:**
  - Very little of the 2004 internal data could be compared to 2005 internal data due to incomplete data:
    - Sick leave hrs. per 1000 hrs. worked
    - Benefits as %’age of total wages/salaries
    - No. job classifications
    - Turnover rates
    - No. Employee Grievances
Comparative Position for FY 2005
Human Resources

• Areas of Strength Compared to ICMA Benchmark
  – Ratio of HR Employees to City Workforce
  – Benefits
  – No. of Job Classifications
  – Working Days to Reclassify Position
  – No. Days to Recruit Positions
  – Performance Reviews Completed on Schedule
  – Turnover (Uniform & IT)
### Comparative Position for FY 2005 Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Ratio HR FTE's to 100 total jurisdiction FTE</th>
<th>Employee Benefits as %'age of total salaries/wages</th>
<th>No. Job Classifications</th>
<th>Working days to complete classification</th>
<th>Percentage of Performance Reviews completed on schedule</th>
<th>Percentage of Performance Reviews completed on schedule</th>
<th>Turnover (Public Safety)</th>
<th>Turnover (IT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>21.31%</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities w/greater than 100,000 pop.</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>25.20%</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83.80%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative Position for FY 2005
Human Resources

– Areas of Concern as Compared to ICMA Benchmark
  • Sick Leave Hours per 1000 hrs. Worked
  • Turnover
    – Overall
    – Non-Uniform (excl. IT)
## Comparative Position for FY 2005
### Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Sick Leave hours per 1000 hours worked</th>
<th>Total Turnover</th>
<th>Turnover (Non-public safety excl. IT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>10.52%</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities w/greater than 100,000 pop.</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Customer Feedback
Human Resources

- Survey of City Employees re: the services received from Human Resources and all internal services departments
  - Results available by January, 2007
- Feedback from New Employee Orientation
- Process for feedback from all training being developed and implemented in FY 06-07
Relative Position for FY 2004-05
Human Resources non-ICMA

- We’re still strong in areas that ICMA does not measure
  - Payroll Accuracy: 99.7%
    - American Payroll Association Standard is 99.4%
  - Payroll Support
    - Average Ratio of 1:845 (Payroll Assistant: City employee)
    - American Payroll Association: Standard Ratio=1:650
Proposed Actions
Human Resources

• Review Sick Leave Hours
  – Begin baseline data for pre and post Attendance Incentive Leave (AIL) policy change

• Began measuring activities not previously tracked that will be included in the 2006 survey
  – Grievances
  – Appeals
  – Customer Satisfaction Survey
Risk Management Function
Background

• Total of 102 respondents/jurisdictions
• Peer Cities
  • San Antonio
  • Austin
  • Phoenix
  • Over 100,000 in population
Comparative Position for FY 2004-05

• RISK MANAGEMENT FUNCTION:
  – Very little of the 2004 data could be compared to 2005 data due to incomplete data:
    • Total Property Loss, Premiums and Other Expenditures per $1,000 of Property Value
    • Risk Management Training Hours per FTE
    • Workers’ Comp Claims per 100 FTE’s
    • Number of Worker Days Lost per Claim
Comparative Position for FY 2004
Risk Management

• Areas we can report:
  – General Liability Claims per 10,000 population
  – Expenditures for Workers’ Comp Claim per $100 of Total Salary/Benefit
  – Number of Worker Days Lost to Injury per FTE (Police)
### Comparative Position for FY 2004

**Risk Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General Liability Claims per 10,000 Population</th>
<th>Expenditures for Workers’ Comp. per $100 of Total Salary/Benefits</th>
<th>Number of Worker Days Lost Due to Injury per FTE (Police)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>$3.51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>$2.39</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative Position for FY 2005
Risk Management

• Areas of Strength and Concern Compared to ICMA Benchmark
  – Depending upon the Activity:
    • Dallas compares well in some areas, and;
    • Dallas shows room for improvement in other areas
## Comparative Position for FY 2005
### Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Number of Risk FTE</th>
<th>Liability Claims per 10K Population</th>
<th>Workers’ Comp. expenditure per FTE</th>
<th>Number of Workers’ Comp. Claims per 100 FTE's</th>
<th>Expenditure for Workers’ Comp per $100 Total Sal./Ben.</th>
<th>Number of Worker Days Lost to Injury Per FTE (Police)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>$1,230</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>$2.39</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities w/ greater than 100,000 population</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>$1,192</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>$734</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Customer Feedback
Risk Management

• Survey of City employees re: the services received from Risk Management and all internal service departments
  – Results available by January, 2007

• Process for feedback from all safety training being conducted in FY 05-06 to be included in the 2006 ICMA survey
Proposed Actions
Risk Management

• Implement the Absence Management Program to track number of days all employees are out due to injury:
  – Return to Work Program;
  – Case Management Policy;
  – Injury Rates that Impact Leave Policies