

VILLAGE OF HOWARD
EMPLOYEE PAY AND BENEFIT
COMPENSATION REVIEW

August 2013

Conducted by Public Administration Associates

SECTION I: Job Descriptions and Titles

A. Narrative on Job Duties by Position

B. Suggestions on Upgrades and Revisions to Current Position Descriptions

LISTING OF HOWARD EMPLOYEE POSITIONS AND GENERAL DUTIES FOR TITLE COMPARISON PURPOSES

Director of Public Works-Has general oversight and personnel responsibilities for the Divisions of Forestry, Streets, Mechanics, Engineering, Utilities, Storm Water District, Parks and Golf Course. Responsible for all agreements with county, state, and federal governments for transportation routes.

Director of Engineering-Signs and approves all developer agreements for residential, commercial and industrial projects in the community. Conducts traffic flow studies, traffic signal projects, other long term engineering studies. Gives presentations and conducts hearings on proposed sidewalk, street paving, street reconstruction, utility expansion projects to residents, developers and the Village Board.

Staff Engineer-Writes specifications for all streets, inter-sections, subdivision projects and commercial and industrial projects. Does field inspections of all private contractors and can order modifications to project design to insure compliance with Village zoning and construction standards. Conducts soil testing and soil compaction reviews.

Senior Engineering Tech-Position is proposed, but does not exist. Would have major drafting duties for all utility projects and also supervises both junior techs and 4-7 seasonal technicians. No Professional Engineer's license required.

Engineering Tech-Drafts most plans for utility expansion for private residences and commercial development. Negotiates with private contractors and coordinates work with Village crews for projects such as sidewalks, retention ponds, storm water sewers, drainage culverts etc.

GIS Coordinator-Operates the CAD mapping program and provides support to both engineering and zoning divisions. Provides low level of Informational Technology support by installing software, hardware and printers for PWD and a few other Village departments upon request. Looks up placement of utilities, private and public and does revisions of Village zoning and Certified Survey Maps.

Public Works Administrative Assistant-Responds to all citizen inquiries and/or complaints regarding department activities. Directs all communication to appropriate division personnel. Coordinates all departmental purchase orders, bills and receipts all payments for services. Processes and files all departmental correspondence and serves as personal assistant to the Director of Public Works.

Water Utility Operator/Working Foreman Water and Sewer-Conducts water quality tests twice weekly and submits water quality tests to State. Maintains chemical treatment and meters for water system and emergency wells. Main source of water is through agreement with City of Manitowoc to pump from Lake Michigan. Maintains and cleans sewer system, including lift stations but no treatment plant within Village

Laborer Water and Sewer-Provides a variety of repair and maintenance of water and wastewater mains, piping and meters. Conduct regular meter reading and replace worn ones. Respond to water main breaks and locate and replace laterals and main connections.

Public Works (Streets/Parks) Working Foreman-Gives daily direction to nine laborers, primarily in the areas of streets, parks, and forestry. Sets schedules and addresses work issues, but has no disciplinary authority and is part of a bargaining unit.

Laborer Public Works-The majority of time is spent in minor street repair, snow plowing, village facility maintenance, special large item garbage and brush pick-up, tree pruning, operating large equipment, sign installation and support of water and sewer utility repair projects (as back-up).

Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk-Repairs, overhauls, maintains all Village trucks, vehicles other motorized equipment. Maintain a parts stockroom for common replacement parts for all vehicles and equipment. Cuts and weld metal and have training in diesel and gas engines. Replace all parts not covered by warranty.

Director of Parks & Forestry (also runs Golf Course maintenance): Oversees maintenance, landscaping and facilities/equipment for 15 Village parks, bike trails and neighborhood play lots. Oversees 20 part-time and seasonal maintenance workers. Oversees Village's urban forestry program which is responsible for planting and care of 900 trees in parks and general pruning and removal of diseased trees in public properties and right-of-ways.

Village Administrator-Responsible for overall Village administration and annual budget preparation. Also advises elected Board on policy and village process. Additionally is responsible for intergovernmental relations with county, state and federal agencies and officials.

Administrative Assistant to the Administrator-Handles correspondence and scheduling for the Village Administrator and Board. Creates Board and Commission agendas. Organizes and assembles board packets. Takes minutes of all Board and some commission meetings. Conducts special research and studies at direction of Administrator and organizes staff reports. Serves as Village public information officer by maintaining web site, blog and e-newsletter.

Director of Administrative Services-a blended position that includes normal Finance Director duties for overseeing all accounts payable, accounts receivable, utility billing, payroll and general accounting duties, as well as budget monitoring. In addition position serves as Treasurer and Clerk with all accompanying requirements of WI State Statutes, including the administration of elections, and issuing of all Village permits, licenses, and collections of fines and forfeitures. Position also serves as part-time Human Resources manager and oversees administration of Village golf-course. (Note: please provide wages of any position such as Finance Director/Treasurer/Clerk or Finance Director-Clerk if applicable)

Accountant I-Position is in charge of accounts payable and receivable and many standard accounting duties. Requires a four year degree in finance, business or accounting. Oversees Account Clerk.

Utility Billing Clerk-Prepares water and sewer bills. Enters accounts payable and receivable for three utility accounts. Requires associate degree in finance or accounting.

Administrative Assistant/Front Counter-Provide initial customer service to all phone and walk-in business at Village Hall. Direct residents and business contacts to appropriate sources of information and assistance within the village organization. Process permits and license applications. Accept payments for village taxes, fees and special charges and provide receipts upon request. Assist Director of

Administrative services with assigned Clerk duties such as election rolls, posting of meeting notices, and absentee voting.

Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Administrator-Conducts inspections of all new construction of residential and commercial property and all significant upgrades and rehabilitation of existing structures. Enforces the building codes of the Village and insures that building permits have been issued in advance. Also enforces storm water and erosion control regulations and cites violations of zoning and sign ordinances.

Director of Community Development-Charged with economic development, marketing of industrial park, housing development, enforcement of zoning and development ordinances, and overseeing building inspection, and zoning code. Also develops and updates community development plan(s) and provision of village services to undeveloped sections of the Village. General administration of zoning code, approves certified survey maps, staffs Plan Commission and works with Administrator to attract economic development in the Village.

Public Safety Director-Administrator of Police Operations through an agreement with Brown County Sheriff's Department for eight officers and two Directed Enforcement officers. Also administers budget, payroll and staffing for a combination Fire Division with one full time position, four part time paid officers, and 50 Paid on Call responders. Prepares emergency management plans and is liaison to Brown County emergency management. Also oversees all training for firefighters and first responders. Creates mutual aid agreements with City of Green Bay and other municipalities.

Fire Captain-Operates command post at all incidents. Is chief field officer and dispatches all other fire officers and crews to the scene of fires and accidents. Files reports of major incidents and consults with Public Safety director on overall departmental planning, scheduling and training needs. Also oversees equipment maintenance and supplies for the department.

Leisure Services Director-In charge of scheduling recreation programs for both parks and village facilities on a year round basis. Hires instructors, publishes calendar, reserves sites for outside groups, and collects fees. While Howard sponsors some programs for its senior citizens, there is no senior citizen center per se.

Municipal Court Clerk-Schedules hearings on violations of municipal ordinances for the Municipal Court Judge to hear on a weekly basis. Tracks juvenile and adult court cases electronically. Notifies defendants of court times. Collects fines and forfeitures from those found or pleading guilty of violations. Remits appropriate portions of such collections to village, county and state government in a timely fashion.

NOTES ON SUGGESTED CHANGES (ADDITIONS/DELETIONS) TO HOWARD JOB DESCRIPTIONS

These suggestions are based on personal interviews with 35 of the 38 employees regarding major job duties of each position, conducted on June 25 and 26 of this year. They are based also on knowledge of comparable positions in similar municipalities in the region and statewide. If no comments are listed, it is safe to assume that the job description is reasonably accurate.

Village Administrator:

Add designation of deputy clerk. Emphasize the duties as “chief negotiator for Village housing and economic development”, and assign percentage to duties. We suggest that this be 10-15% of Administrator’s description, particularly with the new village purchase of 70 acres to create a new subdivision development with improved lots for private sale.

Director of Administrative Services:

Substitute new job description completed by Chris Haltom in June 2013 for the old, outdated version.

Administrative Assistant to the Administrator:

Add more duties related to role as Village public information officer and assign a higher percentage to such duties (30-35% suggested). We believe that more descriptive language should be added, such as “maintains e-newsletter, directs inquiries to other Village departments from Village web-site, and writes weekly blog for citizens”. PAA also recommends that the current title be amended to add, “/Public Information Officer.”

Accountant:

Utility Billing Clerk:

Administrative Assistant/Receptionist:

Director of Community Development:

Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Administrator:

Director of Public Safety:

Fire Captain:

Director of Parks and Forestry and Golf Course Manager:

Delete unapproved reference to “serving as Director of Public Works in Director’s absence.”

Director of Leisure Services:

Municipal Clerk:

Director OF Public Works:

Director of Engineering:

Staff Engineer:

Engineering Tech:

GIS Coordinator:

Reduce percentage of time spent on assisting other departments on informational technology (IT) projects. This appears to be less than 5% of normal duties, and this assistance is often provided more often through either Administrative Services, or by private contractor.

Water Utility Operator/Working Foreman Water and Sewer:

Consider changing title from "Working Foreman Water and Sewer" to the one listed above since nearly 40% of this position's duties relate to testing and maintaining the quality of municipal water flowing from Manitowoc through the Village's system to residents homes and businesses. The old job description may be 15-20 years old and should be re-written with assistance of the incumbent. Should be mentioned that position operates all heavy equipment for utilities and that training and certification for such is a job requirement.

Laborer Water and Sewer:

No section on "Work Environment" presently exists, unlike those included in most other engineering and public works descriptions. Water and Sewer workers work outside and are subject to handling water system breaks in sub-zero conditions.

Public Works Department (PWD) Working Foreman:

Recent job description was not available. If similar to Water/Sewer Foreman, position description is 15-20 years old and seriously outdated. Entirely new PD is recommended.

Laborer Public Works:

No section on "Work Environment" presently exists, unlike those included in most other engineering and public works descriptions. Streets laborers work outside and are subject to extreme cold and heat as well as potential traffic hazards from speeding vehicles.

In addition, add language stating that "position is responsible for backing up water and sewer laborers," and that laborers should be "cross-trained," in water meter installation and water and sewer pipe maintenance and repair procedures."

Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk:

Administrative Assistant to Public Works:

Add under duties," assists Director of Engineering in notification process to residents of street, sidewalk, and curb and gutter construction, including all notices of public hearings."

SECTION II: Internal Rankings Based on Updated Duties and Position by Position Evaluations.

A. Copy of PAA Position Scoring Methodology

B. Numerical Internal Rankings of Howard Positions

Internal Position Evaluation

Internal evaluations of positions are conducted to determine if compensation rates are equitable among positions within the organization. The customary approach is to identify a series of job factors--items that are found to greater or lesser degrees in all positions, to assign weights to these factors, and finally to determine how much of a particular job factor there is in a position. For example, a job factor that might be assigned heavy weighting is knowledge/education. If a particular position required a master's degree, then that position would contain a high degree of the factor knowledge/education. If another position required a high school diploma, then that position would contain a low degree of the factor knowledge/education.

For this study, eight widely used job factors were applied to all of the positions. These factors also were weighted according to standard practices, although the weighting should be reviewed by the organization.

1. Knowledge/education (20% weighting)
2. Experience (20% weighting)
3. Job complexity (20% weighting)
4. Supervision exercised (10% weighting)
5. Supervision received (10% weighting)
6. Consequences of decisions (10% weighting)
7. Interaction with other sets of people (5% weighting)
8. Work environment (5% weighting)

The job factors used a point system assigned to the degree to which a factor was found in the position. The factor degree and point codes are as follows:

Knowledge/Education

7	MPA/MA/MS
6	BA+
5	BA
4	AS+
3	AS or equivalent
2	HS+
1	HS

Experience

- 7 7+ years progressive (2 promotions)
- 6 5+ years progressive (2 promotions)
- 5 5+ years progressive (1 promotion)
- 4 3+ years progressive (1 promotion)
- 3 2-5 years
- 2 1 year
- 1 None

Job Complexity

- 7 Broad scope/highly complex/non-routine
- 6 Medium scope/highly complex/non-routine
- 5 Medium scope/somewhat complex/non-routine
- 4 Medium scope/somewhat complex/somewhat routine
- 3 Limited scope/somewhat complex/somewhat routine
- 2 Limited scope/non-complex/somewhat routine
- 1 Limited scope/non-complex/routine

Consequences of work

- 7 Broad/high impact/no check
- 6 Somewhat broad/high impact/no check
- 5 Somewhat broad/medium impact/limited check
- 4 Somewhat broad/medium impact/high check
- 3 Narrow/medium impact/limited check
- 2 Narrow/low impact/limited check
- 1 Narrow/low impact/high check

Supervision Exercised

- 7 Department heads
- 6 Supervisors
- 6 Subordinates 10+
- 5 Subordinates 4+
- 4 Subordinates 2-3
- 3 Subordinates 1
- 2 Indirect/limited supervision
- 1 None

Supervision Received

- 7 Board direction/latitude
- 6 Board/administrator direction/latitude
- 5 Administrator direction/latitude
- 4 Department head direction/latitude
- 3 Department head direction/limited latitude
- 2 Supervisor direction/latitude
- 1 Supervisor direction/limited latitude

Interaction

- 7 Diverse/initiated and received/complex
- 6 Diverse/initiated and received/somewhat complex
- 5 Somewhat diverse/initiated and received/complex
- 4 Somewhat diverse/initiated and received/somewhat complex
- 3 Not diverse/initiated and received/somewhat complex
- 2 Not diverse/initiated and received/routine
- 1 Not diverse/received/routine

Work Environment

- 7 Regular environment with high physical demands
- 6 Regular environment with uncertain level of risk
- 5 Occasional environment with uncertain level of risk
- 5 Outdoor environment with moderate physical demands
- 4 Indoor environment with moderate physical demands
- 3 Indoor environment with constant and/or unpredictable workflow
- 2 Indoor environment with limited physical demands
- 1 Office environment with no physical demands

Because the analysis is of the job factors in the **position** and not in the performance of the employee, the position description was the starting point in the analysis. It needs to be made very clear that this is **not** an evaluation of current employee performance. Each employee was asked to review his or her position description for accuracy and, if necessary, to recommend modifications in the description. I then interviewed each employee to discuss the position description.

In general, the position descriptions were fairly accurate descriptions of work being performed and of necessary qualifications of employees. There were some discrepancies and several employees indicated that they were doing more than was included in the position description. I examined these recommended additions very carefully in light of the job factors. In most cases, they were an elaboration of work tasks that were more generally defined in the position description, although in a few instances they did affect job complexity or supervision exercised. However, just because certain tasks were being performed did not mean that they should be included in the position description without review by the appropriate department head and the administrator. After the assessment of each position in terms of the job factors, the final steps are to determine the total number of points for each position and to group positions that have similar point totals.

2013 Administrative Salary Schedule

Job Title	2.00% General Increase	Step 1	5.00% Step 2	4.00% Step 3	3.00% Step 4	3.00% 1.50% Step 5	3.00% 1.50% Step 6	3.00% Step 7	1.50% Step 8	1.50% Step 9	1.50% Step 10	1.50% Step 11	1.50% Step 12
Public Works Director		\$73,572	\$77,251	\$80,341	\$82,751	\$85,233	\$87,790	\$90,424	\$91,781	\$93,157	\$94,555	\$95,973	\$97,413
Engineer		63,208	66,369	69,024	71,094	73,227	75,424	77,687	78,832	80,035	81,235	82,454	83,691
Engineer Staff		57,024	59,875	62,270	64,138	66,063	68,044	70,086	71,137	72,204	73,287	74,387	75,502
Engineer Tech		43,098	45,252	47,063	48,474	49,929	51,426	52,969	53,764	54,570	55,389	56,220	57,063
GIS Coordinator		53,981	56,681	58,948	60,716	62,538	64,414	66,346	67,341	68,352	69,377	70,417	71,474
Park Super./Forester		54,104	56,809	59,081	60,854	62,679	64,560	66,497	67,494	68,507	69,534	70,577	71,636
Accountant I		42,231	44,343	46,116	47,500	48,925	50,393	51,904	52,683	53,473	54,275	55,089	55,916
Dir. of Admin. Svcs		69,018	72,469	75,368	77,629	79,958	82,357	84,827	86,100	87,391	88,702	90,033	91,383
Dir. Community Dev.		61,175	64,233	66,803	68,807	70,871	72,997	75,187	76,315	77,459	78,621	79,801	80,998
Code Enforcement Officer		59,393	62,362	64,857	66,802	68,806	70,871	72,997	74,092	75,203	76,331	77,476	78,638
Building Inspector		49,146	51,603	53,668	55,278	56,936	58,644	60,403	61,309	62,229	63,162	64,110	65,072
Dir. of Leisure Svcs		50,490	53,015	55,135	56,789	58,493	60,248	62,055	62,986	63,931	64,890	65,863	66,851
Fire Chief		69,646	73,128	76,053	78,335	80,685	83,105	85,598	86,882	88,186	89,508	90,851	92,214
Administrative Asst		40,390	42,409	44,106	45,429	46,792	48,196	49,642	50,386	51,142	51,909	52,688	53,478
Administrator		92,939	97,586	101,490	104,534	106,102	107,694	107,694	109,309	110,949	112,613	114,302	116,017

SCHEDULE A

Based on means average: 1%(\$.24) 1.50%(\$.36) 1.25%(\$.30) 1.50%(\$.37) 1.25% (0.31)

<u>Classification</u>	<u>1/1/11</u>	<u>1/1/12</u>	<u>7/1/12</u>	<u>1/1/13</u>	<u>7/1/13</u>
Working foreman	\$25.27	\$25.63	\$25.93	\$26.30	\$26.61
Laborer	\$23.74	\$24.10	\$24.40	\$24.77	\$25.08
Laborer assistant	\$23.24	\$23.60	\$23.90	\$24.27	\$25.08
Mechanic 1	\$24.44	\$24.80	\$25.10	\$25.47	\$25.78
Mechanic 2	\$23.74	\$24.10	\$24.40	\$24.77	\$25.08
Mechanic 3*	\$23.41	\$23.77	\$24.07	\$24.44	\$24.75

*Mechanic III will move to Mechanic II upon completion of his/her probation. New Hire rates do not apply.

NEW HIRE RATE:

0 to 6 months	\$2.00 per hour below classification
6 to 36 months	\$1.00 per hour below classification
36+ months	Full rate of classification

**As a quid pro quo for changes in 20.01 Health Insurance, added \$0.15 per hour to wages (included in above rates) to become effective April 1, 2008 commensurate with Central States plan (i.e. employee paying 25% co-payments on drugs). This agreement was signed on March _____, 2008 with backpay for 2008 retroactive to January 1, 2008 at the above rates less the \$0.15 per hour. Any wages earned from January through March 31, 2008 are paid at this lower rate.

Pager employees will receive ninety dollars (\$90.00) per week call time. Employee will be paid a minimum of two (2) hours when called in for non-scheduled hours. During the 1st week of each year there will be a voluntary sign up to be on the pager rotation. Any training required will be offered. All water & sewer personnel are required to take the pager.

Tool Allowance - \$400.00 per year for Mechanic 1 and Mechanic 2. Employees shall be required to submit receipts as proof of purchase to Village for reimbursement.

This agreement entered into by and between the Village of Howard ("Employer") and General Teamsters Local Union 662 ("Union") agree that tools lost in a fire would be covered by the Village Carrier per the plan when a list of items that were lost in the fire is provided.

As a quid pro quo for changes to 13.01 to allow for the contracting for garbage collection, the Village paid each employee a lump sum of \$2,100 on January 8, 1999.

SCHEDULE A

Wage Schedule

Based on Means 1% (\$0.18) 1.50% (\$0.27) 1.25% (\$0.23) 1.50% (\$0.28) 1.25% (\$0.23)

<u>Category</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>1/1/2012</u>	<u>7/1/2012</u>	<u>1/1/2013</u>	<u>7/1/2013</u>
1 Clerk/Typist	\$17.24	\$17.51	\$17.73	\$18.01	\$18.24
2 Court Clerk	\$17.98	\$18.25	\$18.47	\$18.75	\$18.98
3 Account Clerk	\$20.67	\$20.94	\$21.16	\$21.44	\$21.67

NEW HIRE RATE:

0 to 6 months	\$2.00 per hour below classification
6 to 36 months	\$1.00 per hour below classification
36+ months	Full rate of classification

CATEGORY

1	Utility Clerk, Clerk/Typist, Part-time Clerk/Typist
2	Court Clerk
3	Account Clerk/Bookkeeper

Wage progression for full-time and part-time employees shall be automatically based on length of service.

The employer will reimburse employee up to \$50 in expenses for prescription glasses and/or contacts on an annual basis for the duration of the contract, subject to employee providing receipt of purchase prior to reimbursement. Reimbursement for prescription eye glasses or contacts shall not carry over from year to year.

VILLAGE OF HOWARD INTERNAL EMPLOYEE RANKINGS 2013

Prepared by Public Administration Associates July 2013

Title of Position	Education	Experience	Job Compete	Supervision	Supervision	Consequer	Interaction	Work Envir	Total=100%
Weight Given (%)	20%	20%	20%	10%	10%	10%	5%	5%	
Administrator	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	1	670
Dir. Of Public Works	6	7	6	6	6	7	6	3	615
Dir. of Administrative Ser	6	7	6	5	6	7	6	1	595
Dir. Of Public Safety	6	7	5	6	6	6	5	6	595
Dir. Of Comm. Develop.	6	6	6	5	6	5	6	1	555
Dir. Of Engineering	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	3	535
Fire Captain	5	5	5	6	5	6	4	6	520
Super. Parks & Forestry	5	5	4	5	6	4	5	5	460
Building Insp./Code Enf.	5	5	5	1	4	5	6	5	455
Staff Engineer	6	3	4	4	4	5	4	3	425
Accountant I	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	1	425
Dir. Of Leisure Services	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	420
GIS Coordinator	5	5	4	1	4	4	4	1	400
Water Operator-WS Fore	2	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	395
Admistrator Admin. Asst./	3	4	4	1	5	5	5	1	385

Public Information Off.

Engineering Tech	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	365
PWD Working Foreman	2	5	3	5	3	3	3	5	350
Mechanic	2	4	4	1	3	5	3	4	325
Municipal Court Clerk	2	3	4	1	2	4	4	1	255
Utility Billing Clerk	2	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	250
Water/Sewer Laborer	1	3	3	1	2	4	2	5	245
PWD Laborer	1	3	3	1	2	3	2	5	235
Administrative Asst/Recep.	1	2	3	1	3	3	3	1	205
Admin. Asst. PWD/Eng.	1	2	3	1	3	3	3	1	205

SECTION III: External Wage and Mid-Point Comparisons by Position

- A. Approach to Measuring and Calculating External Comparisons**
- B. Summary of Calculations by Position and Creation of Working Ranges from 14 Similar-Sized and Located WI Communities**
- C. Chart of Private Sector Ranges Computed for Somewhat Equivalent Howard Positions**
- D. Appendix with Example of Sun Prairie's Pay Compensation Questionnaire Responses**

SECTION III: External Compensation Comparisons

PAA's Approach

Twenty Wisconsin municipalities originally were selected as comparison municipalities based upon agreed qualities similar to Howard's, such as population size, proximity to metropolitan areas, services provided residents and current or past growth patterns. Fourteen municipalities responded to the survey and data from all were used when relevant to the 24 positions in Howard (i.e. 75% plus of duties were equivalent). Therefore, the first task was to establish the degree to which positions were relevant or equivalent. This was relatively easy to do for positions such as administrator, accountant, director of public works, engineering tech, administrative assistant/counter, in which 11 or more of the peer communities had these titles. It was less easy to do for combined positions where the title and job responsibilities are blended such as director of public safety, director of administrative services, administrative assistant to the administrator, and building inspector/code enforcement officer. In some cases we had to interpret the results and add or delete data for duties that have been added to these combined positions that exist in only a few limited places around the State.

Data were obtained on the salary range for each position and the current salary of the incumbent. Not all of the comparison municipalities maintain salary ranges, however and two provided us only with salaries and mid-points. All of the data of current peer communities were utilized in the following calculations. The value of a relatively large sample is that variation in municipal size, years of service for each employee, and complexity of major duties can be "averaged."

The first calculation is a determination of an average of range mid-points based upon salary range data. The average of midpoints, or middle steps in a pay range, includes the midpoints of the (1) low range, (2) high range, (3) average of complete ranges, and (4) average of actual low and high salaries. The second calculation is the average of the actual salaries currently paid. The third calculation is the average of the first and second calculations. This yields the **external mid-point**. The data in **bold** represent **85%, 100%, and 115%** respectively of the external midpoint and constitute the **working range**, which is a commonly used salary range for municipalities to use in creating logical wage grades and steps for the purposes of promotion and annual wage adjustments. The following is our listing of calculations and comments for each position in Howard's organization whether represented or non-represented, or exempt managerial under FLSA standards, or non-exempt. These positions are listed from highest to lowest according to the internal rankings assessments chart from Section II.

In general PAA comments and makes recommendations for changes to position wages that either deviate **plus or minus 10 percent or greater from the working range**, unless there are mitigating circumstances that are causing such deviations, such as disciplinary action or a probationary period for a new employee. The most common cause for a change in a position's pay grade or hourly rate is the addition or deletion of major duties assigned.

Position: Village Administrator

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	Not Applicable (Most Administrators are on fixed term contracts.)		
<u>High</u>	Not Applicable		
<u>Average Range(4)</u>	83,254	98,824	113,684
<u>Actual Average (11)</u>		101,602	
Working Range	85,181	100,213	115,245
<u>Actual Howard</u>	\$106,102 at Step 5 Current Minimum is \$92,939 and Max is \$116,017.		

Comment: The position is well situated near the working range for comparable communities both in the area and statewide.

Position: Public Works Director

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	63,800	76,559	89,556
<u>High</u>	85,949	97,669	120,133
<u>Average Range (7)</u>	72,762	86,068	99,757
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		91,967	
<u>Average of Midpoints</u>		88,066	
<u>Avg. Actual (13)</u>		91,084	
Working Range	76,139	89,575	103,011
<u>Actual Howard</u>	\$87,790 at Step 6 or Midpoint		
<u>Private Sector (9)</u>	Low (85%) -\$83,870 Midpoint (100%)-98,671 High (115%)-113.471		

Comment: Some of these positions also serve as PWD and Village Engineer and/or Senior Engineer. In the private sector, the position most similar appears to be Director of Engineering.

Position: Director of Administrative Services

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	57,522	67,674	77,825
<u>High</u>	76,580	88,945	103,380
<u>Average Range (5)</u>	63,517	75,832	88,146
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		80,451	

<u>Average of Midpoints</u>		78,226	
<u>Average Actual Wages</u>		83,828	
Working Range	68,873	81,027	93,181

Actual Howard \$88,702 at Step 10
Private Sector (21) Title: Exec. Administration-Low-74,968, MP-86,608, High-101,427

Comment: To qualify as a comparable, the other positions had to have multiple duties as well as Finance Director and Treasurer. These could be Clerk, Human Resources, Assistant Administrator, etc.

Position: Director of Public Safety

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	72,516	85,313	98,110
<u>High</u>	73,237	86,154	99,070
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	72,903	85,731	98,558
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		85,793	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		85,948	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (6)</u>		85,859	
Working Range	73,018	85,903	98,789

Actual Howard \$88,186 at Step 9

Comments: There are very few similar positions in the State of Wisconsin with which to match. Menasha designates a Director of Public Safety because the position is Chief of Police and has administrative oversight over a Fire and EMS contract with the Neenah Fire Department. Ashwaubenon is the best comparable as far as administrative duties. Allouez abolished its Director of Public Safety in 2012 after it closed down its fire operation and contracted with Green Bay. It also has had a longstanding agreement for police coverage with the Brown County Sheriff's Department. Sun Prairie's position is currently in charge of police and oversees Fire and EMS through an independent fire service that will come under City jurisdiction beginning 2014.

Position: Director of Community Development

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	62,784	70,011	77,237
<u>High</u>	76,809	87,283	107,358

<u>Average Range (7)</u>	67,335	78,922	92,173
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		83,511	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		79,932	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (6)</u>		80,636	
Working Range	68,241	80,284	92,327

Actual Howard: \$78,621 at Step 10.

Comments: Midpoint of this range is \$72,997 which is about 9% below Midpoint of the working range, so this should be studied in the future for adjustment to market rates. The position is an important one with the Village getting into housing and commercial development. It is also a position where experienced community development specialists are being actively sought by municipalities in high growth areas across the state.

Position: Director of Engineering

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	54,857	64,458	74,056
<u>High</u>	72,988	82,547	89,789
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	63,158	74,994	86,275
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		73,503	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		73,876	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (6)</u>		75,517	
Working Range	63,492	74,696	85,901
<u>Actual Howard</u>	\$73,227 at Step 5		
<u>Private Sector Comp (5)</u>	62,525	75,559	84,593

Position: Fire Captain

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	52,890	60,900	67,650
<u>High</u>	75,229	85,488	105,150
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	63,628	71,757	83,602
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		79,023	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		74,292	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (7)</u>		73,439	
Working Range	62,786	73,866	84,946

Actual Howard: \$39,936 and not part of a range.

Comments: Several communities surveyed either have little or no authority over the local fire service (Menasha, Middleton, Allouez, and Sun Prairie until 2014), or have Captains who are mostly Paid-on-Call (POC) responders or part time employees. Howard's position is becoming full-time, but the salary is still based on a POC model and it is stuck at 54% of the working range midpoint for a full time position. **It should at least be increased to entry level in the working range which is \$62,786, or pro-rated at this rate if less than 40 hours a week, once the incumbent has completed an associate's degree in fire safety from a two year institution. Until that occurs the position could be maintained at probationary status, or 80-85% of entry level (\$50,230-\$53,370).**

Position: Supervisor Parks & Forestry

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	46,814	55,075	63,336
<u>High</u>	55,422	66,506	77,591
<u>Average Range (5)</u>	53,376	62,597	73,202
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		62,203	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		61,588	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (7)</u>		64,920	
Working Range	53,766	63,254	72,742

Actual Howard \$59,081 at Step 3

Comment: The current pay and pay range is well within the working range.

Position: Building Inspector/Code Enforcement

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Average of Managers (7)</u>		71,488	
<u>Average of Union Wages (6)</u>		53,128	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (13)</u>	52,962	62,308	71,654
Working Range	52,962	62,308	71,654

Actual Howard \$63,162 at Step 10

Comment: PAA found that the 13 comparables for the Building Inspector position were almost evenly split between those that had no managerial responsibilities and were largely hourly union positions, and those that were salaried with some management responsibilities such as

supervision and budgeting. Since the Howard position falls in the middle of this range of duties, we decided to create the working range midpoint by averaging the two sets of building inspectors wage data to create a blended rate.

Position: Staff Engineer

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Actual Range MP (6)</u>		66,842	
<u>Avg. of Private Comps. (16)</u>		69,121	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (5)</u>		60,511	
Working Range	58,753	65,491	75,315

Actual Howard: \$75,502 at Step 12.

Comment: Because of a relatively small public sector sample (5) for ranges for this position, we have included the private sector range for the position title Civil Engineer for creating a valid working range. We always want at least three midpoints for the calculation. The incumbent in this position is already at the maximum of the pay range which is only \$187 a year above the **WR** maximum. However the current pay is almost 3.2% above the highest step in Grade 10 of the recommended 15 step pay plan in Section V.

Position: Accountant I

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	36,920	44,329	51,730
<u>High</u>	48,955	57,594	66,234
<u>Average Range (5)</u>	41,333	48,992	56,645
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		51,577	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		50,623	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (10)</u>		49,050	
Working Range	43,412	51,073	58,734

Actual Howard: \$53,473 at Step 9, the Midpoint is 50,303

<u>Private Sector Comp. (36)</u>	45,536	53,546	61,608
----------------------------------	--------	--------	--------

Comment: The current Howard midpoint is 1.5% under **WR**. We included the private sector median into the **WR** calculation as municipalities often compete with private companies for experienced accountants.

Position: Director of Leisure Services

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	32,885	39,499	46,093
<u>High</u>	61,806	71,714	83,621
<u>Average Range (6)</u>	58,534	67,950	78,372
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		58,253	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		59,354	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (10)</u>		52,812	
Working Range	47,671	56,083	64,495

Actual Howard: \$50,490 at Step 1 or Entry Level, the Midpoint is 60,248.

Comments: There are communities surveyed in which this position is a department head with commensurate higher salaries. Others have made this an entry level position with no supervisory or budgeting responsibilities. That is why we have averaged the actual wages by adding both sets of positions and dividing by two. This position is sometimes called Recreation Director, and may include responsibilities for programming senior citizen social and educational programs as well.

Position: GIS Coordinator

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	40,388	47,515	54,642
<u>High</u>	53,706	63,170	72,654
<u>Average Range (5)</u>	46,075	54,636	63,203
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		56,521	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		55,461	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (10)</u>		54,504	
Working Range	47,019	55,316	63,613

Actual Howard: \$71,474 at Step 12, the Midpoint is 50,303

Comments: The incumbent's wages are at the top of the Howard pay range and are above the maximum for the working range by 12.3%. The position is \$7,794 over the public sector

comparison for the maximum of the working range. **This position should have its wages red-circled (i.e. frozen), until such time as its working range is either increased by Board action, extra steps are added to the Administrative Salary matrix, or the rest of the public sector market catches up to it.**

Position: Water Operator/Foreman Water/Sewer

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Actual Range MP (low+high)</u>		53,633	
<u>Avg. of Private Comps. (16)</u>	47,752	56,179	64,606
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (9)</u>		54,817	
Working Range	46,645	54,876	63,107

Actual Howard: \$26.61 an hour or \$55,349 without overtime.

Comments: Although most union contracts treat the Water and Sewer Foreman/Water Operator position equally with the public works or streets working foreman, we believe the additional training and certificates required to take water samples twice a week adds to the value of this position, Therefore, **PAA recommends that the working range for this position be adjusted by 105% of the PWD foreman’s range if it is ever incorporated into a unified Village pay plan.** We also chose to exclude from our calculations the three peer municipalities in which the Water Operator/Foreman is actually a manager of a water processing plant and/or series of municipal wells which directly serves its residents (e.g. Fitchburg, Sun Prairie, and Town of Grand Chute), as these positions’ duties do not match with the operator in Howard.

Position: Assistant to Village Administrator/Public Information Officer

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	34,429	40,455	46,480
<u>High</u>	41,476	49,772	58,067
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	38,163	45,076	52,512
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		46,248	
<u>Average of MP’s</u>		45,388	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (6)</u>		46,984	
Working Range(MPX115%)	45,147	53,114	61,081

Actual Howard: \$44,106 at Step 3, Current Midpoint (step 6) - \$48,196

Comments: Another “blended” position that was difficult to match with precision. Many of the Executive Assistants among the peer groups were confidential secretaries or assistants to either mayors (Menasha), village presidents (Ashwaubenon) and/or administrators (DePere). However, we find that the role of Public Information officer in mid-sized communities is a growing one and with the advent of blogs, e-newsletters, Facebook accounts and other social media, it will only be more valuable to officials and citizens who will increasingly communicate with the Village through this position. We recommend that the position require a bachelor’s degree and 3-5 years’ experience in similar communication related work. **This why we are recommending Howard add 15% to the working range of this position to recognize the PIO component. This boost would result in a 10.2% increase in the current step of the incumbent or an increase to \$48,605 over a full year.**

Position: Engineering Tech

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	39,634	47,560	55,487
<u>High</u>	47,694	52,998	58,198
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	44,832	50,876	57,052
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		48,916	
<u>Average of MP’s</u>		50,088	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (8)</u>		55,359	
Working Range	44,815	52,723	60,632

Actual Howard: \$57,063 at Step 12, the Midpoint is 50,303.

Comments: We were requested by the Director of Public Works and the incumbent to research the typical requirements and working range for a Senior Engineering Tech or Engineering Tech II in case the Director of Public Works wanted to put in a request for an upgrade for the Engineering Tech in an upcoming budget. The result of this research is contained below along with comments on considerations regarding the granting of such an upgrade.

Position: Engineering Tech II

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	47,694	52,998	58,197
<u>High</u>	46,333	55,600	64,847
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	46,154	54,299	62,444
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		56,281	

<u>Average of MP's</u>		54,795	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (8)</u>		60,750	
Working Range	49,106	57,772	66,438

Actual Howard: Position does not currently exist.

Comments: Five communities that were surveyed have a position titled Engineering Tech II or Senior Engineering Tech. The common component of such a position is years of service as an engineering tech before promotion to the advanced level. The average years of service for incumbents in the peer group is 15. Only one community had a current Engineering Tech II with 10 years or less of service and the current Howard Engineering Tech is at 13+ years. Midpoint of the working range for this title is \$57,772 which is 9.45% or \$5,015 over the midpoint for Engineering Tech.

Position: Foreman Public Works Department

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		56,180	
<u>Avg. of Private Comps. (16)</u>	47,752	56,179	64,606
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (10)</u>		56,742	
Working Range	47,912	56,367	64,822

Actual Howard: \$26.61 hourly or \$55,349. Currently a union represented position.

Comment: The current pay and pay range is well within the working range and includes a private sector midpoint.

Position: Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		52,998	
<u>Private Sector (244)</u>	37,552	44,179	50,806
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (11)</u>		53,477	
Working Range	42,685	50,218	57,751

Actual Howard: Hourly rate - \$25.78 or \$53,622 annually

Comment: The current pay and pay range is well within the working range.

Position: Municipal Court Clerk

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	29,162	34,653	36,837
<u>High</u>	44,671	52,555	60,438
<u>Average Range (6)</u>	34,132	41,527	46,832
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		44,800	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		43,384	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (10)</u>		40,776	
Working Range	35,768	42,080	48,392

Actual Howard: \$18.98 an hour or \$39,478 annually. A union position.

Comment: The current union contract amount is 6.2% below the mid-point in the working range.

Position: Utility Billing Clerk

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	31,075	34,944	45,552
<u>High</u>	39,634	47,560	55,487
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	38,315	43,648	50,073
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		43,281	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		42,358	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (11)</u>		43,892	
Working Range	36,656	43,125	49,594

Actual Howard: Union at 21.67 an hour and \$45,074 annually

Comments: The Utility Billing Clerk tends to be union position. Therefore, there are few ranges for it and fewer midpoints to calculate off of. This leads us to rely more heavily on actual wages for the position which average \$43,892 in the public sector. The Howard position is currently about 3.4% above the average annual wage.

Position: Water and Sewer Laborer

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	17.64 hourly	20.20	22.76
<u>High</u>	26.63	27.02	27.41
<u>Average Range (8)</u>	21.61	23.09	24.58

<u>Actual Range MP</u>		22.53	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		23.21	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (11)</u>		23.68	
Working Range	40,475 (19.45)	47,618 (22.89)	54,761 (27.23)

Actual Howard: \$25.08 hourly and \$52,166 under union contract that expires 12/31/2013.

Private Sector Comparable: 38,525 45,323 (21.79) 52,121

Comment: The current pay and pay range is well within the working range formula which includes the median for private sector wages.

Position: Public Works Laborer

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	17.51	20.04	22.56
<u>High</u>	24.63	24.81	24.98
<u>Average Range (7)</u>	20.43	22.08	23.73
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		21.25	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		22.05	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (11)</u>		23.66 or 49,213	
Working Range	39,780 (19.43)	46,801 (22.50)	54,657 (26.28)

Actual Howard: \$25.08 hourly and \$52,166 annually. Union contract expires 12/31/13.

Private Sector Comps: Construction Worker-Low, 38,525, Mean-45,303(21.78), High-52,121

Comment: The current pay and pay range is well within the working range formula which, includes the median for private sector wages.

Position: Administrative Assistant/Receptionist

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	14.02	16.69	17.71
<u>High</u>	16.33	19.21	22.09
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	15.44	18.89	19.73
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		22.09	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		18.21	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (9)</u>		35,651/17.14	
Working Range	29,738 (15.03)	34,986(16.82)	40,234 (19.34)

Actual Howard: \$18.24 an hour and \$37,939 annually. A union position.

Private Sector (19): Low-26,711, Median-31,425 (15.11), High-36,139

Comment: The current pay and pay range is near the high end of the working range formula which, includes the median for private sector wages

Position: Administrative Assistant PWD

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Midpoint</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Low</u>	14.02	16.69	17.71
<u>High</u>	19.01	22.37	25,72
<u>Average Range (4)</u>	17.22	19.83	22.18
<u>Actual Range MP</u>		19.87	
<u>Average of MP's</u>		19.69	
<u>Avg. Actual Wages (9)</u>		40,477/19.46	
Working Range	31,983 (16.64)	37,627(18.09)	43,271(20.80)

Actual Howard: \$18.24 an hour and \$37,939 annually. A union position

Private Sector (19): Low-26,711, Median-31,425 (15.11), High-36,139

Comment: The incumbent is just above midpoint according to the working range based on comparable public sector and private sector wages for equivalent duties.

HOWARD POSITIONS COMPARED TO PRIVATE SECTOR EQUIVALENTS IN FOX VALLEY IN 2012

HOWARD POSITION	PRIVATE EQUIVALENT	# Of Firms	85% of Avg.	Median	Average Actual	115% of Avg	Comments
Accountant I	Accountant Sr.	36	45,536	53,546	53,572	61,608	
Utility Billing Clerk	Accounting Clerk	66	29,444	33,429	34,640	39,836	
Admin. Asst./Recep.	Admin. Asst. (Assoc.)	19	26,711	30,000	31,425	36,139	Requires 7+ yrs.
Admin. Asst. PWD	Admin. Asst. (Assoc.)	19	26,711	30,000	31,425	36,139	Requires 7+ yrs.
Dir. of Administration	Executive Admin.	21	74,968	86,608	88,198	101,427	Excludes Bonuses
Public Works Director	Exec. Engineering	9	83,870	86,608	98,670	113,471	Excludes Bonuses
Dir. Of Engineering	Civil Engineer	5	62,525	72,909	73,559	84,593	
Staff Engineer	Design Engineer	16	58,753	71,535	69,121	79,489	
Engineering Tech.	Design Drafter	10	41,106	47,862	48,360	55,615	Assocs. Degree
Engineering Tech. Sr.*	Design Engineer	8	68,686	83,502	80,807	92,928	BA In Eng. 6yrs.+
GIS Coordinator	Cad Operator Inmed.	16	43,763	53,170	51,486	59,209	
Foreman PWD/WS	Project Fore. Const.	189	47,752	51,418	56,179	64,606	Also Trans. Const.
Mechanic/Store Mgr	Vehicle Mechanic	244	37,552	43,680	44,179	50,806	
Laborer (PWD/WS)	Construction Worker	7	38,525	40,290	45,323	52,121	Extra \$ for CDL

****Position does not currently exist in Howard***

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality ____City of Sun Prairie__

Your Name & Title ____Brenda Sukenik, Human Resources Director

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Grade Midpoint	Years in Position
Director of Public Works	same	44.6568	92886	63799.60 - 89559.52	76559.52	22
Village Engineer	City Engineer	42.7284	88875.06	63799.60 - 89559.52	76559.52	12
Staff Engineer	Staff Engineer II	32.8876	68406.26	49105.86 - 68748.21	58927.03	12
Sr. Engineering Tech	same	31.0307	64543.96	46333.37 - 64866.71	55600.04	12
Engineering Technician	same	24.6273	51224.68	39633.71 - 55487.19	47560.45	7
GIS Coordinator	same	30.5131	63467.18	49105.86 - 68748.21	58927.03	8
Administrative Assistant-PWD	Secretary	16.61	34548.8	14.02 - 17.71	16.69	25
Water Operator/Foreman	WWTP Supervisor	33.6995	70094.86	52127.87 - 72979.02	62553.44	15
Laborer Water/Sewer	Utility Maintenance Worker	22	45760	17.64 - 22.76	21.46	11
Public Works Foreman	Maint. Worker Crewleader	23.81	49524.8	18.59 - 23.93	22.56	4
Laborer Public Works	Maintenance Worker	22.45	46696	17.51 - 22.56	21.27	10
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Fleet Technician	18.81	39124.8	18.90 - 24.37	22.98	2
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Parks, PW, Forestry Supervisor	29.5363	61435.44	55421.87 - 77590.62	66506.24	4
Village Administrator	City Administrator	51.4423	107,000	79777.52 - 111688.53	95733.02	1

Admin. Asst. to Administrator	same	26.8136	55772.34	41476.48 - 58067.07	49771.78	13
Dir. Of Admin. Services	same	40.8094	84883.44	68626.77 - 96077.47	82352.12	1
Accountant I	same	23.3366	48540.18	41476.48 - 58067.07	49771.78	11
Utility Clerk	Account Clerk	24.1445	50220.56	39633.71 - 55487.19	47560.45	14
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Secretary	17.11	35588.8	14.02 - 17.71	16.69	13
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	same	39.7894	82761.97	59411.27 - 83175.77	71293.39	23
Dir. Community Development	same	44.6093	92787.27	68626.77 - 96077.47	82352.12	1
Public Safety Director	n/a					
Fire Chief	n/a					
Fire Captain (Full-time)	n/a					
Municipal Court Clerk	same	17.11	35588.8	14.02 - 17.71	16.69	11
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Recreation Director	30.1098	62628.37	59411.27 - 83175.77	71293.39	1

SECTION IV: Employee Benefits Review Compared to Public and Private Sectors

A. Public Sector Comparison Chart (Pages 1-4)

B. Narrative Containing Summary of Benefits Survey Results and Recommendations for Future Employee Benefit Plans

C. Example of Original Peer Group Benefits Questionnaire

SECTION IV: NARRATIVE COMPARING HOWARD EMPLOYEE BENEFITS TO PEER GROUPS

Methodology and Summary:

For this portion of the study PAA sent out a questionnaire returned by the same 14 peer municipalities asking for information and data about the five insurance and six employee leave programs currently provided by the Village to see how the cost and scopes of these programs matched with Howard's. In addition, we looked at the Advance Fox Valley Private and Non-Profit Sector 2012 survey of employee benefits to see if cost savings trends can be transferred to Howard.

Howard benefits compared

Health insurance	Vacation leave
Dental plan	Vacation accrual
Vision plan	Sick leave
Term life insurance	Sick leave payout (insurance)
Short term disability insurance	Personal holidays
Long term disability insurance	Compensatory time

Most of the differences, and in some cases, innovations revealed, pertain to the way that health insurance policies are being administered and services are being provided to employee clients by the plans chosen by both sets of employers surveyed. The survey revealed that among the 14 municipalities responding there are four different types of employee coverage and some public and many more private employers are moving toward experimenting with both "high deductible" and Preferred Provider Network options to try to manage rapidly rising premium costs in the 21st Century.

On the other hand, we found only small differences among plans and less opportunity for savings with the dental, life, short term disability and income continuation plans being offered around the State. In regards to the way Howard administers its four employee leave programs (e.g. vacation, sick leave, personal days, and compensatory time), there are opportunities to stream-line administration and dramatically reduce future liability by continuing to move toward a simplified Paid Time Off (PTO) strategy in lieu of administering separate programs for each.

Medical Insurance Review

The survey of similar sized communities in metropolitan areas of Wisconsin showed that there are at least four types of employee health plans being provided by local government employers. These are:

A. Traditional Employee Choice Plans (TEC)—

This was once the standard health insurance plan which allowed the employee a complete choice of any general practitioner, clinic, specialist and hospital within a region as long as the provider agreed to pre-negotiated rates set mostly by the insurance carrier. This is the policy currently in

place in Howard through Central States Teamsters and administered by Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Illinois. Only Suamico offers a lone traditional plan although Allouez and Bellevue offer a traditional plan as one of two employee health plans offered.

B. Preferred Provider Networks (PPN)—

Under this type of plan a large clinic or medical practice teams with one or two area hospitals and signs agreements to provide employees covered by the plan services at set rates among its “Network” of providers. Employees can choose medical professionals, specialists or hospitals outside the Network, but they, not the employer, are responsible for additional fees that can range from 10-25% over usual and customary charges paid when choosing providers and hospitals inside the approved Network. Eight responders have a PPN plan as this is the most popular delivery model among the peer group.

C. Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO)—

With the HMO model, the employer and the insurance administrator provide an array of regional clinic-hospital plans (often 5-8) from which the employee may choose. Each option will have a different premium. Each HMO is a stand-alone, and employees cannot go to providers outside of it without a written referral from the HMO, nor can they change their designated HMO option except once a year. Generally, an employer pays the premium for each employee up to 100 or sometimes 105% of the lowest premium charged by the least expensive HMO within its region or service area as determined by the State of Wisconsin review commission or the village’s third party administrator. Any premiums charged by other HMOs in the plan over and above the low standard plan are the responsibility of the employee, unless the employer contributes to an employee Health Savings Account to cover such costs. Five of those surveyed offer their employees between two and eight HMO options from which to enroll once each calendar year. Sometimes each HMO will offer 2-3 options (low-medium-high service) within the HMO; each having its own premiums and out-of-pocket charges.

D. Blended Traditional & PPN or HMO Option—

Some employers now offer one traditional free choice, set premiums plan combined with one or several Preferred Provider Network or HMO options. Both the PPN and the HMOs are easier to use in conjunction with a high co-pay or high deductible plan since most traditional plans charge only one premium for all categories of service and may not offer a high deductible alternative, particularly for small municipal employers under 100 employees.

It is extremely difficult to compare these four approaches from strictly a premium charged perspective and especially hard to factor in additional employer/employee out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, prescription charges and co-pays for even basic services. That is why this report has focused its analysis of data on the more traditional, high end option offered, most equivalent to Howard’s plan and its premiums charged just to the employer and to an employee who has selected either a single plan or a family option under each program. We also have attempted to simplify the comparison of premiums by using only monthly premiums charged, listing the total to both parties, the charge to the employee, and the charge to the employer (See Benefits Comparison Chart for 14 Peer Communities on page 1 of this section).

Additions in recent years such as Employee + 1, Employee + Children, and high deductible, high co-pay premium options have further complicated “apples-to-apples” comparison in the attached chart. In the changing world of medical insurance, the private sector is the leader in also offering employees with grown children or so-called “empty nesters,” those with domestic partners (both straight and gay), and single parents with children special reduced plans that fall between the premiums charged to either single employees or those with large conventional families, which include both spouses and children.

How does Howard’s present plan specifically compare to other Public employers surveyed?

The current Howard plan is a basic, traditional plan contracted through Central States Teamsters Healthcare CS), and plan administration is through Illinois Blue Cross-Blue Shield, headquartered in Des Plaines, Illinois. The plan features complete and unrestricted employee choice of service providers such as physicians, specialists, nurse practitioners, in-home providers, and hospitals. Providers are reimbursed directly by Illinois Blue Cross-Blue Shield at actual patient costs up to pre-determined schedules of usual and customary charges. There appears to be little or no employer/employee experience rating or underwriting (unlike in some traditional plans and PPNs). Also there are no customary separate premiums (i.e. lower) for single employees or those with just a spouse (E + SP), or children (E + C). All premiums charged to both employer and employees are based on one monthly premium which is closer in price to a family premium in other peer community plans. The plan does contain additional charges to employees for medical office co-pays (\$20 each) and prescription drugs (\$25). Deductibles of \$200-\$400 are applied for some procedures or surgery. The maximum annual Out-of-Pocket paid by the employee is \$1,000 for single coverage, and up to \$2,000 for Family. The plan is also unique in that it covers through one combined premium Howard employees’ and their dependents’ annual dental costs up to \$1,500 per person each year and reimburses the Village for short term disability payments for up to \$300-350 per week to cover 25% of each employees average daily pay for periods as long as 180 days when workers compensation is not a factor.

For calendar year 2013, the total weekly premium for each of the Village’s 32 participants in the plan is a set \$309.70. This equates to a total charge of \$1,342.23 a month and an annual charge of \$16,107 per year. Each participant in the Central States health plan pays 10% of the plan’s premium which works out to about \$134 a month and \$1,609 per year through direct bi-weekly payroll deduction. The monthly and annual charge for the Village of Howard as an employer for each of its 32 participants (four employees have opted out in 2013) is currently \$1,207.83 per month and \$14,494. This means the Village’s yearly share of the costs for health insurance, dental insurance and limited short term employee disability supplement is about \$463,808.

The average monthly and annual dental premiums that are rolled into Howard’s plan, but that are paid by the 13 municipal employers in addition to health premiums, amount to an additional average of \$601 single and \$1,225 family annually.

Chart VI-1

Comparison	Family Premium	Single Premium	Annual Premium	Employer's Share	Employ. +1 Prem.	High Ded-High Co.	Offer 2 or > Plans
Village of Howard	\$1,342 per month	\$1,342 per month	\$16,107	\$14,494	No	No	Only 1 Traditional
14 Peer Responders	\$1,417 per month	\$557 per month	\$6,688(\$)/\$17,001	\$5,623(\$)/14,658	4 offer \$887 mth.	8 of 13 Offer	7 offer 2-8 Plans

The closest comparable plan to Howard’s in the PAA survey belonged to the Village of Suamico which has nearly identical coverage through a contract with the Teamsters Central States plan administered by Illinois Blue Cross-Blue Shield. The only apparent difference is that Suamico’s plan provides \$40,000 dollars of life insurance coverage for each employee and the Village’s share is included in the health insurance premium, whereas Howard is receiving only \$20,000 of term insurance and is paying additional extra premiums through the State of Wisconsin’s Employee Trust Fund for coverage equal to one times each employee’s annual wages or salary. The Suamico monthly premium is also slightly (-3.8%) lower at \$1,290 per month for each employee or \$15,840 per year. Suamico’s responsibility is \$1,161 per participant and \$13,932 annually.

The Howard-Central States (CS) Plan premiums and employee costs can be compared to the mean or average of the 12 (of 14) responding peer communities who offer a “traditional” option wherein the employer still pays 80-90% of the premium (the average employee contribution is 11.73%) and the employee has relatively low annual copays and deductibles under the plans coverage (\$750+Single per year and \$1,500+Family). For those comparable plans, the average monthly premium for a single employee is \$557.31 or \$6,688 annually. The total premium for employees with a family plan was \$1,416.69 or \$17,000 annual, a little less than \$900 more than Howard’s unified premiums which of course, include dental and partial short term disability coverage.

Private Sector Comparisons for Coverage and Costs

PAA also has provided a sheet (Please see chart on the next page) summarizing some of the most common features and costs connected to employee health insurance benefits provided to both hourly and salaried employees in the private sector. These numbers come directly from the Private Sector and Non-Profit organizations and companies in the Fox Valley survey conducted by Advance and the Brown County Chamber of Commerce in 2012. Some features and options now provided employees are applicable to Howard’s plan, both now and in the future.

Chart VI-2

Column1	% Offer Health In.	% Pay 60% > Cost	Pay 80-100%	Avg. Single Prem	Avg. Fam. Prem.
300 Private Firms	98%	74%	39%	\$300-700 MTh.	\$1.100 > month
	% High Ded/Copay	Emp. Out-of-Pock.	H.S.A/HRA	Employer Contrib. to H.S.A./HRA	
127 Private Firms	63.50%	\$3,000 (S)/5,000 (F)	55.10%	\$1000 to \$3,000	

For example in 2012 over 300 firms responded to the Health Care section questions, and 98 % offered some level of paid health insurance to hourly workers, and salaried workers. Of those responding over 74% reported that they not only provided comprehensive medical plans for hourly employees, but they also paid at least 60% of the premium for each participant. Additionally, 38.6% of employers paid 80-100% or more of the premiums for single health plans for hourly employees and 33.6% paid 80-100 percent for family premiums. For salaried employees the results were similar, but slightly higher at 75% at 60% premium level or above and 39% of single plans were paid at 80-100% by employer. Family plans were paid at this level by 34% of the 211 companies/organizations responding.

A comparative statistic regarding employer payments of premiums can be seen by the monthly premiums paid by the majority of Fox Valley firms surveyed. Most employers (53.6%) paid in the range of \$300-500 monthly towards a single plan, and 26.8% paid \$500-700, making a total of nearly 81% in these two categories for both hourly and salaried employees. In the area of family plans, both the percentage of employers offering coverage and the monthly premiums rose considerably. Over 97% of those contributing to an employee plan either paid \$900-1099 per month (21.1 %) or \$1,100 and above (76.5%). The current Howard employer premium cost is \$1,208 a month and the public per group average for family plan was \$1,222 a month.

PAA was equally interested in finding whether private sector firms were offering more cutting-edge and cost-efficient options than their public sector counterparts. The survey indicates that the trend of offering at least one High Deductible/High Co-Pay (HDHC) option with subsequent lower premiums for employees combined with either a subsidized Health Savings Account or a Health Reimbursement Account, has taken hold first in the private sector in the Valley. For example, of 127 firms or organizations responding, 63.5% said they do have the HDHC option, while 36.2% do not offer it. Of the approximately 81 firms who offer exclusively or give that option to their employees, 43.3% combine it with a Health Savings Account (H.S.A.) to which the average firm added at its expense at least \$1,000-2,000 a year to match employees' tax free contributions. Both employer and employee annual contributions can be used to pay down employee's annual out-of-pocket charges which averaged about \$2,119 (S) to \$3,993 (F) in our public sector survey. Another 11.8% of firms couple the HDHC option with contributions of \$1,000 to \$3,000 to a Health Reimbursement Account (HRA) to offset future employee premiums for private or company health insurance coverage. 70.6% of those firms make an employer contribution annually. The primary difference between an H.S.A. and the H.R.A. is that the

former is portable and funds not used by the employee in the account can then be taken with them when they go to a new employer or retire. They usually are controlled by the employee and a third party, independent investment company or bank. The HRA funds are generally controlled by the employer and can only be accessed for paying employee out-of-pocket health or dental costs while the employee is employed by the same organization.

Recommendations on Successor Village Health Insurance Plan

The current Howard-Teamsters Central States Plan ends when both Howard Teamsters' contracts expire on either January 14, 2014 or March 28, 2014, depending on the status of re-certification of the two Village bargaining units. Administrator Evert and Director of Administrative Services Haltom have expressed an interest in pursuing at least one traditional employee choice option to replace it based on perceived advantages. A few private health care companies do offer these plans at higher premiums, as well as the Wisconsin Education Association (WEAC or Public Teachers Union), and of course there is always renewal with the Teamsters Central States (CS) Plan.

PAA recognizes the following advantages of a traditional, one premium plan. It includes not only comprehensive medical insurance for all Village employees at a currently reasonable rate not based on prior claims history, which has been known to fluctuate greatly for small employers (100 or fewer). The CS plan also permits Howard employees freedom of choice in selecting and changing medical providers, a rarity in modern times that appeals to most employees and their families. The Central States plan also provides a competitive dental plan for all employees within the health insurance plan rate structure, whereas other plans most likely will not. **Switching plans could add \$601 a year in premiums average for single employee dental plans, and \$1,357 for ones with families** based on the average for peer communities surveyed. **The current CS plan provides the Village reimbursement for up to \$8,600 per injured or ill employee for short term disability cases.** This is a valuable add-on that reduces Village costs for non-work related charges through its own self-funded plan. However, it should be pointed out that half of the 14 external peers do not choose to provide such disability coverage for employees.

The disadvantages of the current Teamsters-Blue Cross-Blue Shield contract mostly center on the one-size fits all monthly premium of \$1,342 charged against each Howard participant. The public sector survey shows that most peers spend about 1/3 the cost of family premiums for those single employees they insure. *It is believed that Howard currently has two single employees for whom plans with a single option might save on average about \$10,000 per year (or \$20,000 total) combined for the employer and the employee.* In addition, the current plan does not offer an Employee + 1, or an Employee + children premium option. The premiums for these plans appear to come in at an average of 65-70% the cost of a full family premium in the four peer communities that have negotiated such plans. In the private sector, employers have found the E + 1 option typically comes in at \$2,400-3,000 a year below their family premiums. It is not currently known how many Howard employees would opt for the E + 1 type of coverage if available. However Chris Haltom estimates that perhaps 5 employees might be interested in such an option, and *PAA estimates that including such in a future traditional plan could save the Village \$23,000 annually in premiums (Based on 68% X's \$14,494 CS full premium cost X's 5 employees).*

Another cost consideration for a future Howard plan is if a bidder(s) would be interested in offering a traditional plan option that can be coupled with the generally lower priced (for both employee and

employer) High Deductible/High Co-Pay plan option that is popular with the majority of private sector firms in the area. This could be an HMO, PPN, or a Traditional health plan which contains this option.

PAA recommends that Howard actively rebid its employee health insurance contract this fall, prior to either expiration dates of the current agreement among a variety of plan providers in the greater Fox Valley to find the most cost-effective combination of options available. The biggest concern about the marketing of Howard's plan is the size and diversity of its employee census. Employers under 50 will be required to offer certain plan features by 2016 under the Federal Affordable Health Care Act, and already the scope of services and coverage offered in all plans is changing dramatically with the new landscape created by the Act. However, the good news is that Howard's plan already surpasses most if not all federal requirements for services offered and funding. It is assumed that any successor plans will be in compliance with all new federal requirements.

Among the 12 responders in the public survey who do not participate in the State ETF-HMO plan, the average employee premium paid for their traditional or high end plans is 11.75%. The highest percentage currently paid by employees is 20%, with several communities charging 15% of premiums. Most of these also provide a much lower premium (0-5%) for employees who voluntarily choose a High Deductible/High Co-Pay plan with caps on the employee's annual Out-of-Pocket expenses. PAA recommends that a new plan, if it is indeed going to have a Traditional option with unlimited choice of providers, require an employee premium of 15-20% to allow Howard to offer lower premium options and still meet the overall goal of requiring 12% plus employee contributions to all plan premiums, since with the advent of Wisconsin Act 10, this percentage seems to be the new norm in the public sector.

With these caveats in mind, Village staff soon should begin drafting health insurance bidding specifications and soliciting bids for the following types of plans and options:

- 1.) A Plan or Plans from each of four types HMO, Traditional Third Party Administrator, PPN, or combinations thereof (a Blended Plan with 1 Traditional Insurance Option).**
- 2.) High Deductible/High Co-pay, with lower premiums for employees who choose such as an option (See Below).**
- 3.) A Health Savings Account option tied to Item 2.), under which employees can add their own contribution through payroll deduction and accounts invested by a third party administrator (Note: Green Bay Area Banks have started offering these plans). Another option to encourage these types of plans is to have the Village contribute up to half of each employee's H.S.A on a bi-weekly match up to 100% as long as the employee stays with the program and the HD/HC health option.**
- 4.) Negotiate with plan administrators to add Employee + Spouse and/or Employee + Children components at lower premiums than typical Family coverage.**
- 5.) Provide Single Employee coverage plans at reduced premiums.**
- 6.) Under HMO(s), consider 2-3 plans with multiple options under each, in which the Employer pays for only 100-110 % of the lowest HMO option with the employee picking up any premium exceeding the lowest acceptable one.**

Another consideration regarding the offering of continued municipal plan insurance to retirees, is that the Village may wish to discontinue this practice once the existing union contracts expires and the Federal Affordable Health Care Act (Obama care) takes full effect in October 2014. The current Central States plan allows employees with 10 years or more of Village experience to remain in the plan after they retire. The Village has encouraged this for union members only by allowing them to convert unused sick leave pay-outs at retirement into premiums. We understand that there are 5-6 former Howard employees enrolled in the plan now. Presently, seven peer communities (50%) have similar language that allows employees to stay indefinitely on village plans after final separation. Unfortunately, this is both an unfunded liability to the municipalities and a future negative in encouraging providers to bid competitively on the villages' plans because of potential rising claims by older, retired workers. The liability issue is more pressing because in 2013 the Wisconsin legislature passed a law requiring all public employers to "pre-fund" the value of any long term municipal contributions to retiree's health insurance programs in current year budgets, by setting aside reserve funds as determined by independent actuaries hired and paid by the municipality.

PAA's recommendation would be to exclude retirees entirely from participation in any future employee health care plans, and instead, steer them towards the new federal health insurance exchange policies that will be available through the private sector this fall. Any prior or future accrued vacation or Paid Time Off pay owed can be then used by the individual to pay directly for private plan coverage, thus relieving the municipality of all future liability.

Analysis of Other Howard Insurance Benefits

The Howard Dental Insurance Plan is difficult to compare from a price standpoint because usage is not reported by Central States, and premiums for the service are buried in those of the Health Insurance plan. On the surface, it seems to be a good deal for both the employer and the employee. The employee has the choice of any area dentist and specialist. The annual maximum for any one participant in the family for appliances such as inserts, cavity fillings, or crowns is \$1,500, which is \$175 higher than the public survey's average of \$1,325. In addition there is no co-pay to the patient for routine exams or fillings. Similar plans charge premiums of \$55.53 per single and \$113.13 for family per month. The study shows that eight peer municipalities charge their employees an average of 10.3% of the premium. However, five of the peers have no charge to employees just like Howard's. The most common administrator of public dental plans is Delta Dental (9 of 14 responding).

A scan of the Private sector community shows that, while nearly 94% of employers offer a dental plan for both hourly and salaried employees, those that contribute towards premiums most often pay only 40 percent of the premiums, leaving the employee to pay 60% themselves. This is a major difference between the two sectors.

All 14 of the public organizations surveyed provided some sort of term life insurance to fulltime employees. Just as Howard does, 10 of the other 14 purchase one times an employee's annual wages from the State ETF endorsed carrier, Minnesota Mutual Life. Employees then may elect to purchase up to four times additional salary at their own expense. Since the State plan is quite reasonable in its premiums per thousand dollars of insurance coverage, and a large majority of Howard employees

voluntarily add extra coverage according to their personal situations, **PAA recommends not extending the current extra life insurance through any successor health insurance program.**

Any vision insurance is generally rolled into each Health Insurance plan, or offered at 100% charged to the employee.

Analysis of Howard Vacation, Sick Leave, Personal Days, Holidays, and Compensatory Time Policies

Based on the survey of similar leave policies in place in the 14 other peer communities listed in the summary chart on page 1-4 of this section, Howard is in the main stream of its peer group, well within the average in granting all of the above items. The only exception is in regards to Sick Leave policy; where in 2011 the Board authorized administration to gradually replace the prior one, which is based on a typical full-time employee earning 8 hours or one day a month and accumulating up to 96 hours a year in either used or unused leave time. One set of Union employees are still under the old sick live provisions until December 31, 2013, and a limited number will receive final payout for accrued, but unused sick time upon retirement. The new Paid Time Off (PTO) approach regarding sick days has changed to six days or 48 hours a year, which the employee can use for any purpose without having to provide written medical excuses if challenged. However, compared to recent movements in the Fox Valley employer group as measured in the Advance Benefit and Wage survey of last year, Howard has only taken a small and measured step towards a complete conversion of all major leave to a Paid Time OFF system (PTO). The Advance study confirms that with 136 Employers responding, 61.5% or 84 had implemented some sort of Paid Time Off system replacing one or more of their former stand-alone leave systems. When asked how many of the 84 included which of the major categories in the PTO Bank for each hourly or salaried employees, the responses by percentage were:

Chart VI-3

	<u>Vacation</u>	<u>Sick Days</u>	<u>Paid Holidays</u>	<u>Personal Days</u>
<i>% Hourly Employees</i>	91.5	68.3	40.2	70.7
<i>% Salaried Employees</i>	91.4	72.8	40.7	69.1

The arguments for a consolidated PTO structure are as follows:

*A Paid-Time-Off policy eliminates keeping four separate books and often conflicting levels of accrued leave and subsequent short and long term carry-over. This relieves administrative staff and pay-roll from

significant oversight duties and regulation of employee usage and, perhaps violations of leave benefits resulting in employee discipline.

*Most private and public employers have reduced total leave time available while they have done this consolidation. This may reduce frivolous use of leave time and increase general employee productivity.

*A move to PTO is often coupled with a reduction in long term accrued liability for unused sick leave and vacation which must be carried on the books for years until the employee randomly retires or voluntarily terminates his or her employment. Studies have shown that employees use only about 50% of leave time annually when they believe they can be paid out for the balance at the end of their tenure. It is not unusual in some communities to have employees receiving lump sum payouts equal to or exceeding their final annual salary from these accounts that are often under or unfunded by the public employer.

While the survey shows that the private and non-profit sector has trended towards a PTO system for such employee benefits as vacation time, sick days and personal days, it also shows a very low number which have included paid seasonal holidays in their PTO policies. The reason for this might be that most firms, as well as public employers, would prefer to have the majority of their employees take holidays off on the day that they occur on the calendar because less business is conducted on those days anyway. This argument does not pertain to Floating or unrestricted Holiday time, which could be considered for inclusion in a PTO plan.

Of the 14 public sector entities PAA surveyed, only Bellevue has gone further than Howard, by rolling Vacation, Sick Days, and Personal Days into one generic PTO plan, with no delineation. (Please see the note on Bellevue's schedule at the bottom of this page). Suamico has reduced its former 12 sick days a year into five "Casual Days" that can be used as an employee chooses in addition to vacation days and 2 personal days. Village of Weston has Board approval to go to a PTO system in January of 2014, but the plan and schedule have not been determined to date.

PAA Recommendations on Paid Time Off Policy

With the expiration of both current union agreements on December 31, 2013, it is a favorable time to review the advantages of incorporating vacation, personal and any floating holidays into a unified PTO allocation combined with the current six annual days already provided in lieu of sick time to non-represented staff. Under Act 10, employee leave time is no longer a negotiable item even if a union is re-certified.

PAA would recommend that Howard Administration review the attached Bellevue policy (see Appendix A) as a model for how such a plan might be structured and the employee policies governing it. Bellevue's schedule grants an employee between 13-33 days of PTO a year from start of employment up to 30 years plus service to the organization. It covers every type of time off, except paid seasonal holidays (8).

Bellevue also has granted employees with 3 years or more service varying amounts of prior accrued vacation and sick leave carryover to "smooth out" the transition period to a policy where very limited PTO time can be carried over from year to year, or accumulated for a long term pay-out. This phased carry-over may be applied to off-set loss of full pay during periods of short term disability. PAA's recommendation is that since PTO can be used for any purpose with advance

notice to the employee's supervisor, there should not be a need for PTO carry over or long term accumulation in excess of 5 days or 40 hours a calendar year, except for specifically defined use, such as the previously mentioned short term disability pay.

SECTION V: SALARY GRADE AND RANGE RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Grade Allocations for Each Current Position Title

B. Howard Wage Matrix Options

**C. Chart V-1 Present 2013 Village Administrative Salary Pay
Plan and Current Teamsters 662 Contract Pay Schedules (2)**

**D. Chart V-2 Proposed 14 Grade-15 Step Pay Compensation
Matrix Based on External Working Ranges**

**E. Chart V-3 Examples of Several Positions in a 30 Step Pay
Matrix Configuration**

SECTION V: SALARY GRADE AND RANGE RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>Position</u>	<u>Internal points</u>	<u>External average range</u>	<u>Recommended range</u>
<u>Grade 14</u>			
Administrator	670	(Not App.-Mostly Contract)	85,181-100,213-115,245
<u>Grade 13</u>			
Dir. Public Works	615	72,762 -86,068-99,757	76,139 -89,575-103,011
Dir. Public Safety	605	72,903 -85,731-98,558	73,018-85,903 -98,789
<u>Grade 12</u>			
Dir. Admin Services	595	63,517 -75,832-88,146	68,873-81,027 -93,181
Dir. Community Dev.	555	67,335 -78,922-92,173	68,241-80,284 -92,327
<u>Grade 11</u>			
Dir. Engineering	535	63,158 -74,994-86,275	63,492-74,696-85,901
Fire Captain	520	63,628 -71,757-83,602	62,786-73,866 -84,946
<u>Grade 10</u>			
Super. Parks & For.	460	53,376-62,597 -73,202	53,766-63,254-72,742
Building Insp. /Code	455	52,962 -62,308-71,654	52,962-62,308-71,654
Staff Engineer	440		58,753-65,491-75,315
<u>Grade 9</u>			
		(Reserved for Future Position Development)	
<u>Grade 8</u>			
Accountant I	425	41,333-48,992 -56,645	43,412-51,073-58,734
Dir. Leisure Serv.	420	58,534-67,950 -78,372	47,671-56,083-64,495
GIS Coordinator	400	46,075-54,636 -63,203	47,019-55,316-63,613
Engineer. Tech. II*	400*	46,154-54,299 -62,444	49,106-57,772 -66,438
<u>Grade 7</u>			
WS Fore. /Water Op.	395	47,752-56,179 -64,606	46,645-54,876 -63,107
Admin. Asst. /PIO	385	38,163-45,076 -52,512	45,147-53,114-61,081
Engineering Tech.	365	44,832-50,876 -57,052	44,815-52,723-60,632
PWD Foreman	350	47,752-56,179 -64,606	47,912-56,367-64,822

***Position does not currently exist and ranked score is merely an estimate.**

Grade 6

Mechanic/Stock 325 42,685-50,218 -57,751

Grade 5

(Reserved for Future Position Development)

Grade 4

Water/Sew. Laborer 245 21.60-23.09-24.58 40,475(19.45)-47,618 (22.89)
54,761 (27.23)

PWD Laborer 235 20.43-22.08-23.73 39,780(19.43)-46,801(22.50)-54,657 (26.28)

Grade 3

Municipal Court Clk. 255 34,132-41,527 -46,832 35,768-42,080-48,392

Utility Billing Clk. 250 38,315-43,648 -50,073 36,656-43,125-49,594

Grade

2 _____ Ad

min. Asst. Recep. 205 15.44-18.89-19.73 29,738 (15.03)-34,986(16.82)-40,234(19.34)

Admin. Asst. PWD 205 17.22-19.83-22.18 31,983 (16.64)-37,627(18.09)-43,271(20.80)

Grade 1

(Reserved for Seasonal, Interns or Custodial)

Howard Wage Compensation Matrix Options

PAA bases its proposed updated Howard Wage Compensation Pay Schedule (Matrix) options on several principles:

1. That they incorporate, as closely as possible, the Working Ranges we have designed for each of the Village's current 24 positions from external surveys.
2. That they reflect the internal point rankings of positions based on major duties and the ten scored factors in the individual position reviews that were conducted earlier. (However, should there arise a conflict between internal and external comparables, PAA will give a higher weight to the external Working Range in placing positions in matrix grades. This occurred twice in this Study where positions with lower internal scores were placed in higher grades than those with higher internal rankings).
3. That they anticipate the future integration of currently represented positions should unions fail to recertify after January of 2014.

Other factors regarding a final adopted pay plan can vary according to local preferences. For example, the number of steps in each grade or range may be contingent on whether the Board and Administration desire to implement one of the Pay-for-Performance options offered in Section 6, or prefer to maintain a more traditional plan, whereby individuals advance one step per annum, assuming there are no disciplinary actions pending against the incumbent. In other words, almost automatic annual advancement of one step each year until the maximum step in each range is reached, at which time the individual usually gets only a cost of living increase if granted all employees in the plan.

Three charts giving examples of different step options follow this narrative. Chart V-1 in blue and white is the current Howard 2013 Administrative Salary Schedule. It represents a plan where each non-represented position (except that of Fire Captain) has its own 12-step progression. There are no grades listed in this chart, and it is unclear whether employees can move vertically between grades based on changes in assigned duties. The current Howard plan covers 15 positions, all of them non-represented.

Chart V-2 Following is a formal 14 Grade pay plan model that PAA has created based on actual Howard internal point spreads and proposed new Working Ranges created by the consultant. Each grade has 15 individual steps beginning with Minimum, or entry level, Step 8 or Midpoint and running through Maximum, or Step 15. Several grades feature multiple positions based on similar internal point scoring (See rankings in Chart in Section III). Three grades (Numbers 9, 4, and 1) have been left open to allow for future positions and working ranges to be created when and if Village expansion takes place. The primary reason this 15 step plan is proposed for a more traditional matrix is:

1. Each Step constitutes approximately a two percent increase or lift over the prior year based on the 30% overall range between the Minimum and Maximum wages used in creating each position's working range.
2. By proposing a plan with actual grades, Howard is given the option of Reclassifying individuals and positions to allow vertical movement, either up or down, as position duties are periodically reassigned in your changing organization.

3. The V-2 plan incorporates nine positions that are currently represented by union contracts based on hourly wages per year with no future grades or steps.

Chart V-3 is a 30 Step and 14 Grade Pay Plan which provides a 1 percent increase per step based on the same 30 percent Working Range. PAA has given examples of the step differentials for only three of the 11 active grades in V-2, to illustrate the step differential for positions in Grades 2, 8, and 13. This type of Pay Plan might be applicable if the Board desires a Pay-for-Performance Plan with increases built into an employee's base. There is more discussion on the pros and cons of this model in Section VI.

Another possibility for creating a more flexible working Pay Compensation Matrix would be to utilize just the Working Range for each position (currently 24) and allow employees' wages to be set annually at any rate, as long as each one stayed in the range of **Minimum** and **Maximum** limits set in each annual budget. The template for creating Working Ranges by position would be the Summary of Employee Working Ranges listed in Section III of this report as amended annually. This type of Matrix would give Administration flexibility in implementing pay-for-performance or incentive-based compensation plan as discussed in Section VI, and create opportunities to compete for talented/experienced employees from either private or public sector labor markets.

CHART V-2

Grades and Salary Ranges: 15 Step Model *(Each Step = 2% Lift)*

Grade	Internal Range	Minimum	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Midpoint	Step 9	Step 10	Step 11	Step 12	Step 13	Step 14	Max
14	650-700	85,181	86,884	88,622	90,395	92,203	94,047	95,928	100,213	102,217	104	106,347	108,474	110,643	112,856	115,245
13	600-650	74,052	75,563	77,105	78,679	80,285	81,923	83,595	85,301	87,007	88,747	90,522	92,332	94,179	96,063	97,984
12	550-600	68,241	71,119	72,570	74,051	75,563	77,104	78,678	80,284	81,890	83,527	85,198	86,902	88,640	90,413	92,327
11	500-550	64,846	66,168	67,519	68,897	70,303	71,738	73,202	74,696	76,190	77,714	79,268	80,853	82,470	84,120	85,901
10	440-500	55,285	56,414	57,565	58,740	59,939	61,162	62,410	63,684	64,958	66,257	67,582	68,934	70,312	71,719	73,153
9			Reserved for Future Position Development													
8	400-450	47,800	48,775	49,771	50,787	51,823	52,881	53,960	55,061	56,162	57,285	58,431	59,600	60,792	62,008	63,248
7	350-395	47,113	48,075	49,055	50,057	51,078	52,121	53,185	54,270	55,355	56,463	57,592	58,744	59,918	61,117	62,339
6	300-350	43,596	44,485	45,393	46,319	47,265	48,229	49,214	50,218	51,222	52,246	53,291	54,357	55,444	56,553	57,684
			Reserved for Future Position Development													
4	220-250	39,780	40,576	41,387	42,215	43,059	43,920	44,799	46,801	48,570	49,542	50,533	51,543	52,574	53,626	54,698
3	250-300	36,656	37,740	38,510	39,296	40,098	40,916	41,751	42,603	43,455	44,324	45,211	46,115	47,037	47,978	48,937
2	190-220	31,519	32,162	32,819	33,488	34,172	34,869	35,580	36,307	37,033	37,774	38,529	39,300	40,086	40,888	41,705
1	0-189		Reserved for Seasonal, Interns or Custodial													

CHART V-3

Grades and Salary Ranges: 30 Step Model *Note: Grades and Steps Are Inverted from Chart Above* A Step = 1%
Selected Grades Are Illustrative of How Steps Would Appear for All

	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Grade 13	Grade 14
Minimum		31,204						47,322					73,311	
2		31,519						47,800					74,052	
3		31,840						48,287					74,807	
4		32,162						48,775					75,563	
5		32,490						49,273					76,334	
6		32,819						49,771					77,105	
7		33,153						50,279					77,892	
8		33,488						50,787					78,679	
9		33,830						51,305					79,482	
10		34,172						51,823					80,285	
11		34,520						52,352					81,104	
12		34,869						52,881					81,923	
13		35,224						53,420					82,759	
14		35,580						53,960					83,595	
15		35,944						54,510					84,448	
Midpoint		36,307						55,061					85,301	
17		36,663						55,600					86,137	
18		37,033						56,162					87,007	
19		37,396						56,712					87,860	
20		37,774						57,285					88,747	
21		38,144						57,847					89,617	
22		38,529						58,431					90,522	
23		38,514						59,004					91,409	
24		39,300						59,600					92,332	
25		39,685						60,184					93,237	
26		40,086						60,792					94,179	
27		40,479						61,388					95,102	
28		40,888						62,008					96,063	
29		41,288						62,616					97,004	
Maximum		41,705						63,248					97,984	

SECTION VI: Pay-For-Performance and Other Incentive Based Compensation Plans

A. General Discussion on Considerations Regarding Pay Compensation Plans and Performance-Based Evaluations

B. Employee Interview Responses to Merit Pay Based & Annual Evaluations

C. Options I-A and IB Variations on a Pay-For-Performance Model

D. Option 2 – An Experience Based Progression Model

E. Other Incentive Based Compensation Plans

- 1. Group Gain-Sharing**
- 2. Skill-Based Pay**

SECTION VI: Pay-For-Performance and Other Incentive Based Compensation Plans

In the human resources field, there is little disagreement about the first three purposes of an employee annual or semi-annual appraisal: professional development, recognition of superior performance, and documentation of unacceptable performance. It is the fourth purpose, commonly known as “Pay-for-Performance,” that stirs debate.

In order to deal with the issue of “Pay-for-Performance,” or some other incentive based employee pay plans, we need to begin by asking the following question: What is the relationship between monetary compensation in the public sector workplace and performance? The research in both the public and private sector tells us several things.

1. Higher rates of initial compensation and pay increases make it easier to attract and retain more productive (some use the term “hard working”) employees.
2. A clear relationship between high compensation and increased performance exists in situations where there is an objective link between performance and compensation such as in pay for items produced (piece work), commissions based on sales (automobiles or appliances), or pay linked to meeting objective goals (i.e., catching five or more passes in each of ten football games during a season). There is no valid and reliable evidence of a relationship between higher compensation and increased performance for work of a less measurable nature.
3. Employees consistently receiving below average or poor evaluations and no or fewer pay increases may look for work elsewhere, thus improving organizational productivity; however, this is based more on assumptions of economic rationality and less on empirical evidence.

Organizations, in using strictly pay-for-performance, usually assume that merit pay motivates employees to be more productive. In actual practice, merit pay may recognize superior performance, but it will not create this performance. The implications of these research findings in the development of a modern pay compensation plan are:

1. If the objective of the plan is to reward superior performance and weed out sub-performing employees, then a merit pay plan should be considered, but
2. If the objective of the plan is to motivate all employees to be more productive, then a merit plan may make no appreciable difference with those who receive the bonus, and may create bad morale among those who usually do not receive one.

This brings us to a second question: If pay-for-performance recognizes but does not improve employee performance, what then can be done to improve it? Again, the research tells us several things.

1. Giving employees a very clear idea of what is expected of them in their job is the primary factor in improved employee performance. This includes both simply letting employees know what they are supposed to do and setting standards of performance by which they will be judged.

2. Providing professional development opportunities to enhance job skills and increase employee capabilities is an important element in improved employee performance.
3. Providing each employee with a clear pathway for his or her long-term career advancement within the organization and encouraging them to apply for advancement can also assist in retention and job satisfaction.
4. Being part of a group in which there is a sense of collective purpose and internal goal setting/attainment can also be a powerful motivator.
5. Recognition by the supervisor, department head and Village officials, genuinely given, for superior performance can sustain this performance, although it is not likely to increase it.

Employee Observations on Merit Based Plans

As part of this study, all represented and non-represented employees were interviewed. In addition to information about the tasks they performed, employees were asked about whether they preferred to work under a pay-for-performance (PFP) or traditional plan with across the board annual pay akin to percentage cost-of-living (COLA) adjustments. They were also questioned as to who should do their annual personnel evaluation which might lead to a pay-for-performance or merit payment.

The interesting set of responses showed a mixed view on PFP plans. 16 current Howard employees felt they would be better off with a pay increase based in-part on their own job productivity. 13 employees were in favor of current across the board increases. Six employees either felt there were advantages to both approaches or had no strong opinions. Two of the six stated their fears that merit pay for some would increase workplace discord and jealousy among peers. Of the 16 favoring a strong merit component, 10 were currently members of a bargaining unit, and only six favoring were exempt or non-represented.

The question was also asked as to who should do the employee's evaluation among the choices of an immediate supervisor, the department head, and central administration. Responses varied almost evenly among the 36 employees interviewed. 11 favored being evaluated by his or her immediate supervisor, "who knows best what I do on a day-to-day schedule." Another 12 were more comfortable with the department head "who has a broader view of all employees in the department." Ten of the employees, many of whom were department heads, preferred that the Village administrator or central administration do the evaluation. Three had no opinion.

As Frederick Herzberg points out, money is an extrinsic factor in job performance. As long as employees believe that they are fairly compensated, and compensation is based on equitable standards of external equity, internal horizontal equity (equal pay for equivalent work), and internal vertical equity (pay proportionate to job responsibility), money will not affect performance. However, if they believe that equity standards are not being met, then there may be an adverse effect on performance, based on the "Law of Unintended Consequences." Employees, who believe their performance is not being properly recognized, may no longer make the extra effort to serve the residents of the Village.

Recommendations

Two options for determining incentive based salary increases are proposed in this section. The first option utilizes a performance appraisal as the basis for determining step movement is “pay-for-performance” as requested in the Howard Request for Proposals. PAA has divided Option I into two sub-proposals (I-A and I-B) with the major difference being primarily whether the pay increase is built into the ongoing wage base for the employee or given out as a one time, lump sum payment that is “non-recurring.” The second option is what can be termed a “loosely linked” performance appraisal and salary determination.

Later in the Section two other models of Incentive-Based compensation awards are discussed. These are “Group Gain-Sharing,” and “Skill Based Pay.”

2 Performance Based Pay Models

Both plans detailed below are based on a standardized appraisal of job performance. They require an evaluation process that meets the following standards: 1.) relatively objective and uniform appraisal criteria with numerical consistency, 2.) comprehensive standards of evidence (measurement), (3) systematic observation of performance, and 4.) supervisors well trained in performance appraisal. One of the main essentials in a good performance evaluation process is to have agreement on what duties of each employee are subject to “measurement,” and how each is to be “valued.” Then one must assign a numerical value to how well each task is performed over a year period, in order to assign an overall score to the performance in order to compare to those of others in the organization.

A model of such a uniform and numerically weighted performance evaluation instrument is attached in Appendix B of this study. This performance evaluation model uses a 50 maximum point scale for assessing any Village employee’s performance and there are five categories of performance. Satisfactory (or Average) performance would be scored at 21 points minimum to qualify.

Option 1

In both sub-options, employee performance would be rated as either (E) Excellent (41-50), (A) Above Average (31-40), (S) Satisfactory (21-30), (B) Below Average (11-20), and (N) Needs Considerable Improvement (10 or under). Employee performance would be rated as falling into one of the five categories based on an annual employee score from an objective performance evaluation. Only employees receiving Excellent, Above Average or Satisfactory scores would receive annual merit pay. Those receiving Below Average or Needs Considerable Improvement would receive no pay increases or only minimal cost-of living increases as approved for all employees, until their future evaluations rise to the top three categories.

Option 1-A

Under this sub-option the Board would authorize a pool of funds available for one time only, lump sum performance options based on prior year performance evaluations. Total funds available for these bonuses are usually based on a figure such as 1 to 5 percent of prior year total employee payroll for the group eligible for the awards. Bonuses can be given out by the Village Administrator upon recommendation of either the HR Director (Director of Administrative Services) or the Department Heads. The Administrator would directly evaluate and score all Directors himself. An example of how this process might work for calendar year 2014 is as follows:

Village Board approves November 2013 a Merit Pay Pool of 3% of 2013 payroll of \$2,500,000 = \$75,000

Administration submits a plan that will provide the following lump sum payments to the following categories of performance based on actual 2013 evaluation scores:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>#Achieving Score</i>	<i>One Time Payment</i>	<i>Total Paid Out</i>
<i>Excellent</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>\$4,000</i>	<i>\$24,000</i>
<i>Above Average</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>\$2,500</i>	<i>\$35,000</i>
<i>Average</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>\$1,000</i>	<i>\$14,000</i>
<i>Below Average</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
<i>Need Cons. Improve.</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
<i>Totals</i>	<i>37</i>		<i>\$73,000</i>

Option 1-B

This option assumes that the Board adopts the 30 Step Pay Compensation Matrix in Section V as the basis for a pay-for-performance plan and believes that annual merit pay should be built permanently into the high performing employees’ ongoing wage and step base for future years. The 30 Step plan allows employees at Satisfactory and higher to progress through the pay plan at different rates based upon individual job performance. There would be no automatic steps based strictly on longevity of service as exist now in the Howard Administrative Salary Plan. If this option is chosen, here is one way that employees in different categories can be rewarded based on performance evaluation as described above:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Adjustment</i>
<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Three steps of 1 percent of wages within grade</i>
<i>Above Average</i>	<i>Two steps of 1 percent</i>
<i>Average</i>	<i>One step of 1 percent</i>
<i>Below Average</i>	<i>No adjustment</i>
<i>Needs Considerable Improvement</i>	<i>Loss of 1 step</i>

Just as with Option 1-A, the 2014 Budget process would need to take into consideration the actual dollars necessary to pay individuals advancing 1-3 steps in the following year, based on the numerical scores of their 2013 performance evaluations. This plan could be a stand-alone, or combined with a Cost-of-Living increase for all but (N) or lowest category.

If the preference of the Village after reviewing all models presented, is to have a pay-for-performance plan, PAA recommends Option 1-A as the better choice. Our standard philosophy is that merit or bonuses should be based on one year, usually the most recent, and should not be incorporated in the employee’s ongoing base pay, or within the Pay Compensation Matrix itself. Productivity and performance can fluctuate between years and over time. Also Village revenues may, as witnessed during the last recession, fluctuate from year to year affecting funds available for pay increase. A less structured merit pay plan such as Option 1-A allows considerably more control of Village funds than does the step increases required under Option 1-B. A consideration in

whether to establish a pay-for-performance system is: Don't introduce if the individual awards and total dollars in the pool are not large enough sums to cover all eligible employees or make a difference to them financially, particular after payroll taxes are deducted.

Option2

Experience on the job can be recognized by the use of annual step adjustments. (See 15 Step Plan in Chart V-2). A very common approach to compensation recognizes that there is a link between time on the job and job performance. Part of any job is learning the particular tasks of the position and characteristics of the organization. Continued exposure to these job tasks and the organization usually will make employees more productive. A substantial body of research supports this observation. It also tells us that there is an average learning curve for each position. Generally, employees in more routine and less complex positions derive maximum benefit from experience in less time than employees in more complex and discretionary positions.

In the design of a compensation system, a series of pay steps are identified between minimum and maximum salaries and employees' progress through these steps on the basis of experience (longevity), as long as they have received satisfactory performance reviews, until they have reached the maximum step for their particular positions. The advantages of this approach to advancement are as follows:

- It recognizes a vital relationship between experience and productivity.
- It is objective.
- It is easy to administer.
- It allows performance evaluation to be a more direct and constructive exchange, not tied directly to monetary compensation.

The disadvantages to the solely experience-based compensation plan are as follows:

- It is based on the experience of a "typical" employee and not necessarily on the experiences of this Village's specific employees. However, municipalities can control for this with good recruiting practices.
- Sometimes there are problems with senior employees who have reached the top of their pay grades or ranges and have no more step increases to achieve without adding significant duties to their positions.

In this approach, performance appraisal is a tool to establish work expectations, to identify areas for further training and professional development needs, and to let employees know, overall, how they are doing. Both supervisors and employees can be more candid and more future oriented because the burden of assigning (and then receiving) a numerical score that affects compensation is no longer there.

The only formal link between performance appraisal and salary increase is that employees will be evaluated as "meeting performance expectations" or "not meeting performance expectations." The expectation is that they would move a step per year of employment up to the maximum salary. Employees not meeting performance expectations will be not considered for a salary adjustment, or in worst case scenarios, be returned to probationary status. Just as with any other compensation plan, the entire matrix needs to be adjusted incrementally annually or biennially to reflect wage inflation in the external private and public labor markets with which the Village competes for employee talent.

Other Incentive Based Approaches

There are two other approaches that fit into the “loosely linked” category that should be mentioned, which Howard may wish to consider in lieu of or in addition to Options 1 and 2 above.

1. **Group Gain-Sharing.** Specific performance targets would be established for each unit, and, if the performance targets were met, all of the employees in that unit would share in the salary adjustment. This can take the form of either step increases for each group member or one time bonuses for all. The advantages to this approach are that it establishes specific performance targets and it promotes a team focus. The disadvantages are that meaningful objective performance targets are not always easy to establish and some units (divisions) of city government are smaller than the usual minimum for group gain sharing.
2. **Skill-Based Pay.** Skill-based pay is defined as “compensation for the range, depth, and types of skills that employees possess. They are paid for the skills they are capable of using, not for the job they are performing at a particular point in time.” (G.E. Ledford. The Design of Skill-Based Pay Plans, 1989.) Skill-based pay plans have several advantages. The first is that they reward the employees who have those skills most needed by the municipality. Second, skill-based pay is an excellent way to motivate existing employees to improve their skills and knowledge because they know they will be rewarded for obtaining new ones. Thus, there is an explicit link between the capacity goals of the organization and the rewards given to employees. Third, employees may choose to acquire new skills, or not to acquire them. Participation is voluntary, but encouraged. Fourth, there is no ambiguity with regard to whether an objective has been achieved, which can be one of the problems with other merit-based systems.

The challenges of skill-based pay are that it requires considerably more attention to be paid to establishing the skill needs of the organization and its constituent groups in the community, that it works best in a participatory organizational culture, and that professional development/training costs are likely to increase before productivity savings and increased performance are seen. All of these challenges can be reduced if current contract language forbidding pay differential for certain individual training or educational attainment becomes irrelevant.

There are several variants of skill-based pay. The purest version actually replaces the customary job classification system for certain technical jobs with a broad salary band (or working range) and many steps that recognize skill acquisition along the way to achieving maximum pay within range.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Village of Bellevue Paid-Time-Off Policy

Appendix B – Model Village Employee Performance Evaluation

**Appendices C-P – Individual Municipal Wage Data Reports
(Allouez, Ashwaubenon, Bellevue, DePere, Fitchburg,
Germantown, Menasha, Middleton, City of Neenah, Onalaska,
Suamico, Sun Prairie, Town of Grand Chute, and Weston)**

PAID TIME OFF (PTO) 315

Effective Date: 01/01/2013

Paid Time Off (PTO) is an all purpose time-off policy for eligible employees to use for vacation, illness or injury, and personal business. It combines traditional vacation and sick leave plans into one flexible, paid time-off policy. It is meant to function as wage replacement for times that employees choose to be away from work for personal reasons, and is not considered to be compensation.

Employees in the following employment classification(s) are eligible to accrue and use PTO as described in this policy:

- Regular full-time employees
- Regular part-time employees

Once employees enter an eligible employment classification, they begin to accrue PTO according to the schedule below. Before PTO can be requested, a **6-month waiting period** must be completed. After that time, employees can request use of PTO accrued during the waiting period. During the first year of service (i.e., a new regular full-time employees), PTO is available for use on a prorated basis based in accordance with the following formula: the total number of full pay periods remaining in the calendar year divided by 26 multiplied by 5.

Regular part-time employees shall receive PTO in the same manner as full-time employees, however, the number of days allowed shall be **prorated** based on the number of hours regularly worked per week. For example, an employee who is regularly scheduled to work thirty (20) hours per week is entitled to receive 1 week of PTO (.50 x 2 weeks).

The amount of PTO employees receive each calendar year increases with the length of their employment as shown in the following accrual schedules. Years of service are determined as of January 1.

PTO is accrued on a bi-weekly basis but is available for use as of January 1st after the employee's first year of service. Generally, employees will not be permitted to use PTO before it has been accrued unless they receive the prior written authorization from their supervisor and execute a PTO Loan authorization form. For example, an employee with 5 years of service may use 2 weeks of PTO in January (with prior approval and after executing a PTO Loan authorization). However, if the employee terminates July 1, the employee must repay the PTO advanced (in this case, 40 hours).

PTO ACCRUAL SCHEDULE

Years of Eligible Service	PTO Days Each Year	PTO Days Accrued Bi-Weekly <i>Hours</i>
Upon Initial Eligibility	13 Days	0.385 Days (3.077 hours) <i>4 hrs.</i>
After 2 Years	18 Days	0.577 Days (4.615 hours) <i>5.54 hrs.</i>
After 7 Years	23 Days	0.769 Days (6.154 hours) <i>7.08 hrs.</i>
After 15 Years	28 Days	0.962 Days (7.692 hours) <i>8.62 hrs.</i>
After 25 Years (as of 1/1/2013)	33 Days	1.27 Days (10.15 hours) <i>10.15 hrs.</i>

The PTO accrual schedule set forth in the table above is based on an employee working a regular full-time schedule of at least 40 hours per week. Regular part-time employees will have their accruals pro-rated, as noted above.

Employees are accountable and responsible for managing their own PTO hours to allow adequate reserves to cover unforeseen needs for leave, such as personal illness, family sickness, family activities, appointments, emergencies or other unplanned time off from work.

PTO Usage and Rollover

PTO can be used in minimum increments of one hour. Employees will generally not be “advanced” PTO, which means that at no time may employees use PTO before it has accrued. Any time off taken in excess of an employee’s accrual balance will be considered unpaid time off, and is generally discouraged.

PTO is paid at the employee’s base pay rate at the time of absence. It does not include overtime or any special forms of compensation such as incentives, commissions, bonuses, or shift differentials.

In the event that available PTO is not used by the end of the calendar year, employees may carry up to ten (10) days of unused time forward into the next calendar year. Any unused time beyond ten (10) days will be forfeited at the end of the calendar year.

Planned PTO Use

To schedule planned vacation, employees should request vacation at least four weeks in advance from their supervisors. All departments must be appropriately staffed to meet the needs of Village of Bellevue’s customers and clients. This means that PTO may not be granted in all circumstances, and such requests will be approved or denied solely at the discretion of the employee’s supervisor, based upon current workloads, staffing levels, and the employee’s disciplinary status.

When one or more employees in the same area request PTO for the same time periods (for example, around popular vacation times such as summer or holidays), priority will be granted based on seniority. No payments will be made in lieu of taking vacation.

Unplanned PTO Use

In general, PTO cannot be used for missed time because an employee is late for work. In situations involving illnesses or emergencies, employees must notify their direct supervisors and follow the absence reporting procedures set forth in our Attendance and Punctuality policy, or as required by department policies. Such notice generally should occur before the scheduled start of their workday, if possible. Delayed notification to supervisors, or failure to follow proper reporting procedures, may result in disciplinary action and/or the denial of PTO. Proper notice will generally also be required on each additional day of unexpected absence.

PTO and End of Employment

Upon the cessation of employment, employees are typically paid for unused PTO that has been accrued through the last day of work. However, subject to any applicable state laws, Village of Bellevue retains the sole discretion to determine whether or not unused PTO will be paid out, and may choose not to do so if, for instance, employment is terminated for cause, or if the employee fails to provide proper notice of resignation (see Employment Resignation & Termination, Section 717). Generally, PTO may not be used during any resignation notice period.

CITY EMPLOYEE

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Employee Name _____

Job Title _____

Years of Service (In present position) _____

Date _____

Evaluation completed By

_____ Committee or Commission

_____ Supervisor

_____ Supervisor and Employee

_____ Employee

(Please mark preliminary Evaluation in Pencil and Final Evaluation in Dark Ink).

Performance Evaluation Criteria

RATING LEVELS

PRIORITY RANKING

E - Excellent

High- Choose 2 categories 6,5,4,3,0

A - Above average

Normal-Choose 6 categories 5,4,3,2,0

S - Satisfactory

Low- Choose 2 categories 4,3,2,1,0

B - Below average

N - Needs considerable improvement

The City of _____ expects its employee to show acceptable or better levels of achievement in the following categories. Employees are expected to perform at a normal or above normal level, therefore, 8 of 10 categories will be ranked at least at that level. Categories not necessarily as important to the duties of the position are ranked lower. It is designed to allow the supervisor the flexibility to select the level of importance of each category as assigned to a position. It is also designed to give those employees who are performing at an above average or excellent level, additional steps at the higher levels of the pay-plan.

The Supervisor shall select the two most important (High) categories for this position. For these categories, E=6 points, A=5 points, S=4 points, B=3 points, and N=0 points.

The Supervisor shall then select the next six categories of typical importance (Normal) for this position. For these categories, E=5 points, A=4 points, S=3 points, B=2 points, and N=0 points.

The Supervisor shall then select the two categories of lesser importance (Low) to the position. For these categories, E=4 points, A=3 points, S=2 points, B=1 point, and N=0 points.

There is a total of 50 points available.

1. Quality of Work This category rates the accuracy, neatness, completeness, and appearance of work performed by the employee.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

- _____ E-----Performs all work very accurately and completely.
- _____ A-----Performs most work accurately, catches and corrects own mistakes.
- _____ S-----Makes average mistakes, work usually done completely.
- _____ B-----Makes more than normal amount of mistakes, sometimes finishes work.
- _____ N-----Makes many mistakes, rarely finishes work.

Comments _____

2. Quantity of Work This category evaluates the amount of work produced by the employee.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

- _____ E-----Regularly does more than is expected or required.
- _____ A-----Often does more than is directed and produces more than required.
- _____ S-----Does work as directed and produces amount expected.
- _____ B-----Does just enough work to get by, should produce more.
- _____ N-----Does insufficient amount of work requiring others to make up.

Comments _____

3. Interpersonal Skills This category evaluates the employee's relationship with other employees in the Department.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

- _____ E-----Makes extra effort to assist and cooperate with other employees.
- _____ A-----Generally maintains positive attitude and works well in teams.
- _____ S-----Will participate in team situations and works in groups as needed to perform duties.
- _____ B-----Occasionally has problems in relationships with other employees.
- _____ N-----Causes friction, frequently in personal conflicts, resists direction.

Comments _____

4. Communications This category evaluates how the employee communicates with others.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

- _____ E-----Communicates extremely well in writing or orally. An excellent listener.
- _____ A-----A good listener with above average written and oral skills.
- _____ S-----Acceptable communication skills and adequate listener.
- _____ B-----Has some difficulty in expressing him/her self. Could listen better.
- _____ N-----Demonstrates great difficulty in communicating with, and listening to, others.

Comments _____

5. **Job Knowledge** This category evaluates the employee's knowledge of the requirements and responsibilities of his/her job.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

_____ E-----Expert level of knowledge of job requirements, techniques, and regulations.

_____ A-----Good understanding of job requirements, techniques, and regulations.

_____ S-----Fair knowledge of job requirements, techniques, and regulations.

_____ B-----Occasionally needs assistance in interpretation of job responsibilities and forgets a few techniques or regulations.

_____ N-----Often displays lack of knowledge of job requirements and responsibilities.

Comments _____

6. **Resourcefulness and Initiative** This category evaluates how an employee shows initiative in improving performance or operations.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

_____ E-----Consistently finds ways to improve performance or Dept. operations.

_____ A-----Often makes suggestions which improve individual or Dept. performance.

_____ S-----Able to initiate most projects by self except in unusual situations.

_____ B-----Frequently needs help with projects and rarely offers ideas or suggestions.

_____ N-----Constantly needs direction to initiate projects and never makes suggestions.

Comments _____

9. Safety

This category evaluates how an employee acts with consideration of the safety of others and him/her self and the compliance with all city, state, and federal regulations.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

- _____ E-----Shows exceptional thought towards the safe actions of self and others and is well-versed in safety regulations.
- _____ A-----Consistently considers safe, prudent actions and procedures and has read basic safety rules and equipment use procedures.
- _____ S-----Goes to required safety training and is knowledgeable of basic safety rules and equipment use.
- _____ B-----Usually safe actions but occasionally shows lack of discretion regarding basic safety rules or use of equipment provided.
- _____ N-----Ignorant of or disregards safety rules and shows imprudent judgment.

Comments _____

10. Attendance

This category evaluates the employee's reliability in attendance, proper demeanor in the workplace, and respect for workplace rules and maintenance of equipment.

Priority Ranking- High _____
Normal _____
Low _____

- _____ E-----Very punctual and almost never absent. Extremely reliable and very responsible with city equipment. Takes appropriate breaks and lunch periods.
- _____ A-----Seldom absent or late to work. Very reliable. Properly cares for equipment.
- _____ S-----Has average attendance and follows work rules enough to adequately perform the job.
- _____ B-----Occasionally absent or late without adequate notice or excuse. Doesn't consistently observe work rules and/or mistreats equipment or supplies.
- _____ N-----Very often absent or late without adequate notice or excuse. Carelessly breaks equipment, takes frequent breaks, eats at work station.

Comments _____

General Areas for Commendation:

General Comments:

Goals for Improvement by Next Evaluation:

Employee Comments:

Supervisor's Signature

Date

(Employee has reviewed
and has opportunity to
comment)

Date

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality Village of Allouez

Your Name & Title Clara Pickett, Finance Director

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Grade Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works	Public Works Director		96,179.20			7	
Village Engineer	N/A						
Staff Engineer	N/A						
Sr. Engineering Tech	N/A						
Engineering Technician	Engineer	25.28				5	
GIS Coordinator	CAD	21.77				10	
Administrative Assistant-PWD	N/A						
Water Operator/Foreman	Water Foreman	27.52				1	
Laborer Water/Sewer	Water Maintenance	24.18		20.00 - 24.18		1-26	
Public Works Foreman	Street Foreman	27.60				18	
Laborer Public Works	Street Maintenance	24.42		23.66 - 24.42		12-33	
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Street Mechanic	26.03				12	
	Park Mechanic	25.80				11	
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Parks/Recreation/Forestry Director		69,784.00			18	
Village Administrator	Administrator		87,500.00			3	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	N/A						
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Finance Director		75,000.00			1	
	Clerk-Treasurer		59,592.00			24	
Accountant I	Payroll/AP Clerk	19.63				2	
Utility Clerk	Water Bookkeeper	21.28				27	
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Receptionist	13.33				1	
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	Code Enforcement	25.63				2	
	Building Inspector - Contracted						
Dir. Community Development	N/A						
Public Safety Director	N/A						
Fire Chief	Previous to 2013 (now part of GB Metro FD)		86,880 - 2012 Salary			N/A	
Fire Captain (Full-time)	N/A						
Municipal Court Clerk	Court Clerk	16.75				1	
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Recreation Coordinator		35,880.00			1	

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality: Village of Ashwaubenon

Your Name & Title: Amy Wagner - Financial Analyst

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hrly Rates low-high)	Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works	Director of Utilities	\$ 39.97	\$83,128.50			13	
Village Engineer	Village Engineer	\$ 33.65	\$ 70,000.06			4	
Staff Engineer	N/A						
Sr. Engineering Tech	N/A						
Engineering Technician	N/A						
GIS Coordinator	GIS Coordinator	\$ 25.66	\$ 53,372.80			17	does not have a 4 year degree
Administrative Assistant-PWD							
Water Operator/Foreman	Water Utility Foreman	\$ 26.95	\$ 56,056.00			25	
Laborer Water/Sewer	Water Utility Laborer	\$ 25.59	\$ 53,227.20	\$ 24.98 - \$ 25.59		12 yrs - 33 yrs	
Public Works Foreman	Public Works Foreman	\$ 26.95	\$ 56,056.00			25	
Laborer Public Works	Public Works Laborer	\$ 24.98	\$ 51,958.40	\$ 24.63 - \$ 24.98		2 yrs - 33 yrs	
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Lead Mechanic	\$ 25.31	\$ 52,644.80			28	
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Park & Recreation Director	\$ 32.21	\$ 67,003.30			8	Our community is responsible for a manmade lake and a high school pool
Village Administrator	Village Manager	\$ 49.77	\$ 103,524.98			2	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	Confidential Executive Secretary	\$ 21.60	\$ 44,928.00			32	
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Director of Finance	\$ 39.55	\$ 82,272.58			6	
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Village Clerk (Elected - FT)	\$ 25.26	\$ 52,524.68			6	
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Village Treasurer (Elected - PT - 15/hr week)	\$ 19.23	\$ 15,000.00			< 1 yr	
Accountant I	Financial Analyst	\$ 20.19	\$ 42,000.00			< 1 yr	
Utility Clerk	Utility Clerk	\$ 20.59	\$ 42,827.20			15	
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Public Works Secretary	\$ 20.59	\$ 42,827.20			16	
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	Building Inspector	\$ 24.04	\$ 50,000.00			< 1 yr	
Dir. Community Development	Community Development Planner	\$ 30.29	\$ 63,000.00			< 1 yr	
Public Safety Director	Public Safety Director	\$ 44.31	\$ 92,174.42			18	
Fire Chief	N/A						
Fire Captain (Full-time)	Public Safety Commander	\$ 41.94	\$ 87,229.48			22	
Municipal Court Clerk	Court Clerk	\$ 21.39	\$ 44,491.20			27	
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Program Supervisor	\$ 17.08	\$ 35,525.10			1	

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality VILLAGE OF BELLEVUE

Your Name & Title PAM OLSON, HUMAN RESOURCES

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly rates low to high)	Grade Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works	Director of Public Works	\$33.65	\$69,992	\$31.31 - \$46.97	\$39.14	1 year	
Director of Engineering	N/A						
Staff Engineer	N/A						
Sr. Engineering Tech	N/A						
Engineering Technician	N/A						
GIS Coordinator	GIS/IT Coordinator	\$26.21	\$54,517	\$21.63 - \$30.30	\$25.96	5 years	Includes IT
Administrative Assistant-PWD	N/A						
Water Operator/Foreman	N/A						
Laborer Water/Sewer	N/A						
Public Works Foreman	Foreman - Parks & Facilities	\$23.70	\$49,296	See comments	See comments	11 years	currently 3.5% increase over laborer rate
	Foreman - Public Works	\$23.70	\$49,296	See comments	See comments	33 years	currently 3.5% increase over laborer rate
Laborer Public Works	Public Works Laborer	\$22.91	\$47,653	See comments	See comments	4 years	currently not specialized 0-6 months = 80% of \$22.91 7-18 months = 90% of \$22.91 After 18 months = \$22.91
	Public Works Laborer	\$22.91	\$47,653	See comments	See comments	18 years	currently not specialized 0-6 months = 80% of \$22.91 7-18 months = 90% of \$22.91 After 18 months = \$22.91
	Public Works Laborer	\$22.91	\$47,653	See comments	See comments	32 years	currently not specialized 0-6 months = 80% of \$22.91 7-18 months = 90% of \$22.91 After 18 months = \$22.93
	Public Works Laborer	\$22.91	\$47,653	See comments	See comments	3 years	currently not specialized 0-6 months = 80% of \$22.91 7-18 months = 90% of \$22.91 After 18 months = \$22.94
	Public Works Laborer	\$22.91	\$47,653	See comments	See comments	20 years	currently not specialized 0-6 months = 80% of \$22.91 7-18 months = 90% of \$22.91 After 18 months = \$22.95
	Public Works Laborer	\$22.91	\$47,653	See comments	See comments	4 years	currently not specialized 0-6 months = 80% of \$22.91 7-18 months = 90% of \$22.91 After 18 months = \$22.96
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	N/A						
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	N/A						
Village Administrator	Village Administrator	\$42.31	\$88,005	\$37.20 - \$55.80	\$46.50	less than 1 month	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	N/A						
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Clerk/Treasurer/Finance Director	\$34.02	\$70,762	\$26.35 - \$39.53	\$32.94	17 years	
Accountant I	Accountant	\$20.59	\$42,827	\$17.75 - \$24.87	\$44,329.00	1.5 years	
Utility Clerk	Utility Clerk	\$18.40	\$38,272	See comments	See comments	3 years	PART-TIME 0-6 months = 80% of \$18.40 7-18 months = 90% of \$18.40 After 18 months = \$18.40
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Secretary/Receptionist	\$15.79	\$32,843	See comments	See comments	13 years	0-6 months = 80% of \$15.79 7-18 months = 90% of \$15.79 After 18 months = \$15.79
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	Building Inspector	\$26.45	\$55,016	See comments	See comments	12 years	0-6 months = 80% of \$26.45 7-18 months = 90% of \$26.45 After 18 months = \$26.45
		\$26.45		See comments	See comments	12 years	PART-TIME 0-6 months = 80% of \$26.45 7-18 months = 90% of \$26.45 After 18 months = \$26.45
Dir. Community Development	Community Development Director	\$35.33	\$73,486	\$28.73 - \$43.09	\$35.91	4 years	
Public Safety Director	N/A						
Fire Chief	Fire Chief	\$33.05	\$68,744	See comments	See comments	6 months	No specific ranges at this time

Fire Captain (Full-time)	Firefighter - Captain	\$21.34	\$44,387	See comments	See comments	4 years	No specific ranges at this time
Municipal Court Clerk	Municipal Court Clerk	\$18.27	\$38,002	\$14.49 - \$18.83	\$16.66	6 years	
	Municipal Court Clerk Deputy.	\$12.00		\$14.49 - \$18.83	\$16.66	1.5 years	PART-TIME
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Recreation Supervisor	\$17.83	\$37,086	\$15.81 - \$22.16	\$18.99	3 years	

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality Germantown

Your Name & Title _____

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works			88,822	80,696 to 99,271	91,264	5	
Village Engineer			72,988	72,988 to 89,789	82,547	3	
Staff Engineer							
Sr. Engineering Tech							
Engineering Technician							
GIS Coordinator							
Administrative Assistant-PWD							
Water Operator/Foreman		26.92		22.88 to 26.92		varies	start 22.88; 150 days 24.90; 1 year 26.92
Laborer Water/Sewer		26.92		22.88 to 26.92		varies	start 22.88; 150 days 24.90; 1 year 26.92
Public Works Foreman	Foreman-Hwys, Parks, Bldgs. & Grou		60,882	51,363 to 63,186	58,090	2	
Laborer Public Works		25.62				varies	start 21.78; 150 days 23.70; 1 year 25.62
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Mechanic II	26.44				varies	start 22.47; 150 days 24.45; 1 year 26.44
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry							
Village Administrator			95,341	89,218 to 109,754	100,902	7	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator							
Dir. Of Admin. Services							
Accountant I							
Utility Clerk	Utility Account Clerk	19.77				10	start 16.81; 150 days 18.29; 1 year 19.77
Admin. Assistant/Counter							
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	ass't. Bldg. Inspector	27.49				currently vacant	start 23.37; 150 days 25.43; 1 year 27.49
Dir. Community Development			71,007	62,784 to 77,237		6	
Public Safety Director							
Fire Chief			64,900	66,016 to 81,212		23	
Fire Captain (Full-time)							
Municipal Court Clerk							
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Parks & Rec. Dir.		57,500	59,711 to 73,455		3 mos.	

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality __Town of Grand Chute_____		Your Name & Title _____					
Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Grade Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works	Director of Public Works	47.16	98,092.80	\$35.21 - \$47.63	\$41.42	6	
Village Engineer	Contracted through McMahon						
Staff Engineer	Contracted through McMahon						
Sr. Engineering Tech	Contracted through McMahon						
Engineering Technician	Contracted through McMahon						
GIS Coordinator	GIS Specialist	27.65	57,512.00	\$25.82 - \$34.93	\$30.37	10	
Administrative Assistant-PWD	DPW Office Coord.	22.62	47,049.60	\$19.01 - \$25.72	\$22.37	2	Park & Rec, DPW, and Utilities
Water Operator/Foreman	Utility Superintendent	36.62	76,169.60	\$27.34 - \$37.00	\$32.17	21	
Laborer Water/Sewer	Skilled Laborer 2	23.73	49,358.40	\$19.64 - \$23.73	\$22.08	30	
Public Works Foreman	N/A						
Laborer Public Works	Skilled Laborer 2	23.73	49,358.40	\$19.64 - \$23.73	\$22.08	21	
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Skilled Laborer 2	23.73	49,358.40	\$19.64 - \$23.73	\$22.08	5	
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Included in Director of Public Works						
Village Administrator	Town Administrator	54.10	112,528.00	\$41.66 - \$56.37	\$49.01	5	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	Executive Secretary	23.40	48,672.00	\$19.01 - \$25.72	\$22.37	7	
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Finance Director/Treasurer	34.36	71,468.80	\$28.87 - \$39.06	\$33.96	>1	
Accountant I	Deputy Treasurer/Accountant	22.37	46,529.60	\$19.01 - \$25.72	\$22.37	8	
Utility Clerk	Account Clerk	21.90	45,552.00	\$14.94 - \$21.90	\$16.80	27	
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Admin. Assistant	15.44	32,115.20	\$15.23 - \$20.61	\$17.92	1	
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	Code Enforcement	24.62	51,209.60	\$20.42 - \$27.63	\$24.02	4	
	Chief Building Inspector	38.67	80,433.60	\$28.87 - \$39.06	\$33.96	19	
Dir. Community Development	Dir. Community Development	43.66	90,812.80	\$32.27 - \$43.66	\$37.97	3	
Public Safety Director	N/A						
Fire Chief	Fire Chief	41.90	87,152.00	\$35.21 - \$47.63	\$41.42	6	
Fire Captain (Full-time)	Fire Captain	22.55	65,665.60	\$17.63 - \$22.55	\$20.03	23	
Municipal Court Clerk	Municipal Court Clerk	20.43	25,537.50	\$16.78 - \$22.71	\$19.74	12	Two Part-time Court Clerks
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	N/A						

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality __ City of Menasha
current

Your Name & Title __ Michael A. Brunn Human Resources

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT) 37.5 work week	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Grade Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works	Director of Public Works	49.08	95714		89500	25	Director does your top three positions
Village Engineer	Director of Public Works						Director assigns some of the tasks to Eng Super
Staff Engineer	Director of Public Works						
Sr. Engineering Tech	Eng Supervisor					26	
Engineering Technician	Eng Aide	33.11					3 positions also do GIS work
GIS Coordinator	Eng Aide	28.64					
Administrative Assistant-PWD	Administrative Assistant-PWD	22.11	43128		46400	14	one at city hall and one at city garage both DPW
Water Operator/Foreman	none						separate utility
Laborer Water/Sewer	none						Public works sewer main
Public Works Foreman	Public Works Superintendent	35.32	73486		67800	35	Water -separate utility Assistant Superintendent also
Laborer Public Works	common laborer		40 work week			numerous	have equipment operators apx 20 positions
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	equipment operator	19.90 to 24.92		19.90 -24.92			3 mechanics
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Mechanic	25.93 to 27.82	40 hr work week	25.93 -27.82			
Village Administrator	Parks Superintendent	30.84	64148		63900	4 years	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	Elected Mayor	30.76				5 years 2nd 4 yr term	mayor/ city coucil govt
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Adm. Asst/dep city clerk	18				CURRENTLY OPEN	DEPUTY CITY CLERK & ADM ASST
Accountant I	Dir. Of Admin. Services		91,400-111,800			CURRENTLY OPEN	
Utility Clerk	Staff Accountant	31.04				12 years	interiem City Treasurer
Admin. Assistant/Counter	utility is separate from city						separate utility
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	Finance clerk	22.84				20-32 years	2 positions
Dir. Community Development	private contract						
Public Safety Director	Dir. Community Development	41.06	80083		77000	19 years	also Principle Planner as an assistant
Fire Chief	Police Chief	40.7	84659	40 hr work week	85100	1 year	30 sworn officers 8 supervisors 8 clerical
Fire Captain (Full-time)	no fire responsibility					6 years	has 3 deputy chief and adm asst
Municipal Court Clerk	Fire Chief						
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	joint position w/ Neenah						
	Fire Captain (Full-time)						6 positions
	Joint position(s) w/ Neenah						
	Joint position with Neenah						
							municipal swimming pool no golf course
	Park and Rec Director	38.62	75313		70600	23 years	

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Stephen Bechler,
Administrative Intern

Howard Position Title	Your Municipality	City of Middleton		Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Grade Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)					
Director of Public Works	PW Director/City Engineer	\$ 47.86	\$ 99,539	NA	NA	19	
Village Engineer	Asst. PW Dir./City Engineer	\$ 36.74	\$ 76,419	NA	NA	25	
Staff Engineer	NA			NA	NA	NA	Pos. does not exist
Sr. Engineering Tech	NA			NA	NA	NA	Pos. does not exist
Engineering Technician	Engineering Technician	\$ 28.21	\$ 58,684	NA	NA	12	
GIS Coordinator	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Pos. does not exist
Administrative Assistant-PWD	Associate Ops Manager/PW Office Manager	\$ 27.92	\$ 58,064	NA	NA	36	
Water Operator/Foreman	Asst Utility Dir/Utility Foreman	\$ 31.61	\$ 65,741	NA	NA	12	
Laborer Water/Sewer	Lead Utility Crewman	\$ 26.83	\$ 55,806	NA	NA	5	
	Utility Crewman	\$ 22.95	\$ 47,741	NA	NA	5	Average of 4 FTEs
Public Works Foreman	Street Foreman	\$ 29.33	\$ 61,014	NA	NA	23	
	Lead Street Crewman	\$ 27.10	\$ 56,368	NA	NA	34	
Laborer Public Works	Street Crew	\$ 24.04	\$ 50,003	NA	NA	11	Average of 6 FTEs
				NA	NA		
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Mechanic	\$ 28.44	\$ 59,156	NA	NA	20	
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Public Lands Manager	\$ 40.98	\$ 85,229	NA	NA	13	Separate Golf Course Staff
	Director of Golf	\$ 35.82	\$ 74,512.0	NA	NA	10	
Village Administrator	City Administrator	\$ 54.60	\$ 113,577	NA	NA	15	
				NA	NA		
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Pos. does not exist Budget, research, special projects, some correspondence
	Administrative Intern (.5 FTE)	\$ 13.85	\$ 14,404	NA	NA	1	
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Fin. Dir./Asst. City Admin.	\$ 48.92	\$ 101,750	NA	NA	3	
	City Clerk/HR Assistant	\$ 27.92	\$ 58,064	NA	NA	10	
Accountant I	Accountant/Treasurer	\$ 30.74	\$ 63,945	NA	NA	2	
				NA	NA		
Utility Clerk	Utility Billing Manager	\$ 22.74	\$ 47,292	NA	NA	6	
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Finance Assistant	\$ 19.65	\$ 40,872	NA	NA	1	
				NA	NA		
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	Building Inspector	\$ 36.07	\$ 75,031	NA	NA	26	
Dir. Community Development	Director of Planning & Zoning	\$ 41.37	\$ 86,056	NA	NA	25	Dir. of Community Development is City Administrator
				NA	NA		
Public Safety Director	Police Chief	\$ 48.92	\$ 101,750	NA	NA	9	
Fire Chief	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Not a City service
				NA	NA		
Fire Captain (Full-time)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Not a City service
Municipal Court Clerk	Court Clerk	\$ 19.65	\$ 40,872	NA	NA	8	
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Recreation Supervisor	\$ 22.11	\$ 45,995	NA	NA	2	

Survey - Village of Howard

Your Municipality

Neenah

Position	Salary Range	Actual Salary	#Years in position
Director of Public Works (Director of Public Works)	\$76,580 - \$88,945 - \$103,380	\$85,000	5/1/2013
Director of Engineering (Civil Engineer III)	\$54,857 - \$64,458 - \$74,056	\$62,361	5/1/2013
Staff Engineer (Civil Engineer II)	\$47,618 - \$55,949 - \$64,282	\$54,190	4
Senior Engineering Tech (No comparable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Engineering Tech (No Comparable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
GIS Coordinator (GIS Operator)	\$42,185 - \$49,572 - \$56,948	\$50,066	15
Public Works Administrative assistant (Office Manager - Public Works)	\$37,359 - \$43,900 - \$50,437	\$46,086	8
Water Utility Operator/Working Foreman Water /Sewer (Water Dist. Manager/Water Plant Manager)	\$58,476 - \$68,712 - \$78,944	\$69,674 - Dist. Mgr. \$67,252 - Plant Mgr.	13 - Dist. Mgr. 16 - Plant Mgr.
Laborer Water and Sewer (Utility Maint. Distr./Util. Maint. Tech.)	\$55,390 - \$57,013	Former union	Multiple employees
Public Works (Streets/Parks Work Foreman) (No comparable position)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Laborer Public Works (Street & San.)	Starting between \$13.98 - \$18.05	Union positions	Varies
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk (Fleet Superintendent)	\$51,236 - \$60,202 - \$69,168	\$60,929	7
Director of Parks & Forestry (Superintendent of Parks)	\$54,857 - \$64,458 - \$74,056	\$59,818	12
Village Administrator (Mayor)	Elected	\$79,250	11
Administrative Assistant to the Administrator (No comparable - split between numerous departments)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Director of Administrative Services (Director of Finance)	\$76,580 - \$88,945 - \$103,380	\$101,360	14
Accountant I (Accountant)	\$39,773 - \$46,733 - \$53,694	\$48,650	11
Utility Billing Clerk (Utility Billing Clerk)	\$34,4429 - \$40,455 - \$46,480	\$37,138	5
Administrative Assistant/Front Counter (Cashier)	\$34,4429 - \$40,455 - \$46,480	\$36,458	7
Building Inspector/Code Enf. Administrator (Chief Bldg. Inspector)	\$51,236 - \$60,202 - \$69,168	\$70,448	12
Director of Community Development (Director of Com. Dev./Assessment)	\$76,580 - \$88,945 - \$103,380	\$84,793	4
Public Safety Director (Police Chief)	\$72,957 - \$85,725 - \$98,495	\$87,963	4
Fire Chief (Fire Chief)	\$72,957 - \$85,725 - \$98,495	\$87,493	4
Fire Captain (Deputy Fire Chief)	\$62,101 - \$72,966 - \$83,834	\$81,109	14
Leisure Services Director (Superintendent of Recreation)	\$54,857 - \$64,458 - \$74,056	\$68,996	27
Municipal Court Clerk (Municipal Court Clerk)	\$37,359 - \$43,900 - \$50,437	\$45,379	28

Positions in red are Neenah's comparable.

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality __ City of Onalaska

Your Name Hope Burchell - Human Resource Specialist

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works	City Engineer	34.36	71471.76	63948.42-86518.45	75233.43	7	Exempt
Village Engineer	na						
Staff Engineer	Assistant Engineer	25.61	53275.03	48955.43-66233.82	57594.62	1	Exempt
Sr. Engineering Tech	na						
Engineering Technician	na						
GIS Coordinator	GIS Technician/Erosi	21.13	43951.66	40388.01-54642.60	47515.3	11	Exempt
Administrative Assistant-PWD	na						
Water Operator/Foreman	Utility Crew Leader	22.52	46841.60	n/a	n/a	6 mo	a union position
Laborer Water/Sewer	Utility Operator II	22.02	45801.60		21.51 na	5	a union position
Public Works Foreman	na						
Laborer Public Works	Street Laborer	21.51	44740.8	18.89-21.51	19.71	varies	a union position
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Mechanic	22.52	46841.60	na	na	20	a union position
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Parks Supervisor	23.83	49567.31	46813.57-63336.01	55074.79	11	Exempt
Village Administrator	Mayor	28.85	60000	na	na	1	Exempt
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	City Clerk	27.85	57936.71	53239.14-72029.43	62634.28	12	Exempt
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Finance Director/Tre	34.97	72749.49	57522.85-77825.03	67673.94	32	Exempt
Accountant I	Deputy Finance Dire	24.22	50395.3	48955.43-66233.82	57594.62	6	Exempt
Utility Clerk	Utility Billing Admini	20.55	42763.77	40388.01-54642.60	47515.3	6	Non-Exempt
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Office Clerical Suppc	16.32	33962.44	33962.44-45949.19	39955.81	1	Non-Exempt
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	UDC/Building Inspec	19.41	40388.01	40388.01-54642.6	47515.3	6 mo	Non-Exempt
	Commercial Building	24.00	49927.22	44671.72-60438.21	52554.96	21	Non-Exempt
	Electrical Inspector	22.5	46813.57	46813.57-63336.01	55074.79	1	Non-Exempt
	HVAC/Plumbing Insf	25.81	53697.92	46813.57-63336.01	55074.79	18	Non-Exempt
Dir. Community Development	Land Use & Develop	34.59	71948.62	59664.74-80722.84	70193.77	1	Exempt
Public Safety Director	Police Chief	35.88	74648.66	72515.84-98109.66	85312.75	5	Exempt
Fire Chief	Fire Chief	36.91	76781.48	72515.84-98109.66	85312.75	6	Exempt
Fire Captain (Full-time)	Assistant Fire Chief	30.9	64290.25	57522.85-77825.03	67673.94	20	Exempt
Municipal Court Clerk	Municipal Court Sup	23.37	48613.34	44671.72-60438.21	52554.96	8	Exempt
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Parks & Recreation I	30.58	63624.4	61806.56-83620.64	71713.6	11	Exempt

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality ____City of Sun Prairie__

Your Name & Title ____Brenda Sukenik, Human Resources Director

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Grade Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works	same	44.6568	92886	63799.60 - 89559.52	76559.52	22	
Village Engineer	City Engineer	42.7284	88875.06	63799.60 - 89559.52	76559.52	12	
Staff Engineer	Staff Engineer II	32.8876	68406.26	49105.86 - 68748.21	58927.03	12	
Sr. Engineering Tech	same	31.0307	64543.96	46333.37 - 64866.71	55600.04	12	
Engineering Technician	same	24.6273	51224.68	39633.71 - 55487.19	47560.45	7	
GIS Coordinator	same	30.5131	63467.18	49105.86 - 68748.21	58927.03	8	
Administrative Assistant-PWD	Secretary	16.61	34548.8	14.02 - 17.71	16.69	25	
Water Operator/Foreman	WWTP Supervisor	33.6995	70094.86	52127.87 - 72979.02	62553.44	15	
Laborer Water/Sewer	Utility Maintenance Worker	22	45760	17.64 - 22.76	21.46	11	
Public Works Foreman	Maintenance Worker Crewleader	23.81	49524.8	18.59 - 23.93	22.56	4	
Laborer Public Works	Maintenance Worker	22.45	46696	17.51 - 22.56	21.27	10	
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Fleet Technician	18.81	39124.8	18.90 - 24.37	22.98	2	
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Parks, PW, Forestry Supervisor	29.5363	61435.44	55421.87 - 77590.62	66506.24	4	
Village Administrator	City Administrator	51.4423	107,000	79777.52 - 111688.53	95733.02	1	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	same	26.8136	55772.34	41476.48 - 58067.07	49771.78	13	
Dir. Of Admin. Services	same	40.8094	84883.44	68626.77 - 96077.47	82352.12	1	
Accountant I	same	23.3366	48540.18	41476.48 - 58067.07	49771.78	11	
Utility Clerk	Account Clerk	24.1445	50220.56	39633.71 - 55487.19	47560.45	14	
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Secretary	17.11	35588.8	14.02 - 17.71	16.69	13	
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	same	39.7894	82761.97	59411.27 - 83175.77	71293.39	23	
Dir. Community Development	same	44.6093	92787.27	68626.77 - 96077.47	82352.12	1	
Public Safety Director	n/a						
Fire Chief	n/a						
Fire Captain (Full-time)	n/a						
Municipal Court Clerk	same	17.11	35588.8	14.02 - 17.71	16.69	11	
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	Recreation Director	30.1098	62628.37	59411.27 - 83175.77	71293.39	1	

VILLAGE OF HOWARD 2013 PAY COMPENSATION SURVEY OF EXTERNAL PEER COMMUNITIES

PAA -- JUNE 2013

Your Municipality __ Village of Weston

Your Name & Title Sherry Weinkauff, Village Clerk/HR Director

Howard Position Title	Your Equivalent	Hourly Wage	Yearly Wage (Without OT)	Range within Grade (Hourly Rates low to high)	Grade Mid-Point	Years in Position	Comments
Director of Public Works		47.77	99,367	N/A	N/A	16	Duties completed by both the DPW and Staff engineer
Village Engineer	N/A See comments						Duties completed by both the DPW and Staff engineer
Staff Engineer	Deputy DPW	23.08	48,000	N/A	N/A	3	
Sr. Engineering Tech	N/A						
Engineering Technician	N/A						
GIS Coordinator	Technology Dir.	26.39	54,899	N/A	N/A	9	
Administrative Assistant-PWD	N/A						
Water Operator/Foreman	Utility Manager	26.43	54,974	N/A	N/A	19	
							All water/sewer operators are certified by DNR for water. The manager is a working foreman. All 4 rotate on-call responsibility.
Laborer Water/Sewer	Utility Operators N/A	23.76	49,421	N/A	N/A	between 11 and 18	
Public Works Foreman	Street Manager x2	25.73	53,518	N/A	N/A	36 and 27	Also, perform the work
Laborer Public Works	Operators		21.43 to 22.82		22.56	between 6 and 24	
Mechanic/Stockroom Clerk	Fleet Manager	25.73	53,518	N/A	N/A	19	
Dir. Of Parks & Forestry	Park Manager	25.73	53,518	N/A	N/A	13	
Village Administrator	Same	40.87	85,000	N/A	N/A	1	
Admin. Asst. to Administrator	N/A						Clerk and Deputy perform most of these duties
Dir. Of Admin. Services	Clerk/HR Director	27.82	57,868	N/A	N/A	19.5	Clerk and Finance Dir. Share these duties
	Finance Dir.	43.29	90,041	N/A	N/A	13	
Accountant I	Deputy Finance Dir.	26.52	55,167	N/A	N/A	6	
Utility Clerk	Same	20.85	43,368	N/A	N/A	25	
Admin. Assistant/Counter	Admin. Specialists x2	15.47	32,178	N/A	N/A	7	
Building Inspector/Code Enf.	Building Manager	34.17	71,073	N/A	N/A	7	
Dir. Community Development	Same	30.37	63,176	N/A	N/A	10	There is also a Taxpayer Relations Coord. And Admin. Specialist in this Dept.
Public Safety Director	N/A						Contracted services
Fire Chief	Same	31.22	64,929	N/A	N/A	5	
Fire Captain (Full-time)	Deputy Chief	19.21	55,953	N/A	N/A	13	
Municipal Court Clerk	Same	19	39,520	N/A	N/A	10	
Leisure Services (Rec Dir.)	N/A						Park Manager and clerical share these duties