



# **CITY OF BURLINGTON**

## **EMPLOYEE CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY**

**FINAL REPORT**

**FEBRUARY 2016**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION – Pages 1 to 3**

- Scope of Work – Page 1

### **II. POSITION CLASSIFICATION PLAN – Pages 4 to 5**

### **III. JOB EVALUATION – Pages 6 to 7**

### **IV. SALARY AND BENEFITS SURVEY – Pages 8 to 14**

- Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Survey Purposes – Page 8
- Salary Survey – Page 10
- Appraisal and Use of the Salary Survey Data – Page 11
- Benefits Survey – Page 12
- Benefits Survey Findings – Page 12

### **V. PAY PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS – Pages 15 to 21**

- Development of the Pay Plan – Page 15
- Pay Plan Options for the City’s Consideration – Page 15
- Defined Increment, Open-Range, and Blended Pay Plans – Page 15
- Pay Philosophy – Page 18
- Proposed Pay Plan and Structure – Page 18
- Implementation and Administration of the Pay Plan for Current Employees – page 18
- Employee Advancement Through the Ranges – Page 19
- Future Administration of the Pay Plan – Page 20
- Future Administration of the Classification Plan – Page 20

### **TABLES**

Table 1 – Classification Plan – Page 22

Table 2a – Comprehensive Table – Page 24

Table 3 – Compensation Plan (Proposed Pay Ranges) – Page 26

### **APPENDICES**

Appendix A – Job Analysis Questionnaire

Appendix B – Detailed Salary Survey Data

Appendix C – Detailed Benefits Survey Data

## I. INTRODUCTION

GovHR USA is pleased to have had the opportunity to work with the City of Burlington on this Compensation and Classification Study. Human resource management is a significant concern as governmental services continue to increase in cost and complexity, and the resources to fund local government are restrained. The day-to-day governing of the City of Burlington presents challenging administrative problems in planning, organizing, and directing human resource functions in order to achieve maximum efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of municipal services. A properly developed and administered position classification and compensation plan forms the foundation for meeting these challenges. It helps to ensure that the City can not only recruit talented and competent employees – even in a competitive marketplace – to complete its mission, but retain those employees as well. By retaining qualified, experienced employees the City avoids the costs of re-recruitments, retraining and lost productivity, while maximizing the benefits of the investments it has made in training employees and the institutional and community knowledge acquired by employees over their tenures.

It was the City's goal to update its existing classification and compensation system in support of its efforts to attract and retain a highly talented, effective and motivated workforce while also meeting the highest standards of fiscal performance, accountability and stewardship. The City administration worked closely with the GovHR USA Consultants throughout the process and the result is a report that is comprehensive and recommendations that reflect the unique resources, challenges and goals of the City of Burlington. As GovHR USA has completed its analysis on behalf of the City, we are pleased to present the results of our findings and to make recommendations for consideration by City officials.

### **Scope of Work**

The scope of work called for GovHR USA to carry out the following tasks:

#### **I. Job Evaluation Analysis and Job Classification System**

The following steps were included in this component of the Study (listed in the order that the work was performed):

- **Study preparation meeting.** Held a conference call with the Director of Administrative Services and HR Generalist to discuss study methods and objectives and the current job descriptions and

compensation plan. Determined problem areas, answered questions, and reviewed the scope and schedule of work.

- **Material distribution.** Prepared a memorandum of explanation which was distributed to employees, followed by a meeting with employees to distribute and explain the Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) forms and to discuss the scope and purpose of the Study. Employees were then allowed one week to complete the questionnaire. These questionnaires were reviewed by each employee's Supervisor and Department Head for comments as well as City administration for approval of content, and returned to GovHR USA within three weeks of distribution.
- **Determined comparable communities and prepared and distributed the compensation survey.** Working with the Director of Administrative Services, determined a logical survey sample of "like" communities that impact the compensation market for City.
- **Designed and distributed the compensation survey for 31 benchmark job classifications and selected benefits to 14 municipalities.**
- **Job evaluation analysis and establishment of job classification system.** Upon return of the JAQs by the City, GovHR USA performed the following:
  - Read each JAQ and corresponding Job Description in its entirety.
  - In mid-November, interviewed in person at least one person in each classification covered by the Study, as well as the Department Heads with regard to jobs under their jurisdiction, to further understand the scope, requirements and responsibilities of every job.
  - Applied a measurement system of job evaluation factors to all classifications, which formed the basis for internal rankings of classifications.
  - Upon completion of the job evaluation measurements, a new Classification Plan was developed.

## II. Survey Analysis

The following steps were included in this component of the Study:

- Tabulated, summarized, and analyzed comparative compensation information obtained through the salary survey. The salary range minimums and maximums provided by the comparables for each classification were analyzed to determine the wage ranges that are "at market", or at about the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. Data have been displayed for each jurisdiction regarding each surveyed classification (Appendix B), summarized in an overall table (Table 2), and analyzed to develop salary ranges that establish the City as an average payer in relation to comparable municipalities.
- Based on the above data, developed and recommended new salary schedules (Table 3) and titles.

## III. Draft and Final Report Preparation

- A preliminary analysis of the data and recommended classification and compensation plan was shared with the Project Team (Director of Administrative Services and City Manager). Feedback from the Project Team was reviewed and incorporated into the recommendations.
- A draft final report was prepared by the Consultant and sent electronically to the City for review by the department heads. Feedback from the department heads was gathered and incorporated into a revised draft report which was distributed to the City Council for review.
- GovHR presented the draft findings to the City Council on January 25, answered questions and gathered feedback. After incorporating several revisions, this report has been finalized and issued in electronic and hard copy formats.

## II. THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION PLAN

A position classification plan provides for a systematic arrangement of positions into classes. A position, often referred to as a job (e.g., Administrative Assistant), contains a specific set of duties and responsibilities that is the objective of the classification process - not the person currently holding that job. A classification is a grouping of positions which are "similar" in nature of work, principal duties and responsibilities, and relative level of work difficulty, and which require similar levels of knowledge, ability, and skill. Positions allocated to the same classification are "sufficiently similar" with respect to the types of factors enumerated above to permit them to be compensated at the same general level of pay. The positions do not have to be identical, however, and can be in different departments or in the same department dealing with different subject matter or performing different duties.

It is this arrangement of positions and resulting classification structure that forms the basis for the pay plan. As noted above, a classification study is not intended to assess individual performance. To that end, a position that belongs in a certain classification is *not* entitled to be placed in a higher class simply because the individual performs with a high degree of success and efficiency, nor is it placed in a lower class simply because the incumbent performs with low competence or productivity. Variations in individual performance are not recognized by differences in classification, but are management issues. Similarly, there is a tendency in some work forces to use the classification plan to reward longevity, even though the duties and responsibilities of individual positions may not have changed over time. However, just because an individual has been with an organization for a long time and is at the top of their pay range does *not* mean they should be moved to the next higher pay grade. Longevity is not a classification factor and the classification plan should not be used in this manner.

As an assessment of duties performed and of responsibilities exercised, a position classification plan is an exceedingly useful managerial tool. It provides the fundamental rationale for the pay plan and helps management identify positions which have taken on (or in some cases reduced) duties and responsibilities. Through proper maintenance of the classification plan, employees are assured of management's continuing concern about the nature of work that they carry out and its reward in the form of appropriate pay levels and relationships.

The classification plan also provides the basis for recruitment, screening, and selection of employees in direct relationship to job content. Promotional ladders as well as opportunities for lateral career development are also evidenced by the logical grouping of allied occupational classes and hierarchies.

### III. JOB EVALUATION

GovHR USA's approach to job evaluation involves a quantitative point and factor comparison method, which "cross-compares" all jobs in the organization against numerous factors such as educational requirements, experience, work conditions, and the like (see below). Therefore, all jobs in each organizational unit (e.g., Finance, Police, Public Works, etc.) are compared against each other, based upon the same factors.

In conducting the job evaluation exercise, it must be again emphasized that the position, and *not the qualifications, performance, or years of service of the incumbent in the position*, is evaluated. An incumbent employee may feel s/he should be placed in a higher level (i.e., receive more points) because the individual performs well, has a long tenure with the organization, and/or has additional education or skills not required to perform that job, or s/he may feel s/he does more tasks than a similar employee in another Department. However, these personal attributes are not valid determinants for job classification analysis.

Before reviewing the results of the evaluation of the job classifications, it is important to note that the purpose of job evaluation is to identify whether a job is more or less advanced than, or equal to, other jobs in the organization, based on nine (9) objective factors. While these factor definitions are guidelines, they are constructed to allow limited flexibility of interpretation while at the same time providing a strict framework and structure for comparison.

The nine (9) factors used for the evaluation of Burlington's job classes are as follows:

1. Preparation and Training
2. Experience
3. Decision Making and Independent Judgment
4. Responsibility for Policy Development
5. Planning
6. Contact with Others
7. Work of Others (Supervision Exercised)
8. Working Conditions
9. Use of Technology/Specialized Equipment

As part of the job evaluation process, the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements for each job classification were reviewed through a thorough reading of the incumbent’s current job description and a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQs) completed by each employee (Appendix A). In addition, we conducted interviews with at least one employee in each classification covered by the study and the Department Directors. Points were assigned to each factor by selecting the description that best fit the appropriate level of compliance. In other words, a job classification that requires a Masters Degree would receive more points under the “Preparation and Training” factor than a job classification that did not require this advanced degree. Points for each factor were then totaled for each job classification. Using this method, the classifications were equated to distinguishable job factor analysis (JFA) scores and grouped with others with similar JFA scores into eleven salary grades. Table 1 contains the Classification Plan, including the job classification title, the JFA score, proposed Grade, and proposed new title for the evaluated classifications.

As part of the service provided in the pay study, we make recommendations of title changes/additions to reflect either a better description of the job being performed or to be consistent with trends in the organization or the marketplace. Based on this, we recommend the following changes to the current plan:

**Current Title**

**Proposed New Title**

Accounting Supervisor/City Treasurer  
 Code Inspector III  
 Engineer Intern II  
 Administrative Assistant/Billing Manager  
 Administrative Assistant – Inspection  
 Deputy City Clerk/Administrative Assistant  
 Administrative Assistant – Library  
 Office Coordinator – Public Works or WWTF

Accounting Manager/City Treasurer  
 Chief Code Inspector  
 Civil Engineer I  
 Billing Coordinator  
 Project Coordinator  
 Deputy City Clerk/Office Coordinator  
 Office Coordinator  
 Office Coordinator

## IV. SALARY AND BENEFITS SURVEY

The City of Burlington initiated this study with the objective of assuring that its pay plan is both internally equitable and externally competitive. The Job Evaluation System (outlined in Part III) is performed to address the issue of internal equity. In order to achieve external competitiveness, a survey of the salaries and benefits offered by comparable jurisdictions was conducted. The following presents and explains the labor market review and survey data.

### **Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Survey Purposes**

When selecting jurisdictions to serve as survey comparables, it is important that they be the most similar entities available in terms of such criteria as size, proximity and economic indicators. Public sector municipalities are preferred over private sector companies as comparable due to the following reasons:

- There are few “like” positions found in both the private and public sectors. Although positions such as Accounting Supervisor, Administrative Assistant or Network Support Manager may be found across sectors and industries, the majority of public sector employees (police officers, public works and utilities operators, etc.) do not have analogous positions in the private sector.
- Unlike public employers, a private employer’s salary information is not part of the public record. They are under no obligation to share their data with others and are usually very reluctant to do so, placing a high value on maintaining the confidentiality of their compensation data.
- The comparability of any data received from the public sector is limited if the respondent does not include bonuses, commissions and/or stock options as part of the base salary. Benefits packages often differ significantly between the private and public sectors, limiting the comparability of salaries isolated from the value of the total compensation package.

The selection and validation of comparable municipalities for this Study, which was a cooperative effort between the City of Burlington and GovHR, differed in some aspects from the process that GovHR most commonly utilizes when identifying communities to survey in a compensation study. The process typically begins by setting proximity and population parameters to identify those communities most likely to be comparable to the client community. For the City of Burlington, the initial criteria were: cities with population between 20,000 and 30,000 within the state of Iowa. For many communities, the

initial population and proximity criteria will result in a list of 25 or more potential comparables. In such cases, GovHR would then apply additional criteria (generally financial factors such as total general expenditures budget, total estimate assessed value, property tax levy per capita, etc.) to further narrow down that larger list by identifying the communities of similar size and proximity that are most comparable to the client city. However, in the case of the City of Burlington, there are only six other cities in the state of Iowa with populations between 20,000 and 30,000. These six cities – Clinton, Fort Dodge, Marshalltown, Mason City, Muscatine and Ottumwa – are the “core comparables” that Burlington typically uses as its comparables. Based on the uniform application of reasonable proximity and population parameters, GovHR affirmed the selection of these cities as Burlington’s core comparables. GovHR also reviewed the per capita incomes for these core comparables, all of which fell within +/- 10% of the per capita income of the City of Burlington, further validating their appropriateness as comparables.

At the recommendation of GovHR USA, in addition to these core comparables the City also selected the next three largest cities in the state as well as five smaller cities in closer proximity to survey to ensure that any impact they might have on the market wages would not be overlooked. A total of 14 communities overall were selected to be surveyed. They are as follows, in alphabetical order. The “core comparables” are followed by an asterisk:

<u>COMMUNITY</u>		
Bettendorf	Fort Madison	Muscatine*
Boone	Keokuk	Newton
Cedar Falls	Marion	Ottumwa*
Clinton*	Marshalltown*	Spencer
Fort Dodge*	Mason City*	

It is important to note, however, that as GovHR reviewed the salary survey data received from the “non-core” communities, it was clear that the pay scales they employ differ sufficiently (either higher or lower depending on city size) that their inclusion in the data set would skew the data inappropriately.

Ultimately, these communities are not sufficiently comparable to the City of Burlington. Therefore, at GovHR’s recommendation, the data from these eight cities were not included in the analysis of the salary survey data that determined the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile salary ranges.

## The Salary Survey

After selecting the above referenced municipalities as our source for salary and benefit survey data, the Consultants then selected 31 positions for the purposes of gathering minimum and maximum salary data from the comparable entities. These positions were chosen as “benchmarks” to achieve representation from the current positions to provide an overall basis for comparison. “Benchmarks” selected are those that:

1. Are representative of each occupational grouping; i.e., Finance, Library, Public Safety;
2. Include substantial numbers of Burlington employees, when possible;
3. Can be described in a concise manner that accurately identifies the nature of work and level of difficulty; and
4. Are known to commonly exist in other local government organizations.

The detailed survey data for each position are contained in Appendix B. Table 2 provides a summary of the benchmark salary survey data. Also displayed in Table 2 are Burlington’s positions grouped into one of eleven pay grades according to JFA scores, as well as the recommended salary range minimums and maximums associated with each grade.

It is important to make a few observations regarding the survey data and the recommended pay ranges.

1. Thirteen of the 14 municipalities responded to the survey conducted on behalf of Burlington. Newton did not respond despite several requests for information.
2. The salary data gathered from the comparables reflect their wage ranges and actual salaries as of October and November 2015. Most of the responding municipalities indicated they would be implementing across-the-board salary increases as of July 1, 2016, with an average increase across the comparable municipalities of 2.5%. The new recommended salary ranges for Burlington were developed using the October/November 2015 salary data from the comparables. However, the City of Burlington plans to implement the recommended salary ranges after July 1, 2016. Therefore, the recommended salary range minimums and maximums

given in this report (Tables 2 and 3) have been increased by 2.5% so that when implemented in the latter half of 2016 they will be current with market wage rates at that time.

3. Most of the comparable communities provided salary ranges for comparison purposes, while other communities (those that don't utilize salary ranges as part of their pay plans) provided actual salaries for the surveyed positions. Any actual salaries provided by the comparable communities were not analyzed simply because there was abundant salary range information available, which are the preferred data for analysis.
4. The salary range minimums and maximums collected from the core comparables were then analyzed to determine the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile to identify wage ranges for an "average" payer. [Definition: the Nth percentile represents the salary that is higher than N% of the salaries provided by comparable municipalities.]
5. Together these statistics were used to derive recommended new salary ranges at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile that position the City as an average/"at-market" payer when recruiting its labor force.
6. Part-time salaries included in Table 2 have been converted to a 40-hour workweek for comparability. Upon implementation of this pay plan, the wages should be pro-rated according to actual hours worked per week.
7. Several positions are currently being paid salaries that are below the recommended salary range minimums. These positions are highlighted in green font in Table 2.

### **Appraisal and Use of Salary Survey Data**

While comparing Burlington's current salaries to those paid by other employers in the survey group, it must be noted that variations in compensation may be due to several factors, including:

1. Organizational size and economic conditions can have an impact on classifications. In smaller organizations, employees are often asked to "wear many hats" and therefore take on more duties and responsibilities than would normally be required of a certain position. In addition to that, the economic downturn forced organizations to "do more with less", compelling staff to take on more duties and responsibilities than they have in the past. Therefore, it becomes increasingly harder to compare "like" classifications within organizations. To try to avoid inaccurate comparisons, we always include a short job description of the classifications we are surveying in order to assure that we are comparing "like" positions.

2. Some employers place a different “relative worth” on certain groups of employees. For example, some employers are forced to place a higher value on certain employees or groups of employees because of the market, and therefore, pay them more. Overall, the policies and value judgments of different employers in compensating the same kind of work vary widely. There is rarely a single prevailing rate for any particular kind of work, even within the same labor market.
3. Exact comparisons among different employers of ostensibly similar jobs as to duties and responsibilities and related employment factors are sometimes difficult to make.

Nevertheless, comparative salary data generally is a good measure of the appropriate compensation rates with respect to the prevailing market. They are also useful as an indication of generally prevailing opinions concerning the pay relationships that should exist among different classes of work. Of equal importance, however, are the internal relationships arrived at by comparing the relative levels of difficulty, responsibility, experience, and training for the various classes, as was accomplished in the job evaluation portion of this Study.

## **The Benefits Survey**

In addition to the salary survey, a benefits survey was developed and distributed to the comparable communities. The benefit portion of the survey collected data related to the following benefits:

Health Insurance  
Dental Insurance  
Holidays and Personal Days  
Sick Leave  
Vacation  
Tuition Reimbursement

## **Benefits Survey Findings**

Appendix C contains tables displaying and analyzing the data related to the benefits survey. As a result of the review of the data it was determined that the benefits the City provides are in some instances more generous than the comparable entities and in some instances on par with or less generous than the comparable entities. An assessment of the benefits survey results for each benefit follows:

Health Insurance – As the City offers a health benefit that is unique in its design, a direct comparison to its peer municipalities is difficult. The City offers a cafeteria type plan with an annual allocation based on family status that employees can use to build a customized benefits package. The City has available for employees five health plans; the annual allocation covers 97.5% of the premium cost of “Plan C” (\$6,722 annual premium for single coverage and \$17,488 for family coverage). This compared favorably to the premiums and contributions offered by the surveyed entities: on average, peer municipalities contributed 94% of the employee-only coverage annual premium of \$6,765 and 90% of the family coverage annual premium of \$16,406. Based on premium cost and contribution levels, it would appear that the health benefit offered by the City is more generous than its peer municipalities; however, a full analysis of the plan design of each municipality would be required to confirm this. Additionally, the City offers benefits to those employees who waive coverage due to a spouse’s coverage – benefits such as flexible spending account contributions or vision coverage that can be purchased with the annual allocation provided to all employee. Only one other surveyed municipality offers a benefit for waived coverage.

Dental Insurance – Most of the surveyed municipalities offer dental insurance although they vary widely in terms of how it is funded – for some (such as Burlington) it is included in the cost of health insurance; others pay 100% of dental premium coverage on behalf of employees, while the remaining offer coverage for purchase but require employees to pay the full premium cost.

Holidays and Personal Days – Burlington is on par with its comparable communities in this area. The City offers 10 holidays and two personal per year as compared to an average of 10 holidays and 1.9 personal days offered by the other entities in the survey.

Sick leave – Burlington provides an annual sick leave benefit that is more generous than average. Burlington offers slightly more sick leave annually (18 days) when compared to its comparable communities (an average of 16 days). Three of the thirteen responding municipalities allow unlimited accrual of sick leave. Of the remaining ten, the average maximum accrual of sick days allowed by the comparable entities is 135 days, while Burlington allows an

accrual of 180 days. Four of the thirteen responding entities do not pay out for accrued sick leave upon employee retirement; the remaining municipalities vary widely in how the accrued leave is treated (such as cash-out arrangements or application towards health insurance premiums or health savings accounts).

Vacation leave – Although Burlington offers a more generous vacation benefit early in an employee’s tenure when compared to its comparables, it generally lags behind the other entities by varying amounts at later milestones. For example, Burlington offers 10 days of vacation at the 1 year and 5 year milestones and 20 days at the 15 and 20 year milestones. In contrast, the surveyed entities on average offer 7.7 days at the 1 year milestone and 13.8, 20.8 and 23.8 at the 5, 15 and 20 year milestones.

Tuition Reimbursement – Of the twelve jurisdictions that responded to this question, five do not offer tuition reimbursement and two offer it only for Police employees. Only five peer municipalities – along with the City of Burlington – offer a tuition reimbursement program for which all employees are eligible to participate (with management approval and sufficient funding budgeted).

It should be noted that the analysis of the benefits offered does not rank the perceived value of each benefit by City employees. For example, Burlington offers a more accessible tuition reimbursement program than many of its comparables, but provides less vacation leave than its peer municipalities at some milestones. Employees may place a higher value on one of these benefits than the other. Thus, when looking at all benefits, it is recommended that a full understanding of the benefit offered (i.e. medical insurance plan design) as well as the perceived value of the benefit by the City’s employees be considered.

## V. PAY PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Development of the Pay Plan**

A basic element in any human resources management program is adequate and equitable employee compensation. A pay plan of this nature is essential if qualified employees are to be recruited and retained. To achieve these ends, there must also be a reasonable and uniform ascertainment of the job content upon which the compensation system rests. Such ascertainment and definition of job content were the purpose of the job evaluation aspects of this study.

The primary function of the proposed pay plan is to provide a structure that will enable Burlington to recruit and retain competent employees. The plan presented in this report is designed to accomplish these goals by: (1) providing for equal compensation for work of equivalent responsibility; (2) facilitating adjustments to changing economic and employment conditions requiring changes in pay levels and interrelationships; and (3) establishing pay rates that compare favorably with those of other comparable jurisdictions within the appropriate labor market.

### **Pay Plan Options for the City's Consideration**

One of the purposes of this Study was to provide a more structured pay plan that both relates to the external market and is internally equitable. The consulting team held several discussions with the Project Team (Director of Administrative Services, HR Generalist and the City Manager) to examine the many facets of salary administration, at both the technical and philosophical level. During these discussions, the concepts – and potential advantages and disadvantages – of *defined increment*, *open range* and *blended pay plans* were reviewed.

### **Defined Increment, Open-Range, and Blended Pay Plans**

*Defined increment merit plans* are pay plans that have salary ranges with a minimum and a maximum with defined percentage increments (e.g., 3%) in between. If an employee has a satisfactory performance evaluation, he/she systematically advances through the pay range. This performance evaluation, and resulting salary increment increase, occurs annually. *Open-range merit plans* also have

salary ranges with minimums and maximums, but without defined percentage increments in between. Employees are advanced through the pay range based on annual satisfactory performance evaluation, with the “percentage” of their increase determined by their supervisor.

The various levels of an organization may react differently toward, and be motivated differently by, the salary plan they work under. Management personnel may have a higher acceptance of open-range, goal-oriented merit salary plans, and thus tends to be more comfortable with and motivated by this method of compensation. Mid to lower level positions may want the assurance of a defined salary increase based on satisfactory performance. Possible advantages and disadvantages of each plan are summarized below:

### **DEFINED INCREMENT MERIT PLAN**

#### **Advantages**

City: A defined increment merit plan has the advantage of creating financial predictability because it is easier for management to foresee and plan for salary increases on an annual basis.

Employees: Employees like a defined increment merit plan because it offers security and predictability for advancement through the range. Another plus of this plan is that it offers a high degree of internal equity and fairness – the expectation that fellow workers in this plan are all being treated the same.

#### **Disadvantages**

City: A City may feel that increment plans simply reward pay increases on a routine basis. However, by tying the increase to a satisfactory performance evaluation, the City can be assured that only acceptably-performing employees will receive a salary increase.

Employees: Employees may feel unmotivated to perform at an above average or superior level, knowing their salary increase amount is pre-determined. One way to remove this negative is to allow an employee with a superior performance evaluation to get a two (2) increment increase. This, however, would be the exception and not the rule to this system. Most employees would be considered “average” performers and receive a one (1) increment increase.

### **OPEN-RANGE MERIT PLAN**

#### **Advantages**

City: The open range plan tends to motivate employees to perform at a higher level, thereby achieving greater production/benefit for the City. This plan also enables the supervising authority to reward high-performing employees with a salary increase greater than a defined increment.

Employees: Employees who are high performers like working under this plan as they can “earn” a higher percentage salary increase.

### **Disadvantages**

City: Anticipating the cost of merit increases has less financial predictability, as it is not always possible to know how many employees will be high performers in any given year. However, the City can fund a “merit increase pool” for all open-range employees to receive an average percentage (i.e., a 2-3% increase), knowing that some employees will receive less (or no increase) and some employees will earn more.

Employees: Open-range merit plans can create a *perceived* inequity regarding how individuals are granted salary increases. It is incumbent upon management to use an equitable performance evaluation system when implementing this salary plan.

### **BLENDED MERIT PLAN**

There are positives and negatives for both defined increment merit plans and open-range merit plans. However, it is also possible to design a pragmatic salary system that uses elements of both defined increment and open-range plans. It is becoming increasingly common for organizations to have a blended pay plan for various levels of positions that reflects the particular circumstances and culture of the organization. A plan of this type is customizable to the needs of the organization. The following is one example provided for consideration:

**Exempt:** All exempt employees are in an open-range merit plan.

**Non-exempt:** Non-exempt employees are in defined-increment/open-range blended merit plan. In this plan, salary ranges begin at the minimum with, for example, three defined increments and then transition into an open range. The initial increment of the assigned range is intended as the normal hiring/promoting rate. Increments 2 and 3 would be awarded upon successful completion of the employee's initial evaluation period and/or after another period that is set by the City (e.g. Increment 2 after the initial evaluation and Increment 3 after an additional year of employment.) After Increment 3 employees may advance through the open range as a result of a successful performance appraisal.

The City of Burlington is considering an open-range merit plan. A template for implementing and administering such a plan is described in the following sections. However, as the City considers adopting a merit plan – which would also require the implementation of a performance evaluation system – the City is electing to continue use of the “Transition Plan” model it currently employs for annual salary adjustments. Under that model, employees with salaries below the salary range mid-point are eligible for an increase of 3% to 4.5% depending on tenure with the organization, while employees at or above the midpoint receive an across-the-board increase of, for example, 2%.

## **Pay Philosophy**

An important component in the process of developing a pay plan is understanding and applying the pay philosophy that has been adopted by the local government jurisdiction. The Project Team has asked GovHR to design a compensation plan at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile for the City Council's consideration. A compensation plan at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile will position the City as an average or "at-market" payer with salary ranges that are higher than half of its comparable municipalities and lower than the other half of its comparables.

## **Proposed Pay Plan and Structure**

The next step in this process is to combine the Job Factor Analysis (JFA) scores included in Tables 1 and 2 with the proposed salary ranges in Table 2. The JFA scores were categorized into 11 skill level/pay grades, which recognize significant and definable differences in the level of duties and responsibilities and group classifications according to these factors. The type of pay plan desired and the City's pay philosophy were also incorporated into the development of Proposed Salary Schedule.

Table 3 outlines the Proposed Salary Schedule for this report. The minimum and maximum salary for each pay grade has been provided. There is a 7% gradation between Grades 1 through 7, a 9% gradation between Grades 8 through 10, and a 10% gradation between Grades 10 and 11. All grades have a spread of 30% from minimum to maximum salary.

## **Implementation and Administration of the Pay Plan for Current Employees**

Implementation of the Pay Plan, as it affects individual employees, should be under the following pattern of adjustments:

1. Employees whose present pay is below the minimum pay of the range for their classification should be raised to the minimum of the range.

2. The pay of employees whose present pay is within the range for their class should be slotted into the new pay plan at the current pay.
3. The pay of the employee whose present pay is above the maximum step of the range should be held at his or her present rate, *without a reduction in pay* (sometimes referred to as “red lining”), until such time as the pay range increases to the employee’s pay level. However, under this proposed pay plan there are no employee salaries currently over the range maximum.

Please note that although the City Engineer was assessed as Grade 9 in terms of job factor analysis (internal equity), the salary survey data strongly suggests that the external market is currently placing a much higher value on the position than the salary range associated with Grade 9. Therefore, we suggest the City consider compensating the City Engineer position according to the salary ranges associated with Grade 10 in order to be competitive with the external marketplace.

### **Employee Advancement through the Ranges**

It is recommended that the following procedure for ongoing administration of an open range merit plan be implemented.

The starting salary of the range (Minimum) is the normal hiring/promoting rate. Exceptions to this starting point should be limited to hiring situations involving applicants with exceptional background and qualifications; a promotional increase in which the employee’s current pay is higher than the minimum of the new range; or a labor market situation where it is impossible to recruit qualified candidates at the minimum. In these cases, employees may be appointed to their positions anywhere within the defined range, depending on their experience and qualifications. Employees should not be hired below the minimum of their pay range.

Salary advancement between the hiring rate and the top of the range (Maximum) is done throughout the employee’s tenure with the organization. Advancement through the range would be done on an annual basis via merit-based increases and would be dependent on a satisfactory performance evaluation. Incumbents progressing through the range should understand that standards of performance would become more exacting or controlling as compensation levels advance. Typical movement through the range could be in increments of 1% to 3%, depending on the employee’s performance evaluation and goal attainment, as well as the financial resources of Burlington.

It is recommended that Burlington set aside a "merit pool" every year, so as to fund increases for employees in this plan. This money would then serve as the "pool" for merit payments, knowing that some employees will be high performers, getting a higher percentage, and some employees will be lower performers, getting a lower percentage.

It should also be noted that the implementation and use of a formal performance evaluation process for all staff members is a key component to the success of this merit system. Equally, if not more important, is to have supervisors be adequately trained to perform the formal performance evaluation process.

### **Future Administration of the Pay Plan**

In order to maintain competitive salary levels and salary ranges, there should be an annual review of Burlington's salary ranges. The 6 municipal entities used in the survey group as "core comparables" for this Study have been determined to be comparable jurisdictions to Burlington. Therefore, Burlington can continue to use these jurisdictions as a comparable salary survey group for annual salary comparison purposes, until it is determined that they are no longer valid comparables. It is GovHR USA's recommendation that an annual "survey" of these jurisdictions be conducted to determine the percentage increase each organization in the comparable group may be granting as an "across-the-board increase" to their employees.

It is the further recommendation of the Consulting team that the salary ranges for each grade be increased by the average percentage increase of the comparable group and that each employee be granted the same percentage increase so that he or she retains the same position in the new salary range as he or she had in the previous range. Employees would "advance" through the pay ranges (provided that the employee is not at the maximum of the pay range) by virtue of the merit increase granted for satisfactory or above satisfactory performance of their job duties. These increases would be in addition to the increase the employees received from the across-the-board adjustment to the ranges.

### **Future Administration of the Classification Plan**

The administration of a classification plan is an ongoing process. It must be recognized that it is not static and is not intended to affix positions permanently into job classes. Instead, the plan must be administered continually to adapt it to changing conditions.

Three specific types of changes in the plan itself are possible: *abolition* of a classification, *creation* of a classification, or *adjustment/revision* of a classification. When all positions in a class are abolished or when positions are significantly changed in the nature of work duties and responsibilities so that the class becomes inappropriate or inaccurate, the classification should be abolished. Similarly, new classifications should be created when new work situations arise that are not covered by the established classifications. However, caution should be exercised in this respect, particularly to assure that new classifications are not merely duplicating established classifications, cannot be accommodated through changes in existing classifications, and reflect substantially permanent rather than temporary situations. The adjustment or revision of a classification should be done when there are substantial changes to the requirements of the classification or to the nature and complexities of the duties being performed. All changes should be thoroughly evaluated for their effect on employee morale and the integrity of the class relationships established in the classification and pay plans.

Burlington Administration will be provided with the electronic Job Analysis Questionnaire as well as the Job Factor Scoring Sheet, enabling the City to grade a newly created or revised position. GovHR USA provides scoring assistance in such cases free of charge for one year after the delivery of this report.

## **APPRECIATION**

GovHR USA has appreciated the opportunity to work with the City of Burlington, its employees and the Project Team, in this most important Classification and Compensation Study. Without the assistance and cooperation of the City's employees and the Project Team, the work of the Consultants would have been much more difficult to complete. We thank you and we would look forward to assisting the City of Burlington again in the future should the need ever arise.

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

**Table 1**

<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Total JFA Score</b>	<b>Skill Level Ranges</b>	<b>New Pay Grade</b>	<b>Recommended Title</b>
Development & Parks Director	795	765+	11	
Fire Chief	795			
Police Chief	790			
Director of Public Works	775			
Director of Administrative Svcs.	765			
<hr/>				
WWTF Superintendent	735	725-760	10	
Library Director	725	(35 points)		
<hr/>				
Assistant Fire Chief	720	685-720	9	
Police Major	720			
Fire Marshal	720			
City Engineer	690			
<hr/>				
Police Lieutenant	680	630-680	8	
Battalion Chief	675	(50 pts)		
Operations Manager	650			
Accounting Supv/City Treasurer	640			Accounting Manager/City Treasurer
Parks Superintendent	640			
Recreation Manager	640			
RecPlex General Manager	640			
Network Support Unit Manager	635			
<hr/>				
Safety Director	610	575-625	7	
Code Inspector III	605			Chief Code Inspector
Police Sergeant	590			
WWTF Maintenance Foreman	585			
Property Maintenance Manager	585			
Civil Engineer II	585			
City Planner II	580			
Senior Librarian	575			
<hr/>				
City Forester	560	520-570	6	
WWTF Pretreatment Coordinator	550			
RecPlex Maintenance Supervisor	540			
Golf Course Grounds Supt.	535			
City Clerk	525			
<hr/>				
Fiscal Officer/Records Supervisor	505	465-515	5	
Code Inspector II	465			
City Planner I	465			
Network Support Specialist	465			
<hr/>				
Engineer Intern II	455	425-460 (35 points)	4	Civil Engineer I
<hr/>				

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

**Table 1**

<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Total JFA Score</b>	<b>Skill Level Ranges</b>	<b>New Pay Grade</b>	<b>Recommended Title</b>
Code Inspector I	420	385-420	3	
Admin. Asst./Billing Manager	405			Billing Coordinator
HR Generalist	390			
Admin. Asst. - Inspection	375	345-380	2	Project Coordinator
Deputy City Clerk/Admin. Asst.	355			Deputy City Clerk/Office Coordinator
Admin. Asst. PT - Library	325	up to 340	1	Office Coordinator
Office Coordinator - PW	305			Office Coordinator
Office Coordinator - WWTF	305			Office Coordinator

CITY OF BURLINGTON

Table 2

COMPREHENSIVE TABLE WITH BENCHMARK SALARY DATA AND RECOMMENDATIONS -- 50th Percentile

Position Title	Total JFA Score	Skill Level Ranges	New Pay Grade	Salary Survey Data		Burlington			Recommended New Pay Ranges**	
				50th Percentile (Core Comps)		Current Salaries*	Current Pay Ranges		Min.	Max.
				Range Min.	Range Max.		Min.	Max.		
Development & Parks Director	795	765+	11			\$78,988	\$69,432	\$93,732	\$ 83,054	\$ 107,970
Fire Chief	795			\$80,639	\$100,985	\$91,780	\$75,726	\$103,743		
Police Chief	790			\$78,794	\$98,783	\$91,780	\$75,726	\$103,743		
Director of Public Works	775			\$82,222	\$112,643	\$96,928	\$75,726	\$103,743		
Director of Administrative Svcs.	765			\$81,229	\$107,537	\$87,282	\$75,726	\$103,743		
WWTF Superintendent	735	725-760	10	\$73,632	\$98,842	\$83,850	\$69,432	\$93,732	\$ 75,504	\$ 98,155
Library Director	725	(35 points)				\$77,662	\$65,502	\$88,427		
City Engineer***	690			\$76,311	\$100,006	\$71,422	\$59,546	\$80,388		
Assistant Fire Chief	720	685-720	9	\$73,632	\$85,842	\$72,124	\$59,546	\$80,388	\$ 69,270	\$ 90,050
Fire Marshal	720					\$69,992	\$59,546	\$80,388		
Police Major	720					\$71,812	\$59,546	\$80,388		
Police Lieutenant	680	630-680	8	\$61,966	\$78,284	\$67,522	\$55,136	\$74,433	\$ 63,550	\$ 82,615
Battalion Chief	675	(50 pts)				\$67,522	\$55,136	\$74,433		
Operations Manager	650					\$66,482	\$55,136	\$74,433		
Accounting Supv/City Treasurer	640			\$61,959	\$76,580	\$66,638	\$55,136	\$74,433		
Parks Superintendent	640			\$58,449	\$72,003	\$61,074	\$51,051	\$68,919		
Recreation Manager	640			\$56,077	\$68,515	\$66,404	\$55,136	\$74,433		
RecPlex General Manager	640					\$68,042	\$55,136	\$74,433		
Network Support Unit Manager	635			\$64,286	\$82,971	\$73,736	\$55,136	\$74,433		
Safety Director	610	575-625	7			\$53,248	--	--	\$ 56,146	\$ 72,990
Code Inspector III	605			\$51,766	\$66,012	\$63,024	\$47,270	\$63,815		
Police Sergeant	590			\$55,905	\$71,576	\$59,592	\$47,270	\$63,815		
WWTF Maintenance Foreman	585					\$57,070	\$47,270	\$63,815		
Property Maintenance Manager	585					\$59,358	\$54,051	\$68,919		
Civil Engineer II	585					TBD	N/A	N/A		
City Planner II	580					TBD	\$47,270	\$63,815		
Senior Librarian	575			\$45,364	\$62,149	\$55,259	\$47,270	\$63,815		
City Forester	560	520-570	6			\$56,836	\$44,178	\$59,640	\$ 52,473	\$ 68,215
WWTF Pretreatment Coordinator	550			\$51,622	\$62,845	\$63,830	\$47,270	\$63,815		
RecPlex Maintenance Supervisor	540					\$54,132	\$44,178	\$59,640		
Golf Course Grounds Supt.	535					\$63,232	\$47,270	\$63,815		

CITY OF BURLINGTON

Table 2

COMPREHENSIVE TABLE WITH BENCHMARK SALARY DATA AND RECOMMENDATIONS -- 50th Percentile

Position Title	Total JFA Score	Skill Level Ranges	New Pay Grade	Salary Survey Data		Burlington			Recommended New Pay Ranges**	
				50th Percentile (Core Comps)		Current Salaries*	Current Pay Ranges		Min.	Max.
				Range Min.	Range Max.		Min.	Max.		
City Clerk	525			\$44,970	\$57,866	\$58,552	\$47,270	\$63,815		
Fiscal Officer/Records Supervisor	505	465-515	5			\$51,298	\$41,287	\$55,738	\$ 49,040	\$ 63,752
Code Inspector II	465					\$46,774	\$41,287	\$55,738		
City Planner I	465			\$49,033	\$59,515	\$44,356	\$41,287	\$55,738		
Network Support Specialist	465					\$50,414	\$41,287	\$55,738		
Engineer Intern II	455	425-460 (35 points)	4			\$49,972	\$41,287	\$55,738	\$ 45,832	\$ 59,581
Code Inspector I	420	385-420	3	\$43,473	\$54,303	\$38,779	\$33,703	\$45,499	\$ 42,834	\$ 55,684
Admin. Asst./Billing Manager	405					\$45,006	\$41,287	\$55,738		
HR Generalist	390					\$36,421	\$41,287	\$55,738		
Admin. Asst. - Inspection	375	345-380	2	\$37,452	\$47,376	\$36,296	\$33,703	\$45,499	\$ 40,031	\$ 52,041
Deputy City Clerk/Admin. Asst.	355					\$43,784	\$36,062	\$48,684		
Admin. Asst. PT - Library	325	up to 340	1	\$37,452	\$47,376	\$36,337	\$33,703	\$45,499	\$ 37,413	\$ 48,636
Office Coordinator - PW	305			\$34,923	\$44,694	\$41,574	\$31,499	\$42,522		
Office Coordinator - WWTF	305			\$34,923	\$44,694	\$31,499	\$31,499	\$42,522		

\*"Current Salary" provides wages as of September 2015. If there are multiple incumbents in a position, it reflects the average of all incumbents' salaries. All salaries are converted to a 40-hr workweek for comparability. Upon implementation, wages should be pro-rated according to hours worked. Current salaries that are lower than the recommended range minimum are in green font. Current salaries that are higher than the recommended range maximum are in red font.

\*\*The City anticipates implementing the recommended new pay ranges in July 2016. Therefore, the ranges in this table have been adjusted to include the 2.5% across-the-board increase that its comparable communities plan to implement as of July 1, 2016.

\*\*\*Although the City Engineer was assessed as Grade 9 in terms of job factor analysis (internal equity), the salary survey data strongly suggests that the external market is currently placing a much higher value on the position than the salary range associated with Grade 9. Therefore, we suggest the City consider compensating the City Engineer position according to the salary ranges associated with Grade 10 in order to be competitive with the external marketplace.

**CITY OF NEW BURLINGTON  
PROPOSED PAY RANGES**

Table 3

<b>Pay Ranges at the 50th Percentile</b> <b>30% range from minimum to maximum</b> <b>7% between grades 1-7</b> <b>9% between grades 8-10</b> <b>10% between grades 10-11</b>			
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Minimum Pay</b>	<b>Midpoint</b>	<b>Maximum Pay</b>
1	\$37,413	\$43,024	\$48,636
2	\$40,031	\$46,036	\$52,041
3	\$42,834	\$49,259	\$55,684
4	\$45,832	\$52,707	\$59,581
5	\$49,040	\$56,396	\$63,752
6	\$52,473	\$60,344	\$68,215
7	\$56,146	\$64,568	\$72,990
8	\$63,550	\$73,083	\$82,615
9	\$69,270	\$79,660	\$90,050
10	\$75,504	\$86,829	\$98,155
11	\$83,054	\$95,512	\$107,970

# APPENDIX A

---

---

## EMPLOYEE JOB ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE (JAQ)

---

---

### CITY OF BURLINGTON, IOWA

---

#### IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

NAME:	DATE:
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE WITH EMPLOYER:	JOB TITLE:
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE ON THIS JOB:	YOUR JOB IS: FULL TIME <input type="checkbox"/> PART TIME <input type="checkbox"/>
YOUR YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THIS FIELD:	YOUR EDUCATION: <input type="checkbox"/> High Sch. <input type="checkbox"/> Assoc. Deg. <input type="checkbox"/> Bach. Deg. <input type="checkbox"/> Mas. Deg.
NAME OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR:	HIS/HER TITLE:

---

#### INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain additional information about your job that may not be included in your current job description. Please answer each question thoughtfully and frankly. After you have finished your portion of the questionnaire, give it to your immediate supervisor, who will complete his/her section.

---

---

General Summary: In three or four sentences, please summarize the major purpose or primary function of your job.

Please indicate if you have reviewed your current job description.

If you have any changes to your current job description, please mark them on the JD and attach it to this JAQ, or indicate changes here:

If you do not have a job description available to review, please list your job duties. Try to place your duties in their order of importance, and group "like" tasks together (e.g., "clerical duties including word processing, opening mail, filing, etc." or e.g., "front desk responsibilities including greeting visitors, answering telephones and routing calls, etc.").

#### Job Duty

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.

- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.

Feel free to add more numbers/duties if necessary.

.....

1. **Education and Training:** In your opinion, what kind of education and training is necessary to perform your job?

- Level of knowledge that is below what is normally attained through high school graduation.
- High school diploma (GED) or equivalent.
- High school, plus elementary technical training, acquired through one year or less of technical or business school.
- Extensive technical or specialized training such as would be acquired by an Associate’s Degree or two years of technical or business school.
- Completion of four-year college degree program.
- Additional professional level of education beyond a four-year college program, such as a CPA or Professional Engineer (P.E.) training.
- Completion of graduate coursework equal to a Master’s Degree or higher.

What specific degree/coursework is NECESSARY?

What specific degree/coursework is PREFERRED?

If a specific certificate or license is mandated by an outside agency to perform your duties, name the certificate or license:

What special skills, knowledge, and abilities are required to perform your job? Please list:

.....

2. **Years of Experience:** How much previous work experience do you feel is necessary to perform your job?

- LESS THAN 1 YEAR    1 TO 3 YEARS    4 TO 6 YEARS    7 TO 10 YEARS    MORE THAN 10 YEARS

What is the minimum number years required?

What specific experience is necessary?

.....

3. **Independent Judgment and Decision Making:** How much discretion do you have in making decisions with or without the input or direction of your supervisor?

- Little discretion or independent judgment exercised.
- Some discretion or judgment exercised, but supervisor is normally available.
- Job often requires making decisions in absence of specific policies and/or guidance from supervisors, but some direct guidance is received from supervisors.
- High level of discretion with decisions restricted only by broad Organization-wide policies and little direct guidance from supervisors.
- Very high level of discretion with decisions only restricted by the broadest policies of the Organization.

If you make an erroneous decision, what impact would this decision have on your work unit, department, and/or the Organization?

- Minor: Some inconvenience and delays but little cost in terms of time, money, or public/employee good will.
- Moderate: Significant costs in time, money, or public/employee good will would be incurred. Delays in important projects/schedules likely.
- Serious: Important goals would not be achieved and the financial, employee, or public relations posture of the Organization would be seriously affected.
- Very Serious: Critical goals and objectives of the Organization would be adversely and very seriously affected. Error could likely result in significant financial loss, property damage, or bodily harm/loss of life.

.....

4. **Responsibility for Policy Development:** Does your job require you to participate in the development of policies for your unit/division/department/the Organization?

- Position involves only the execution of policies or use of existing procedures.
- Position involves some participation in the development of policies and procedures for the department only. May provide some input to supervisor when policies and procedures are updated.
- Position involves some development of policies/procedures, as well as the interpretation and execution of broader policies in the department.
- Position involves significant or primary responsibility for the development of policies and procedures for a division or organizational component of a department, as well as the interpretation, execution and recommendation of changes to department policies.
- Position involves significant responsibility for major input/development of departmental policies and procedures, plus occasional participation in the development of policies which affect other departments in the organization.
- Position involves the primary responsibility for the development of departmental policies and procedures and regular participation in the development of policies that affect other departments and occasionally involves participation in the development of organization-wide policies.

Give some examples of the types of policies you've written or been a part of creating:

.....

5. **Planning:** How much latitude do you have to set your own daily work schedule and priorities for a given workday?

- Position requires that my daily work load and activities are assigned to me by my supervisor.
- Position requires that I plan my own daily work load and work independently according to established procedures or standards.
- Position requires that I plan my own daily work load and those of others in the department (first-level supervision).

- Position requires an above average ability to analyze data and develop departmental plans, including plans where a number of difficult, technical and/or administrative problems must be addressed (Manager/Division level supervision).
- Position requires a high level of analytical ability to develop plans for a department or complex situation, including plans that involve integrating/involving/impacting other departments (Department Head level supervision).

6. **Contacts with Others:** In the course of performing your job, what contacts with people in your department, other departments within the organization, and/or people from outside the organization are you required to make?

- Position involves interaction with fellow workers on routine matters with relatively little public contact.
- Position involves frequent internal and external contact, but generally on routine matters such as furnishing or obtaining information.
- Position involves frequent internal contact and regular contact with outsiders generally on routine matters, including contacts with irate outsiders which require some public relations skill for taking complaints for others to follow up upon.
- Position involves frequent internal and external contacts which require public relations skills in handling complaints. Contacts involve non-routine problems and require in-depth discussion and/or persuasion in order to resolve the problem. Handles more difficult contacts that are referred by front line employees.
- Position involves frequent internal and external contacts which require skill in dealing with, and influencing others, and initiating changes in policy/procedures to address the issue so as to avoid having to deal with the issue again in the future.
- Position involves frequent internal and external contacts in which I act as the spokesperson for the department and may be authorized to make commitments on behalf of the department.
- Position involves frequent internal and external contacts where I represent the organization and am authorized to make commitments in matters of critical interest to the City.

With which internal individuals or groups do you have the most contact?

With which external individuals or groups do you have the most contact?

7. **Supervision Given:** Do you supervise or assign work to other employees?  Yes  No

If yes:

- Position is regularly responsible for assigning work to an employee or employees, without acting in a supervisory role. To whom does this position assign work?
- Position is responsible for the supervision of one full time or several part time employees.
- Position is responsible for the supervision of two to five full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- Position is responsible for the supervision of six to 15 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 16 to 29 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 30 to 50 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of more than 51 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.

Actual number of full-time (or full-time equivalent) employees supervised:

8. **Physical Demands:** Please describe any physical demands required to perform your job.

Demand	No	Yes	How often? (rarely, occasionally or daily)
Lifting up to 20 pounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Lifting 20-50 pounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Lifting 50+ pounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Climbing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Walking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Kneeling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Crouching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Crawling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Bending	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sitting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Prolonged Standing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Prolonged Visual Concentration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Unpleasant or Hazardous Conditions:** Please describe any unpleasant or hazardous conditions you are exposed to in performing your job and how often you are exposed to those conditions. Include only those conditions which are directly related to your work rather than specific work area conditions.

Condition	No	Yes	How Often?
Lighting-dimness or brightness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dust	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Heat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Cold	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Odors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Vibration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Wetness/Humidity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Toxic Agents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Electrical Currents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Heavy Machinery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Violence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Disease	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Smoke	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

9. **Use of Technology/Specialized Equipment:** Please check the level of technology or specialized equipment use needed for you to perform your job:

- Position has no responsibility for, or use of, technology.
- Position has some basic use of computers for word processing/data entry and some use of the telephone, copier, etc.
- Position has daily use of computers for word processing/data entry and use of the telephone, fax machine, copier, etc.

- Position has daily use of computers, the Internet, Smartphones, etc. to create databases, spreadsheets, or reports. Position designs and creates customized reports, presentations, and/or documents using advanced software skills.
- Position provides routine consultation and technology support for everyday computer programming and/or software requests/questions to others in the organization; is an applications super user; or uses specialized software such as GIS or SCADA.
- Position uses/repairs/troubleshoots various pieces of specialized equipment such as HVAC, lighting, gas flares, blowers, engines, heavy equipment, diagnostic equipment, large vehicles (vacuum trucks, street sweepers, fire apparatus) and/or medical equipment.
- Position is responsible for advanced computer programming, maintenance, training, and purchasing of items such as computers, printers, scanners, etc., for the computer system for the organization (IT personnel).
- Position is responsible for system security, as well as the overall direction and supervision of the staff that are responsible for the computer and technology needs of the organization, including responsibility for developing technology policies for the organization (IT personnel).

10. **Comments/Additional Information:** Feel free to add additional information below. If using a printed copy of this form, use the back of the form to add your comments.

Type your name and the date below, then save this form as a Word document with your last name and job title in the file name and email it to your supervisor. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it and then deliver to your supervisor.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME** **DATE**

**THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR AND/OR DEPARTMENT HEAD**  
 Please provide your comments below. If using a printed copy of the form and additional space is needed, please use the back of this form or attach an additional sheet. **Please do not mark in employee's portion of the questionnaire.**

1. Do you agree with the employee's answers to all of the above questions? If not, please explain.
2. List any job duties or assignments which the employee performs which are in addition to those listed on the job description or this form.
3. How long has this employee worked for you?
4. Additional comments from the employee's immediate supervisor:

Type your name and the date below, then email this form to your Department Head (if applicable) or to the Director of Administrative Services. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it before forwarding.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME** **DATE**

**If Supervisor isn't Department Head, Department Head should review this form as well.**

- I have read the above and substantially concur.
- I have read the above and have the following comments:

Type your name and the date below, and then email this form to the Director of Administrative Services. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it before forwarding.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE**

**IMPORTANT DATES:**

**October 22<sup>nd</sup>:** Employees complete and submit the JAQs to their Supervisors. Please save file as follows: Last Name – Job Title

**October 29<sup>th</sup>:** Supervisors and Department Heads review and then submit the JAQs to Administrative Services

**November 5<sup>th</sup>:** Administrative Services reviews and then submits the JAQs to the GovHR

**November 11<sup>th</sup> through 13<sup>th</sup>:** GovHR USA conducts on-site interviews with employees

# APPENDIX B

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - City Clerk**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf					N/A - Duties included in the City Administrators job
Boone			\$70,000	Clerk/Finance Officer	
Cedar Falls	\$68,130	\$103,717			
<b>Clinton</b>	\$41,174	\$52,401			37.5 hrs/wk
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					N/A - Finance Director/City Clerk is a combined position
Fort Madison	\$55,432	\$65,062			
Keokuk			\$46,659		
Marion	\$36,455	\$53,610		Administrative Clerk	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$59,134	\$78,416			
<b>Mason City</b>			\$140,691	City Administrator	
<b>Muscatine</b>					N/A
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$44,970	\$57,866			
Spencer	\$58,447	\$70,377			
<b>Burlington</b>	\$47,270	\$63,815	\$58,552		
					<b>Mason City deleted from analysis b/c positions not analogous</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	<b>\$44,970</b>	<b>\$57,866</b>			

Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Deputy City Clerk/Administrative Assistant**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$45,257	\$65,894		Administrative Assistant	
Boone	\$20,800	\$24,960		Administrative Assistant	20 hrs/wk converted to 40
Cedar Falls					N/A
<b>Clinton</b>					N/A
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$42,518	\$54,298		Deputy City Clerk	
Fort Madison	\$32,926	\$39,291		Administrative Assistant II	All city clerical and Waterworks Office staff are classed at this - 4 employees
Keokuk					N/A
Marion	\$45,176	\$66,436			
<b>Marshalltown</b>					N/A
<b>Mason City</b>	\$53,373	\$62,067			
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$39,256	\$53,782		Administrative Secretary	
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$32,261	\$41,267		Administrative Secretary	
Spencer					N/A
<b>Burlington</b>	\$36,062	\$48,684	\$43,784		<b>This data is not included in the analysis because the majority of reported data are for Admin. Assistant/Secretary positions only (not including Deputy Clerk responsibilities).</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			

Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Development & Parks Director**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$77,237	\$123,703			Have both a Parks Director and Community Development Director & both pay range is the same
Boone					N/A
Cedar Falls					N/A
<b>Clinton</b>					N/A
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison					N/A
Keokuk					N/A
Marion	\$98,575	\$144,963		Planning & Development Director	Parks has a separate Director
<b>Marshalltown</b>					N/A - This is covered in three different departments
<b>Mason City</b>	\$86,029	\$100,006		Development Services Director	Does not include Parks/Rec/Forestry but has Transit
<b>Muscatine</b>				N/A	
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$63,336	\$80,850		Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Manager	
Spencer	\$58,447	\$70,377		Park and Recreation Director	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$69,432	\$93,732	\$78,988		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			This data is not included in the analysis because the majority of reported data are for department head positions of more limited scope.

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Administrative Assistant**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$45,257	\$65,894		Administrative Assistant	
Boone					N/A
Cedar Falls					N/A
<b>Clinton</b>					N/A
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$36,735	\$46,911		Admin. Assistant Library	Also a CD Admin Tech at \$42,518/min - \$54,298/max
Fort Madison					N/A
Keokuk			\$32,195	Administrative Secretary	
Marion	\$45,176	\$66,435			
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$39,957	\$49,899		Park and Rec Administrative Assistant	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$38,168	\$40,061			
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$34,923	\$47,840		Office Coordinator	
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$24,752	\$28,725		Beach Concessions Manager	25 hrs/wk converted to 40
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$33,703	\$45,499	\$36,296		
					<b>Ottumwa deleted from analysis b/c position not analogous</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$37,452	\$47,376			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - City Planner**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$53,438	\$77,805			
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$81,902	\$124,690		Planning & Community Services Manager	
<b>Clinton</b>			\$24,960	Planning Intern	Part-time, hours vary. Wage calculated for 40 hours.
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$44,694	\$56,963		Associate Planner	Also Senior Planner at \$61,935/min - \$79,051/max
Fort Madison	\$55,432	\$65,062		Planning & Zoning Dir/Bldg Inspector	
Keokuk			\$53,041	Community Development Director	
Marion	\$62,445	\$91,831		Associate Planner	
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	Eliminated position in 2015 through attrition
<b>Mason City</b>	\$53,373	\$62,067		Planner I	Data provided by Mason City HR to Burl. City Planner I
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$61,035	\$83,643			
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$43,202	\$55,162			
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$41,287	\$55,738	\$44,356		
					<b>Clinton deleted from analysis b/c position not analogous</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$49,033	\$59,515	\$41,809		

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Chief Code Inspector**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	Duties are included with the Community Development Director
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$69,330	\$105,548		Inspection Services Manager	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$51,766	\$66,012		Building Inspector	
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk				N/A	Duties Included with Community Dev. Director
Marion	\$82,731	\$121,663		Building Inspection Director	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$56,134	\$78,416		Chief Building Official	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$59,134	\$62,150		Chief Building Official	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$50,662	\$69,395		Senior Inspector	
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$45,053	\$52,770		Building Inspector	
Spencer	\$55,860	\$67,248		City Planner	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$47,270	\$63,815	\$63,024		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$51,766	\$66,012			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Code Inspector I**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$45,889	\$66,953		Inspector	
Boone				N/A	Duties included with Director of Public Works
Cedar Falls				N/A	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$40,372	\$51,367		Neighborhood Services Inspector	37.5 hrs/wk converted to 40
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$42,518	\$54,298		Rental & Nuisance Inspector	
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$34,015	Code Enforcement Officer	
Marion	\$55,648	\$81,835		Code Compliance Division Coordinator	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$44,429	\$54,309		Housing Inspector	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$53,643	\$56,306		Code Enforcement Officer	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$45,364	\$62,149		Inspector II	
Newton					
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$33,259	\$38,896		Housing and Code Enforcement Inspector	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$33,703	\$45,499	\$38,779		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$43,473	\$54,303			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Parks Superintendent**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$57,189	\$91,594		Parks Manager	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$47,746	\$72,679		Public Works & Parks Supervisor	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$55,844	\$71,081		Grounds & Facilities Superintendent	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$51,766	\$66,012			
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$45,416	Bridge, Park & Cemetery Manager	
Marion	\$67,896	\$99,848		Operations Manager	Reports directly to Parks Director
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	Eliminated position in 2015 through attrition
<b>Mason City</b>	\$62,878	\$72,925		Street/Parks Supervisor	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$61,053	\$83,643			
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$41,267	\$52,562		Park Maintenance Supervisor	
Spencer	\$48,586	\$58,447			
<b>Burlington</b>	\$51,051	\$68,919	\$61,074		
					<b>Ottumwa deleted from analysis b/c position not analogous</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$58,449	\$72,003			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - City Forester**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$40,710	\$63,161		Arborist	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$42,518	\$54,298			
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk				N/A	Duties Included with Bridge, Park & Cemetery Mgr.
Marion				N/A	
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>				N/A	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$41,766	\$44,533		Landscape Horticulturalist	
Newton					
<b>Ottumwa</b>				N/A	Duties included with Parks Director
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$44,178	\$59,640	\$56,836		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			<b>Insufficient data for analysis</b>

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Recreation Manager**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$57,189	\$91,594		Recreation Division Manager	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$70,527	\$107,374		Recreation & Community Programs Manager	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$59,717	\$76,010		Recreation Director	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$51,766	\$66,012		Recreation Administrator	
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk				N/A	
Marion	\$59,759	\$87,881		Recreation/Aquatics Coordinator	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$56,077	\$68,515		Recreation Supervisor	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$62,878	\$72,925		Recreation Superintendent	Reports to City Administrator
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$45,364	\$62,149		Program Supervisor	
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>				N/A	Duties included with Parks Director
Spencer				N/A	Supervising swim pool & golf course & hiring full-time & seasonal staff duties included with Park and Recreation Director
<b>Burlington</b>	\$55,136	\$74,433	\$66,404		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$56,077	\$68,515			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Network Support Unit Manager**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$66,901	\$107,148		IT Manager	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$74,462	\$113,360		Information Systems Manager	
<b>Clinton</b>			\$42,235	IT Manager	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk				N/A	
Marion	\$80,912	\$118,989		IT Manager	
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	Outsourced
<b>Mason City</b>	\$45,365	\$52,749		Information Systems Coordinator	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$64,286	\$88,071		IT Manager	
Newton					
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$65,000	\$82,971		Information Technology Manager	
Spencer				N/A	
					N/R
<b>Burlington</b>	\$55,136	\$74,433	\$73,736		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$64,286	\$82,971			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Director of Administrative Services**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf					Has a Finance Director (\$86,643 to \$138,767) and a Human Resources Director (\$77,237 to \$123,703)
Boone				N/A	Duties included with City Clerk
Cedar Falls	\$100,872	\$153,591		Director of Finance & Business Operations	
<b>Clinton</b>			\$120,000	City Administrator	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$80,236	\$102,431		Director of Finance/City Clerk	
Fort Madison	\$55,432	\$66,186		Finance Director/Treasurer	
Keokuk			\$54,109	Finance Manager	
<b>Marion</b>					City Manager performs these duties
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$101,254	\$117,645		Finance Director	Duties do not include HR but do include IT & GIS
Muscatine	\$82,222	\$112,643		Finance Director	Duties do not include labor negotiations or any HR functions
Newton					N/R
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$73,070	\$93,246		Finance Director	No HR duties
Spencer	\$64,120	\$77,302		Deputy City Manager/Finance Officer	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$75,726	\$103,743	\$87,282		<b>Please note these salary ranges are mostly for Finance Director responsibilities only, not including HR or IT</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$81,229	\$107,537			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Accounting Supervisor/City Treasurer**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$66,901	\$107,148		Manager of Accounting	
Boone				N/A	Duties included with City Clerk
Cedar Falls	\$71,835	\$109,373		Controller/City Treasurer	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$75,110	\$95,590		Finance Director	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$62,864	\$80,236		City Treasurer	
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk				N/A	Duties included with the Finance Manager's job
Marion	\$101,924	\$149,888		Finance Director	
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$62,878	\$72,925		Assistant Finance Director	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$61,053	\$83,643			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$47,694	\$60,840		Accountant	
Spencer				N/A	Duties included with Deputy City Manager/Finance Officer's job
<b>Burlington</b>	\$55,136	\$74,433	\$66,638		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$61,959	\$76,580			<b>Clinton deleted from analysis b/c position not analogous</b>

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - HR Generalist**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	
Boone				N/A	Duties included with City Clerk
Cedar Falls	\$57,888	\$89,816		Personnel Specialist	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$46,911	\$59,874		HR/EEO Specialist	
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$35,120	Payroll/HR	
Marion	\$50,034	\$73,579			
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$73,882	\$85,842		Human Resources Director	
<b>Muscatine</b>				N/A	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$85,883	\$106,704		City Attorney/HR Manager	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$41,287	\$55,738	\$36,421		<b>Mason City and Ottumwa deleted from analysis b/c positions not analogous; insufficient data for analysis of Core Comps</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Fire Chief**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$82,550	\$132,212			
Boone			\$76,244		
Cedar Falls	\$81,902	\$124,690		Assistant Director of Public Safety/Fire Chief	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$80,117	\$101,963			37.5 hrs/wk converted to 40
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$72,794	\$92,875			
Fort Madison	\$61,235	\$70,782			
Keokuk			\$69,182		
Marion	\$99,920	\$146,941			
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$81,162	\$109,866			
<b>Mason City</b>	\$86,029	\$100,006			
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$82,222	\$112,643			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$70,533	\$90,002			
Spencer	\$64,120	\$77,302			
<b>Burlington</b>	\$75,726	\$103,743	\$91,780		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$80,639	\$100,985			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Assistant Fire Chief**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$70,907	\$113,565		Assistant Fire Chief	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$58,777	\$89,477		Battalion Chief	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$59,717	\$81,077		Battalion Chief	37.5 hrs/wk
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$59,874	\$76,427		Assistant Fire Chief	
Fort Madison	\$51,193	\$63,656		Assistant Chief	56 hrs/wk
Keokuk			\$56,034	Assistant Chief	
Marion	\$75,307	\$110,745		Assistant Fire Chief	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$73,632	\$99,611		Deputy Fire Chief	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$73,882	\$85,842		Deputy Fire Chief	One for Operations & one for EMS
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$64,286	\$88,071		Battalion Chief	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$60,395	\$63,744		Assistant Chief	56 hrs/wk
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$59,546	\$80,388	\$72,124		
					Clinton, Muscatine and Ottumwa deleted from analysis b/c positions not analogous
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$73,632	\$85,842			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Fire Marshal**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls				N/A	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk				N/A	
Marion	\$72,408	\$106,482		District Chief/Fire Marshal	
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$73,882	\$85,842		Deputy Fire Chief - Fire Marshall	
<b>Muscatine</b>				N/A	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$52,562	\$67,059		Deputy Fire Chief	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$59,546	\$80,388	\$69,992		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			<b>Insufficient data for analysis</b>

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Administrative Assistant/Billing Manager**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$45,257	\$65,894		Administrative Assistant	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls				N/A	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$32,251	Account Clerk I	
Marion	\$45,176	\$66,435			
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$38,168	\$40,061		Records Clerk	Ambulance billing is outsourced
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$55,905	\$76,590			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$32,739	\$39,499		Accounting Clerk II	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$41,287	\$55,738	\$45,006		
					<b>Insufficient data from analogous positions for analysis</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Library Director**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$77,237	\$123,703			
Boone			\$63,938		
Cedar Falls	\$70,527	\$107,374			Currently share 40/60 with City of Waterloo, will change soon, as we are in process of hiring a 100% Library Director for Cedar Falls. Rates shared are 100% rates.
<b>Clinton</b>			\$68,675		
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$69,293	\$88,459			
Fort Madison	\$55,432	\$65,062			
Keokuk			\$50,340		
Marion	\$86,302	\$126,915			
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$76,731	\$103,834			
<b>Mason City</b>			\$79,539		
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$76,311	\$104,547			
Newton					
<b>Ottumwa</b>			\$66,435		
Spencer	\$58,447	\$70,377			
<b>Burlington</b>	\$65,502	\$88,427	\$77,662		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$76,311	\$103,834	\$68,675		Due to the significant disparity between the 3 actual salaries and 3 salary ranges provided by the core comps, the range data is not presented in the comprehensive table as the range data alone does not appear to fully represent the market for the position

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Senior Librarian**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$62,729	\$100,468		Assistant Library Director	
Boone	\$28,000	\$37,000		Librarian	
Cedar Falls	\$51,582	\$78,526			
<b>Clinton</b>			\$53,081	Assistant Library Director	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$36,735	\$46,911		Library Youth Services Director	
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$34,292	Library Business Manager	
Marion	\$62,384	\$91,741		Reference Librarian/ Circulation Manager	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$56,077	\$68,515		Youth Service Supervisor	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$42,224	\$42,702		Head of Information Services / Head of Youth Services	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$45,364	\$62,149			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>			\$48,173	Assistant Director	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$47,270	\$63,815	\$55,259		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$45,364	\$62,149	--		Mason City deleted from analysis b/c not true range

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Police Chief**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$86,643	\$138,767			
Boone			\$90,103	Police Chief/Director of Public Safety	
Cedar Falls	\$100,872	\$153,581		Director of Public Safety/Police Chief	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$75,110	\$95,590			37.5 hrs/wk
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$76,427	\$97,559			
Fort Madison	\$61,235	\$69,056			
Keokuk			\$69,182		
Marion	\$103,131	\$151,663			
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$81,162	\$109,866			
<b>Mason City</b>	\$86,029	\$100,006			
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$82,222	\$112,643			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$72,842	\$93,642			
Spencer	\$67,462	\$82,000			42 hrs/wk
<b>Burlington</b>	\$75,726	\$103,743	\$91,780		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$78,794	\$98,783			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Police Lieutenant**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$62,729	\$100,468			
Boone			\$70,768	Commander	
Cedar Falls	\$62,627	\$95,347		Police Captian	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>				N/R	
Fort Madison	\$53,748	\$63,664		Captain	42 hrs/wk
Keokuk			\$52,299	Captain	12 Hr. Shifts 2-2, 3-2, 2-3
Marion	\$79,758	\$104,055			
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$63,835	\$84,594			
<b>Mason City</b>	\$62,878	\$72,925			
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$61,053	\$83,643			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$52,562	\$67,059			
Spencer	\$53,274	\$61,200			42 hrs/wk
<b>Burlington</b>	\$55,136	\$74,433	\$67,522		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$61,966	\$78,284			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Sergeant**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$60,801	\$85,916			
Boone			\$60,600	Captain	
Cedar Falls	\$57,011	\$86,796		Police Lieutenant	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$51,052	\$74,003			
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$49,823		42 hrs/wk converted to 40
Marion	\$64,324	\$94,594			
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$58,551	\$71,576			41.5 hrs/wk converted to 40
<b>Mason City</b>	\$58,552	\$69,098			
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$55,905	\$76,540			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$47,694	\$60,840		Police Supervisor	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$47,270	\$63,815	\$59,592		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$55,905	\$71,576			

Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Fiscal Officer/Records Supervisor**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$44,097	\$64,337		Senior Records Clerk	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls				N/A	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$39,062	Communications/Data Processing Supervisor	
Marion				N/A	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$41,080	\$50,232		Police Records Coordinator	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$32,261	\$41,267			
<b>Muscatine</b>				N/A	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$35,797	\$40,851		Records Clerk	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$41,287	\$55,738	\$51,298		
					Data not included in analysis b/c positions appear to be insufficiently analogous
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			

Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Director of Public Works**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$86,864	\$138,767			
Boone			\$82,577	Director of Public Works/Parks/Pool/Cemetery	
Cedar Falls				N/A	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$72,794	\$92,875			Does not oversee Engineering
Fort Madison	\$81,286	\$91,499		Public Works Director	Over Water, Wastewater and Public Works
Keokuk			\$64,752		
Marion	\$98,467	\$144,804		Public Services Director	
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$86,050	\$116,459		Engineer, WPCP, Airport	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$101,254	\$117,645		Operations & Maintenance Director	Reports to City Administrator, has Street/Sewer maintenance, Wastewater and Parks
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$82,222	\$112,643			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$73,299	\$93,538		Public Works Director	
Spencer	\$64,120	\$77,302			
<b>Burlington</b>	\$75,726	\$103,743	\$96,928		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$82,222	\$112,643			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - City Engineer**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$70,907	\$113,565			
Boone			\$83,060	City Engineer/Superintendent of Water and Sewer Plants	
Cedar Falls	\$81,902	\$124,690			
<b>Clinton</b>	\$75,110	\$95,590			
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$88,459	\$112,907			
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk				N/A	
Marion	\$98,387	\$144,686			
<b>Marshalltown</b>					Duties included with Director of Public Works
<b>Mason City</b>	\$86,029	\$100,006		N/A	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$76,311	\$104,547			
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$75,941	\$96,907			
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$59,546	\$80,388	\$71,422		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$76,311	\$100,006			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Operations Manager**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf	\$70,907	\$113,565		Deputy Public Works Director	
Boone			\$56,134	Foreman	
Cedar Falls	\$73,154	\$111,367		Public Works & Parks Manager	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$55,844	\$75,820		Grounds & Facilities Superintendent	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$56,963	\$72,794		PW Operations Manager	
Fort Madison	\$55,432	\$65,062		Superintendent - Public Works	
Keokuk	\$48,688	\$54,325		Each Dept. has it's own Manager	
Marion	\$80,594	\$118,520			
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>				N/A	
<b>Muscatine</b>				N/A	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$55,162	\$70,346		Public Works Superintendent	
Spencer	\$48,586	\$58,447		Street Superintendent	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$55,136	\$74,433	\$66,482		<b>Data not included in analysis as position appear to be insufficiently analogous; plus data points are limited once reduced to core comps</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - WWTF Superintendent**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$70,527	\$107,374		Water Reclamation Manager	Does not include duties with residential solid waste program; garbage, refuse, leaves & recyclables.
<b>Clinton</b>	\$55,844	\$71,081		Water Quality Superintendent	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison	\$55,432	\$65,062			
Keokuk			\$69,182	Water Pollution Control Superintendent	
Marion				N/A	Contracts with City of Cedar Rapids for services
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$73,632	\$99,611		WPCP Superintendent	Does not include garbage, refuse, leaves, recyclables
<b>Mason City</b>	\$62,878	\$72,925		Water Reclamation Supervisor	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$76,311	\$104,547		WPCP Director	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$78,042	\$98,842		WPCF Superintendent	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$69,432	\$93,732	\$83,850		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$73,632	\$98,842			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Office Coordinator**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls				N/A	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$32,218	\$41,008		Administrative Specialist	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	\$34,988	\$44,694		Department Secretary	
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk			\$32,218	Secretary/Clerk	
Marion	\$45,176	\$66,435			N/A - Contracts with City of Cedar Rapids for services
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$39,957	\$49,899		Admin Asissant /Office Manager	
<b>Mason City</b>				N/A	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$34,923	\$47,840			
Newton					
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$31,013	\$37,378		Clerk	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$31,499	\$42,522	\$36,537		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$34,923	\$44,694			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - Pretreatment Coordinator**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	
Boone				N/A	
Cedar Falls	\$47,746	\$72,679		Water Reclamation Supervisor	
<b>Clinton</b>	\$42,209	\$52,766		Pretreatment Technician	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison				N/A	
Keokuk					Duties included with Superintendent's job
Marion				N/A	Contracts with City of Cedar Rapids for services
<b>Marshalltown</b>				N/A	
<b>Mason City</b>	\$62,878	\$72,925			Position includes Safety Director duties
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$61,035	\$83,643		Environmental Coordinator	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$39,978	\$45,843			
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$47,270	\$63,815	\$63,830		
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	\$51,622	\$62,845			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DETAILED SALARY SURVEY DATA**

**Position - WWTF Maintenance Foreman**

<b>All Communities</b>	Minimum	Maximum	Actual	Title - If Different	Comments
Bettendorf				N/A	
Boone			\$58,534	Assistant Superintendent	
Cedar Falls				N/A	
<b>Clinton</b>				N/A	
<b>Fort Dodge</b>					
Fort Madison	\$41,579	\$49,130		Maintenance Operator	
Keokuk			\$54,313	Chief Operator	
Marion				N/A	Contracts with City of Cedar Rapids for services
<b>Marshalltown</b>	\$59,134	\$78,416		WPCP Assistant Superintendent	
<b>Mason City</b>				N/A	
<b>Muscatine</b>	\$67,683	\$92,727		Plant Maintenance Manager	
Newton				N/R	
<b>Ottumwa</b>	\$44,970	\$57,866		Maintenance Supervisor	
Spencer				N/A	
<b>Burlington</b>	\$47,270	\$63,815	\$57,070		
					<b>Data not included in analysis b/c positions appear insufficiently analogous</b>
<b>50th Percentile-Core Comps</b>	N/A	N/A			

**Note: Only data from the "Core Comparables" in bold was used to calculate the recommended salary ranges at the 50th percentile for the City of Burlington.**

# APPENDIX C

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
HEALTH INSURANCE**

Municipality	PPO Employee Only Plan			PPO Family Plan			Benefit for waived coverage?	Comments
	Total Premium	% Paid by Employee	% Paid by Muni.	Total Premium	% Paid by Employee	% Paid by Muni.		
Bettendorf	\$6,480	5%	95%	\$14,400	5%	95%	No	Includes dental
Boone	\$7,955	0%	100%	\$19,240	5%	95%	No	For family coverage, non-union employees actually pay 8% of the difference between single and family coverage. Given the 2015 premium amounts, that works out to 5% (rounded) which is entered at left. Also, City offers an HSA at no cost to employee for family coverage and City also contributes to that account
Cedar Falls	\$5,164	5%	95%	\$14,865	6%	94%	No	
Clinton	\$8,520	4%	96%	\$42,576*	4%	96%	No	Fire Union employees pay only 3%
Fort Dodge	\$6,520	8%	92%	\$16,704	8%	92%	N/R	Employees in the PPO plan are eligible for reimbursement of 80% of the \$500/\$1,000 deductible with documentation of payment. Fort Dodge also offers a high-deductible plan
Fort Madison	\$6,193	6%	92%	\$17,906	10%	90%	No	Current contribution is for most employees 6% (single) and 10% (family) through 7/16. Contribution will then increase up to 8% and 12% by 2017 for most employee groups
Keokuk	\$5,716	0%	100%	\$15,900	10%	90%	No	
Marion	\$5,962	8%	92%	\$14,905	8%	92%	Yes	Employees that waive family coverage (when eligible) receive the following benefit: electing single-only coverage allows them to get a \$100 bonus each month by encouraging spouses to elect coverage through their own insurance
Marshalltown	\$6,192	15%	85%	\$14,619	15%	85%	No	Includes dental
Mason City	\$6907 for 80/20 plan; \$7507 for 90/10 plan	10%	90%	\$13282 for 80/20 plan; \$14436 for 90/10 plan	10%	90%	No	
Muscatine	\$6,078	5%	95%	\$16,167	5%	95%	No	Rates begin in 2016
Newton	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	N/R
Ottumwa	\$8,158	10%	90%	\$19,034	10%	90%	No	
Spencer	\$7,556/\$8,040	0%	100%	\$18,843/\$19,707	28% or 31%	69% or 72%	No	Also offers a high-deductible plan
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>\$6,765</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>\$16,406</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>90%</b>		
Burlington	\$6,722	2.5%	97.5%	\$17,488	2.5%	97.5%	Yes	Cafeteria plan allocation includes Dental. Premium amounts at left are for Plan C of 5 health plans. City pays 97.5% of premium for Plan C; higher or lower cost plans can be selected for additional employee contribution or unused annual allocation to spend on other benefits. There is a 5% cap on annual cost increases -- if over 5%, plan design changes are made or an increase in contribution is made; decision made with employee representation. For employees with other insurance who waive coverage, a wrap plan is available, as are other benefits (flex spending, vision, etc.) that can be purchased with annual allocation amount

\*Clinton's family plan premium not included in calculation of the average premium

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DENTAL INSURANCE**

Municipality	Employee Only Plan			Family Plan			Comments
	Total Premium	% Paid by Employee	% Paid by Municipality	Total Premium	% Paid by Employee	% Paid by Municipality	
Bettendorf	--	--	--	--	--	--	Included in health insurance coverage
Boone	\$392	0%	100%	\$1,286	9%	91%	For family plan employee pays \$120 annually, which is approximately 9%
Cedar Falls	--	--	--	--	--	--	N/R
Clinton	\$307	0%	100%	\$806	0%	100%	
Fort Dodge	unknown	0%	100%	unknown	0%	100%	
Fort Madison	\$276	100%	0%	\$846	100%	0%	
Keokuk	\$316	0%	100%	\$969	10%	90%	
Marion	\$241	8%	92%	\$624	8%	92%	
Marshalltown	--	--	--	--	--	--	Included in health insurance coverage
Mason City	\$402	100%	0%	\$1,407	100%	0%	
Muscatine	\$31	0%	100%	\$55	100%	0%	Rates begin in 2016
Newton	--	--	--	--	--	--	N/R
Ottumwa	\$216	0%	100%	\$456	100%	0%	
Spencer	--	--	--	--	--	--	N/A
Burlington	--	--	--	--	--	--	Included in health insurance coverage

## CITY OF BURLINGTON HOLIDAYS AND PERSONAL DAYS

Municipality	Holidays per Year	Personal Days per Year
Bettendorf	11	1
Boone	10	0
Cedar Falls	11	0
Clinton	9 for non-bargaining, 10 for Fire union, 10 for Police union, 11 for AFSCME union	3 for non-bargaining
Fort Dodge*	9	2
Fort Madison*	10	2
Keokuk	11	5
Marion	11	2
Marshalltown	8-9 depending on union/non-union	2-3 based on union/non-union
Mason City	10	1
Muscatine	10	1 to 1.5 depending on position
Newton	N/R	N/R
Ottumwa	11	1
Spencer	7	4
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1.9</b>
Burlington*	10	2

\*Burlington: Library employees receive 7 holidays per year and 5 personal days. Police sergeants receive 80 "Kelly hours" per fiscal year in lieu of holidays. Fire Battalion Chiefs accrue 24 hour "Comp days" in lieu of holidays and no personal days

\*Fort Dodge: Employees who use no sick days in a calendar year earn one additional holiday to be used the following year

\*Fort Madison: Library Staff have 11 holidays

## CITY OF BURLINGTON SICK LEAVE

Municipality	Sick Days Earned per Year	Maximum Accrual of Days (Sick Leave Bank)	Treatment of Accrued Sick Leave at Retirement
Bettendorf*	10	120	Not paid out
Boone	18	Unlimited	If hired after October 2007 then max \$2,000 buyout; if hired prior to and have been with the City more than 5 years then 80% of 1440 hours
Cedar Falls	12	Unlimited	SE & NE & Fire Union employees: can use toward health premiums according to following payout schedule: 0% for first 90 days; 100% next 90 days;+ 50% of days over 180 days; Police Union & Parks Public Works Union employees: not eligible for payout. (These payout policies are for employees hired after 7/1/89)
Clinton*	14	120	Not paid out
Fort Dodge	18	200	Non-department heads hired after 2013 receive separation pay at retirement according to following schedule: 15 yrs service/125 days sick leave/\$5,000; 20 yrs/150 days/\$6,500; 25 yrs/175 days/\$8,000; 30+ yrs/200 days/\$10,000. For department heads: 4 yrs/\$10,000; 10 yrs/\$13,000; 20 yrs/\$16,000; 30+ yrs/\$20,000
Fort Madison*	18	Varies between 100 and 125 days	Non-Bargaining up to 250 hours after 25 years of employment. Other employee groups: if you have 20 years of service you receive payment of the following: up to 500 hours paid out for Library and Water; 500 hours for Public Works and 400 hours for Police; Fire receives nothing
Keokuk	13	180	IPERS rules currently in effect, up to 720 hours may be cashed out or, up to 1440 hours may be used to purchase insurance
Marion	18	112.5	Not paid out
Marshalltown	12	130	If over 15 years of service - 25% goes into a Health Saving Account
Mason City	18	120	Not paid out
Muscatine	15	140	40% paid into a retirement Health Savings Account
Newton	--	--	N/R
Ottumwa	24	240	Not paid out for most employee groups. Fire union personnel receive cash contribution to PEHP plan at separation if a minimum of 2,400 hours sick leave is accrued. Chief and Deputy Chief receive annual payout of 25% of sick leave accrued over 1,920 hours
Spencer	12	Unlimited	320 hours is the max paid out at the employee's hourly salary or half the accrued sick leave hours, whichever is less
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>16</b>		
Burlington	18	180	Cash payout for leave in excess of 120 days (Fire Battalion Chiefs: 1440 hrs) but not exceeding 180 days (Battalion Chiefs: 2160 hrs). Employees who elect to remain on City's health insurance after retirement contribute 100% of pre-tax sick leave payout to an HRA

\*Burlington: Fire Battalion Chiefs accrue sick leave at rate of 24 hours/month up to 1080 hours, then at a rate of 16 hrs/month up to 2160 hours

\*Bettendorf: the 120 days maximum accrual in the chart above is for Non-Union, AFSCME General, AFSCME Library, Police Non-Sworn and non-shift Fire. Maximum accrual for Police Sworn are 104 days due to 10 hour shifts and for Fire Shift employees it is 100 duty days

\*Clinton: Fire Union employees receive 12 Sick days. Maximum accrual of 150 days for Police Union and 60 days for Fire Union

\*Fort Madison: Police and Public Works employees receive 21 sick days.

## CITY OF BURLINGTON VACATION

Municipality	Milestone Comparison -- Days of Vacation in Given Year						Comments
	1 yr	5 yrs	10 yrs	15 yrs	20 yrs	25 yrs	
Bettendorf	10	15	15	20	25	25	Vacation schedule for non-union
Boone	5	15	20	20	20	20	Vacation schedule for non-union
Cedar Falls	10	10	15	20	25	25	
Clinton	5	15	20	20	25	25	30 days for 30+ years
Fort Dodge	10	15	20	25	25	25	N/R
Fort Madison	10	15	15	20	25	25	There is a slightly different vacation schedule for water employees. Newer hires not eligible for 25 days
Keokuk	5	15	20	20	25	30	
Marion	10	15	20	25	25	25	
Marshalltown	5	15	15	20	25	25	
Mason City	5	10	15	20	20	25	
Muscatine	10	15	15	20	25	25	
Newton	--	--	--	--	--	--	N/R
Ottumwa	10	15	15	20	25	25	
Spencer	5	10	15	20	20	20	Vacation schedule for non-union
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>24.6</b>	
<b>Burlington*</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	

## CITY OF BURLINGTON VACATION

Municipality	Time Off for Years of Service												Comments & Additional Entries
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5		Level 6		
	Years	Days	Years	Days	Years	Days	Years	Days	Years	Days	Years	Days	
Bettendorf	<5	10	5	15	11	20	18	25					Vacation schedule for non-union
Boone	1	5	2	10	5	15	10	20					Vacation schedule for non-union
Cedar Falls	1 to 6	10	7 to 12	15	13 to 18	20	> 18	25					
Clinton	1	5	2	10	5	15	10	20	20	25	30	30	
Fort Dodge	1	10	4	15	7	20	11	25					
Fort Madison	1	10	4	15	12	20	18	25					There is a slightly different vacation schedule for water employees. Newer hires not eligible for 25 days
Keokuk	1	5	2	10	4	15	10	20	17	25	25	30	
Marion	<2	10	2 to 8	15	9 to 14	20	15+	25					
Marshalltown	1	5	2	10	5	15	12	20	20	25			The 20 years of service has some grandfathered employees and for some unions it is automatic
Mason City	0.5	2.5	1	5	2	10	8	15	14	20	22	25	
Muscatine	0 to 4	10	5 to 12	15	13 to 19	20	20+	25					Union positions receive 5 days in first year
Newton	--		--		--		--		--		--		N/R
Ottumwa	<5	10	5	15	12	20	20	25					
Spencer	1	5	2	10	9	15	15	20					Vacation schedule for non-union
<b>Burlington</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>					

\*Burlington: Employees that do not use sick leave during the six month period from 1/1-6/30 or 7/1-12/31 earn 1 extra day of vacation leave for each 6-month period completed in a fiscal year. Fire Battalion Chiefs accrue vacation according to the following schedule: 1-4 yrs=120 hrs accrued; 5-9=144 hrs; 10-14=168 hrs; 15-19=240 hrs; 20-24=288 hrs; 25+=360 hrs. Department heads and supervisors have opportunity to accrue vacation based on continuous years of service with public employers

**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
TUITION REIMBURSEMENT**

Municipality	Offered?	Program Parameters
<b>Bettendorf</b>	Yes	50% of books and tuition. Must receive a C or above in order to receive reimbursement.
<b>Boone</b>	Yes	Only for Police
<b>Cedar Falls</b>	No	--
<b>Clinton</b>	Yes	Only for Police Officers and Office Secretary. Tuition and books reimbursement only for college courses required for an A.A. degree in law enforcement or 60 hours of credit toward a degree in law enforcement. Employee must obtain approval from Police Chief prior to taking the course. Receipts are required showing expense incurred
<b>Fort Dodge</b>	N/R	--
<b>Fort Madison</b>	Yes	75% reimbursement for tuition and books for regular full-time employees to improve appropriate skills and knowledge in the performance of the employee's job will be given after course completion with a passing grade. Prior to class, department head
<b>Keokuk</b>	No	--
<b>Marion</b>	Yes	50% reimbursement for tuition and books for pre-approved, job-related coursework contingent on funding being available within the departments current budget
<b>Marshalltown</b>	No	--
<b>Mason City</b>	No	--
<b>Muscatine</b>	Yes	If related to work and with department head and City Administrator approval
<b>Newton</b>	N/R	--
<b>Ottumwa</b>	No	--
<b>Spencer</b>	Yes	Reimbursement for tuition and books for classes related to work. If employee leaves City employment within four years of taking class, repayment if prorated
<b>Burlington</b>	Yes	Maximum of \$1,000/year for college/university courses and \$300/year for technical/skill-related courses. Course or degree must be work-related. Employee must have tenure of one to three years and average or above average evaluations to be eligible. Approval at discretion of management. 100% reimbursement for "A", 75% for "B", and 50% for "C". Separation within two years requires full repayment of reimbursement