



CITY OF DYERSVILLE, IOWA
CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY

FINAL REPORT

June 2021



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	
Scope of Work	Page 1
II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Internal Equity – Classification Plan Development	Page 3
Job Title Changes	Page 4
External Equity – Market Competitiveness	Page 4
Salary and Benefit Survey	Page 5
Proposed Classification and Compensation Plan	Page 5
Future Administration of the Classification and Compensation Plan	Page 5
III. JOB EVALUATION	
Job Evaluation	Page 6
IV. THE CLASSIFICATION PLAN	
The Classification Plan	Page 8
V. SALARY AND BENEFIT DATA	
Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Data Purposes	Page 9
Salary Survey	Page 11
Appraisal and Use of the Salary Data	Page 11
Benefit Survey Findings	Page 12
VI. COMPENSATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Development of the Compensation Plan	Page 15
Compensation Plan Options for the City’s Consideration	Page 15
Recommendation: Open-Range Merit Plan	Page 18
Pay Percentile	Page 18
Proposed Compensation Plan and Structure	Page 18
Implementation and Administration of the Compensation Plan	Page 19
Employee Advancement through the Ranges	Page 20
Future Administration of the Compensation Plan	Page 21
Future Administration of the Classification Plan	Page 22
Appreciation	Page 23

TABLES

Table 1: Classification Plan	Page 24
Table 2: Comprehensive Table	Page 25
Table 3: Proposed Compensation Ranges	Page 26

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Job Analysis Questionnaire	Page 27
Appendix B: Comparable Community Analysis	Page 34
Appendix C: Detailed Salary Survey Data	Page 39
Appendix D: Detailed Benefit Survey Data	Page 61

I. INTRODUCTION

GovHR USA, LLC (GovHR) is pleased to have had the opportunity to work with the City of Dyersville on this Classification and Compensation Study. Human resource management is a significant concern as governmental services continue to increase in cost and complexity, and the resources to fund local governments are constrained. Day-to-day operations present 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 Classification and Compensation Plan forms the foundation for meeting these challenges. It helps to ensure that the City can not only recruit the best and brightest employees but can also retain those employees, even in a competitive marketplace. By retaining qualified, experienced employees the City avoids the costs of re-recruitments and lost productivity, while maximizing the benefits of the investments it has made in employees and the institutional and community knowledge acquired by those employees over their tenures.

GovHR understands the high expectations that have been established in Dyersville for service delivery and competitiveness in recruiting and retaining excellent employees. These factors have been taken into consideration in the analysis and reflected in the Study results.

Scope of Work

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

I. Job Evaluation Analysis and Job Classification System

Below is a list of tasks included in this component of the Study (listed in the order that the work was performed):

- **Study preparation and project meetings.** Met with the City Administrator to discuss Study methods and expectations, and to review the current compensation and organizational structure. Determined potential problem areas, answered questions, and reviewed the scope and schedule of work.
- **Material distribution.** Prepared a memorandum of explanation, which was distributed to employees. Held meetings with employees to discuss the Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) and to explain the scope and purpose of the Study. Employees were allowed about ten (10) days to complete the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires were then reviewed by each employee's Supervisor and/or Department Head and City Administration. The JAQs were returned to GovHR within approximately three (3) weeks of distribution.

- **Determined comparable communities and collected compensation data.** GovHR, along with the City, determined a logical survey sample of “like” communities that impact the compensation market of Dyersville. Then, GovHR designed and sent out the survey for the benchmark positions and benefits covered in the Study.
- **Job Evaluation Analysis and Establishment of a Classification Plan.** Upon return of the JAQs by the City, GovHR performed the following:
 - Read each JAQ and corresponding Job Description in its entirety.
 - Conducted virtual interviews with at least one (1) employee in each position covered by the Study to further understand the scope of duties and responsibilities of the position.
 - Applied a measurement system of Job Evaluation Factors to all positions, which formed the basis for internal rankings (equity) of positions.
 - Upon completion of the Job Evaluation measurements, a new Classification Plan was developed.

II. Salary and Benefit Survey

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

- Tabulated, summarized, and analyzed comparative compensation information obtained from the comparable communities. Prepared pay tabulations that compared the salary ranges of the City of Dyersville to the salary ranges of its comparable communities. Prepared comparison calculations at the 50th, 60th, 65th, 70th, 75th and 80th percentiles. Displayed data for each jurisdiction and for each position and summarized the data in table form. Based on discussions with the City and the gathered data, developed salary ranges that would establish Dyersville as a payer at the 65th percentile of the salary data from the comparable communities.
- Based on the above data, developed and recommended new salary schedules and recommended new Job Titles for some positions.
- Analyzed and summarized the benefit information.

III. Final Report and Presentation

- A preliminary analysis of the data and recommended Classification and Compensation Plan was shared with the City. Feedback from City Administration was reviewed and incorporated into the recommendations.
- A final report was prepared by the Consultant and sent electronically to the City.
- A presentation of these findings will be conducted for City Leaders.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Classification and Compensation Study encompasses a significant amount of information that can be time consuming to condense and organize into an abbreviated format. Therefore, GovHR has compiled this Executive Summary in order to provide a quick synopsis regarding the major components, findings and recommendations of this Study. The purpose of a well-designed Classification and Compensation Study is twofold. First, it establishes internal equity (ranking) among employees across Departments in the City. Second, it assures external equity/competitiveness by comparing the compensation of Dyersville employees against market data.

Internal Equity - Classification Plan Development

The Study developed a new Classification Plan for nineteen (19) positions in the City of Dyersville. To complete this task, the Consultant completed a Job Evaluation. The Job Evaluation included the completion of a questionnaire by all employees covered in the Study and interviews with at least one (1) employee working in each position covered by the Study (see Appendix A). Upon the completion of those tasks, the Consultants assigned a numerical value to each position so that like positions within the organization would be grouped together in a classification to produce an internal equity hierarchy. Nine (9) factors were used for the evaluation of Dyersville's positions:

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

The product of this internal ranking is shown in Table 1, which lists the City's positions with their numerical Job Evaluation score, also known as a Classification Plan. The higher the Job Evaluation Score, the higher the position is within the Classification Plan.

Job Title Changes

After conducting the Job Evaluation noted above, the Consultants observed some inconsistencies with the market and the actual duties assigned to some positions. Therefore, the following Job Title changes have been recommended based on clarification of duties and market trends.

Current Title

Parks and Recreation Director

Proposed New Title

Parks and Recreation Manager

External Equity – Market Competitiveness

The next component of the Classification and Compensation Study involved establishing external competitiveness. A group of communities comparable to the City was established. The Consultants started with Iowa communities with populations between 2,000 and 10,000 in the following counties: Allamakee, Benton, Black Hawk, Bremer, Buchanan, Cedar, Chickasaw, Clayton, Clinton, Delaware, Des Moines, Dubuque, Fayette, Henry, Howard, Iowa, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Jones, Keokuk Lee, Linn, Louisa, Muscatine, Poweshiek, Scott, Tama, Van Buren, Washington, and Winneshiek. After that, a specific set of comparison criteria (e.g., median household income, property tax revenue, etc.) was applied to each community (see Appendix B). Based on the results of this analysis, nineteen (19) communities with a total compatibility score of eighty-five (85) or greater were deemed to be most comparable to the City. In addition, the City added five (5) communities that scored less than eighty-five (85) but are competitors in the marketplace (noted in **bold** below). The full list of the twenty-four (24) chosen comparables is listed below.

Anamosa	Hiawatha	New Hampton
Asbury	Independence	North Liberty
Camanche	Le Claire	Oelwein
Cedar Rapids	Manchester	Tiffin
Cresco	Maquoketa	Vinton
DeWitt	Marion	Waukon
Dubuque	Monticello	West Burlington
Eldridge	Mount Vernon	Williamsburg

Salary and Benefit Data

GovHR then prepared and distributed a salary and benefit survey to the twenty-four (24) comparable communities. All of the communities, except Anamosa, Le Claire, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids, responded to the survey either by directly responding to the survey or supplying GovHR with a copy of their most recent Compensation Plan. The salary summary results can be found in Table 2 and the detailed salary data can be found in Appendix C. To provide external competitiveness for the City's salaries, the salary ranges derived from this data collection were used to help establish the proposed Compensation Plan. In some cases where there was not enough salary range data, actual salaries were used. The recommended pay ranges are contained within Table 3 of the report.

Proposed Classification and Compensation Plan

The goal of this Study was to recommend a Classification and Compensation Plan that is internally equitable and externally competitive. To accomplish this, a Compensation Plan was developed using the 65th percentile comparison of the salary ranges that were acquired through the salary survey. The resulting Classification and Compensation Plan consists of nine (9) pay grades; one (1) being lowest and nine (9) being highest and is broken down into the following four (4) bands:

Grades 1 – 3: Administrative and Technical Staff

Grades 4 – 5: Supervisory and Advanced Technical Staff

Grades 6 – 8: Directors and Senior Manager

Grade 9: City Administrator

Grades 1 – 5 are a blended merit plan, while Grades 6 – 9 are open ranges. There is an 7.5% gradation between Grades 1 – 3 and a 5% gradation between Grades 4 – 5. All Grades 1 – 5 have a 30% range spread with a defined step increment of 2% from Step A – Step J and then an open range from Step J to the maximum of the range. There is a 12% gradation between Grades 6 – 8. Grades 6 – 9 have a 40% range spread from minimum to maximum.

Future Administration of the Classification and Compensation Plan

Within the body of this report, GovHR has outlined how the City can maintain the Classification and Compensation Plan. GovHR will supply the City with a User's Manual and all associated documents to maintain the Classification and Compensation Plan and the steps to ensure the City remains competitive with the market in the years to come.

III. JOB EVALUATION

GovHR's approach to Job Evaluation involves a quantitative point and factor comparison method, which cross-compares all positions in the organization against numerous factors such as educational requirements, experience, work conditions, etc. Therefore, all jobs in each organizational unit (e.g., Police, Administration, Public Works, etc.) may be compared against each other, based upon the same factors.

In conducting the Job Evaluation exercise, it must be emphasized that the position, and not the incumbent's qualifications, performance, or years of service in the position, is evaluated. An incumbent employee may feel he/she 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 may feel he/she does more tasks than a similar employee in another Department, but these are not valid determinants for a position.

Before reviewing the results of the evaluation of the positions, it is important to note that the purpose of a 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 Dyersville's positions are as follows:

- 1) Preparation and Training
- 2) Experience Required
- 3) Decision Making and Independent Judgment
- 4) Responsibility for Policy Development
- 5) Planning of Work
- 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 position were reviewed via a thorough reading of the incumbent’s current job description and a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) completed by each employee (Appendix A). In addition, GovHR conducted interviews with at least one (1) employee in each of the positions covered by the Study. Points were then assigned to each factor by selecting the description that best fit the appropriate level of compliance. In other words, a position that requires a Master’s Degree would receive more points under the “Preparation and Training” factor than positions that did not require this advanced degree. Points for each factor were then totaled for each position. Using this method, the positions were found to fall into distinguishable Job Factor Analysis (JFA) scores. Table 1 contains the Classification Plan, including the Position Title, the Proposed New Title (if applicable), the JFA Score, Skill Level, and proposed Grade for the evaluated positions.

As part of the service provided in the Compensation Study, GovHR makes Job Title change recommendations to either reflect a better description of the job being performed or to be consistent with trends in the organization or the marketplace. Based on this, GovHR recommends the following Job Title changes:

Current Title

Parks and Recreation Director

Proposed New Title

Parks and Recreation Manager

IV. THE CLASSIFICATION PLAN

A Classification Plan provides for a systematic arrangement of positions into classifications. A position, often referred to as a job (e.g., Administrative Assistant), contains a specific set of duties and responsibilities and that is the objective of the classification process – not the person currently holding that job. A classification is a grouping of positions which have similar levels of knowledge, skills and abilities needed to perform the job. The positions are also similar in nature of work, level of work difficulty and responsibilities. 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, they can be in different departments, dealing with different subject matters and performing different duties.

It is this arrangement of positions and resulting classification structure that forms the basis for the Classification Plan. As noted in the previous section, a Job Evaluation and Classification Plan 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 classification simply because the individual performs with a high degree of success and efficiency, nor is it placed in a lower classification simply because the incumbent performs with low competence or productivity. Variations in individual performance are not recognized by differences in classifications, instead they 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. 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 Classification Plan is an exceedingly useful managerial tool. It provides the fundamental rationale for the Compensation 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 classifications and hierarchies.

V. SALARY AND BENEFIT DATA

The City of Dyersville initiated this Study with the objective of assuring that its Compensation Plan is both internally equitable and externally competitive. The Job Evaluation System (outlined in Section III) is performed to address the issue of internal equity. To achieve external competitiveness, a market survey of comparable jurisdictions was conducted. The following explains the labor market review and collection of salary data.

Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Data Purposes

Selecting jurisdictions for the comparison group is an important element in a Classification and Compensation Study. When selecting jurisdictions to serve as comparables, it is important to use particular criteria to evaluate the other jurisdictions to assure that those chosen as comparables will be the most similar to Dyersville.

To determine which municipalities should be used for survey purposes, GovHR first considered all Iowa communities with populations between 2,000 and 10,000 in the following counties: Allamakee, Benton, Black Hawk, Bremer, Buchanan, Cedar, Chickasaw, Clayton, Clinton, Delaware, Des Moines, Dubuque, Fayette, Henry, Howard, Iowa, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Jones, Keokuk Lee, Linn, Louisa, Muscatine, Poweshiek, Scott, Tama, Van Buren, Washington, and Winneshiek; and then applied the following seven (7) criterion:

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Total Possible Points</u>	<u>Factor Weight</u>
1. Population	15	15%
2. Median Household Income	15	15%
3. Total Valuation	15	15%
4. Property Tax Revenue	15	15%
5. Total Exp. (Less Capital Projects)	15	15%
6. Salaries and Wages Paid	15	15%
7. Proximity	10	10%
	100	100%

The seven (7) categories listed above were selected to mirror important criteria that reflected the following:

- 1) Similar Financial Conditions: 85% of the criteria involved financial benchmarks.
- 2) Population: 15% of the criteria involved a population comparison.
- 3) Proximity: 10% of the criteria involved the proximity of the communities to Dyersville.

Within each of the seven (7) categories, ranges of compatibility were established. For example, the closer a community was to matching the Dyersville’s estimated population, the closer the community would be to receiving the maximum of fifteen (15) points. A community whose population was significantly larger or smaller than Dyersville’s population would receive fewer or even zero (0) points. Thus, a municipality achieving a total of one hundred (100) points would be considered most comparable to the City of Dyersville. A community with zero (0) points was therefore determined to be the least comparable to Dyersville. A more detailed explanation of the methodology used to determine the comparable communities is included in Appendix B.

A cutoff of eighty-five (85) points was established to select the communities most similar to Dyersville across the seven (7) categories. After applying the seven (7) criteria, nineteen (19) communities achieved eighty-five (85) or more compatibility points on the comparison scale with Dyersville. In addition, the City added five (5) communities that scored less than eighty-five (85) but are competitors in the marketplace (noted in **bold** below). The full list of the twenty-four (24) chosen comparables is listed below.

Anamosa	Hiawatha	New Hampton
Asbury	Independence	North Liberty
Camanche	Le Claire	Oelwein
Cedar Rapids	Manchester	Tiffin
Cresco	Maquoketa	Vinton
DeWitt	Marion	Waukon
Dubuque	Monticello	West Burlington
Eldridge	Mount Vernon	Williamsburg

Salary Survey

The Consultants then prepared and distributed a salary survey to the twenty-four (24) comparable communities. All of the communities, except Anamosa, Le Claire, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids, responded to the survey either by directly responding to the survey or supplying GovHR with a copy of their most recent Compensation Plan. Table 2 is a summary of the benchmark salary survey data. The detailed salary survey data for each position is contained in Appendix C.

It is important to make a few of observations regarding Table 2 and Appendix C.

- 1) The salary data is information that was available as of April – May 2021. The new recommended salary ranges for the City were developed using this salary data from the comparable communities.
- 2) Some of the comparable municipalities provided salary range minimums and maximums for comparison purposes, while others (those that do not utilize salary ranges as part of their pay plans) provided actual salaries for surveyed positions. The salary range minimums and maximums were analyzed to determine the 50th, 60th, 65th, 70th, 75th and 80th percentiles to identify wage ranges for “average” and “above average” payers. Any actual salaries provided by the comparable municipalities were only analyzed in a few instances when there was not enough salary range information. Salary ranges are a better gauge of market salaries than an actual salary and are thus preferred to conduct analysis.
- 3) Salary ranges associated with positions that have been reclassified may not be consistent with other salary ranges in a particular Grade.
- 4) Data contained within Appendix C has been thoroughly reviewed. If the Consultants determined the data was not relevant, it was removed. Thus, if a specific position within the salary survey has two worksheets associated with it in Appendix C, then data was removed. The second data sheet will have the word “Edited” after the title of the position surveyed. If a specific data point was removed, it is highlighted on the first and second worksheets and then removed on the second worksheet associated with the position.

Appraisal and Use of Salary Data

While comparing Dyersville’s current salaries to those paid by other employers in the comparable communities, 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 positions. 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, 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" positions within organizations.

- 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 can vary widely. There is rarely a single prevailing rate for any particular kind of work, even within the same labor market.
- 3) It can be difficult to make exact comparisons among the different employers of the duties and responsibilities of ostensibly similar jobs.

Nevertheless, comparative salary data is widely recognized as a good measure of the appropriate compensation rates with respect to the prevailing market. This data is also useful as an indication of prevailing opinions concerning the compensation relationships that should exist among different classifications of work. Of equal importance, however, are the internal relationships for the various positions that were accomplished in the Job Evaluation portion of this Study.

The Benefits Survey and Findings

The benefits portion of the survey collected data related to the following benefits:

- Health Insurance
- Dental Insurance
- Sick Days
- Holiday Days
- Personal Days
- Vacation Time

A review of the benefits offered in Dyersville versus the comparable communities shows that the City's benefits are competitive with the other entities surveyed. However, there are some differences that are noted below:

Health Insurance/Dental Insurance:

It is often difficult to compare apples to apples when it comes to the variety of health insurance plans and offerings provided by each community. In an effort to compare them, GovHR asked each community the following questions:

- Type of Plan.
- What carrier do you cover?
- Total monthly premium for single coverage.
- Amount of single coverage covered by the City.
- Out of Pocket Maximum (OOPM) for single coverage.
- Total monthly premium for family coverage.
- Amount of family coverage covered by the City.
- Out of Pocket Maximum (OOPM) for family coverage.
- Does your community offer any health insurance deductible reimbursements of HSA contributions? Other additional comments.
- Is your plan an ACA compliant plan?

Based on the information received from these questions, overall it appears that Dyersville is on par with the other communities. For instance, the average total monthly premium for employee only coverage is \$599.07 with the employee contribution average at \$68.34; Dyersville is slightly above the average at \$970.40 for the monthly premium and \$97.04 for the employee monthly contribution. For family coverage, the monthly premium is higher than the average but the employee monthly premium contribution is below the average at \$248.87 (the average is \$309.58).

In addition, the average out of pocket maximum is for employee only coverage is \$1,131.25 and Dyersville is below that at \$1,000. The average out of pocket maximum for family coverage is \$2,450 and Dyersville is just above that at \$3,000.

Dental insurance is included in the medical cost for Dyersville and a couple of other communities, but most communities it is separate. The average monthly cost for employee only coverage for dental is \$35.03 and the average monthly cost for family coverage is \$107.86.

Paid Time Off

Dyersville is right on par with the averages for all categories of paid time off. For instance the average sick days per year are 13.43 and Dyersville is right below that at 13.43; the average holidays per year are 10.34 and Dyersville is right at the average at 10 days per year; and the average personal days provided to employees per year is 2.47 days and Dyersville is right at the average at 2 days per year. Vacation time varies significantly in each community based on the longevity of employees and a variety of milestone calculations. To compare vacation time across all communities, GovHR used the following milestones: 0 – 6 years; 7 – 12 years; 13 – 17 years; 18 – 25 years; 25+ years. At these milestones, Dyersville is right at or right below for each one. For instance, the average for 0 – 6 years is 10.78 and Dyersville is at 10 days per year; the average for 25+ years is 23.06 and Dyersville is just below that at 20 days per year.

Appendix D contains tables summarizing the detailed data related to the benefits survey.

VI. COMPENSATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Development of the Compensation Plan

A basic element in any human resources management program is adequate and equitable employee compensation. A Compensation Plan of this nature is essential if qualified employees are to be recruited and retained. To achieve this goal, there must be a reasonable and widely accepted model of Job Factors upon which the Compensation Plan rests. Application of this model was the purpose of the Job Evaluation aspect of this Study. The Plan presented in this report is designed to accomplish the Study goals by:

- 1) Providing for equal compensation for work of equivalent job content and responsibility.
- 2) Facilitating adjustments to compensation levels based on changing economic and employment conditions that impact these interrelationships.
- 3) Establishing compensation ranges that compare favorably with those of other equivalent jurisdictions within the appropriate labor market.

In preparing this Plan, the Study only looked at base compensation. The compensation associated with longevity or other fringe benefits was not analyzed or factored into the Compensation Plan.

Compensation Plan Options for the City's Consideration

One of the purposes of this Study was to provide an updated Compensation Plan that relates to the external market and is internally equitable. Below is a detailed explanation of three (3) different Compensation Plans:

- 1) **Defined Increment Plan:** This is a Compensation Plan that has 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 compensation range. The performance evaluation and resulting salary increment increase occurs annually.
- 2) **Open Range Merit Plan:** This is a Compensation Plan that also has salary ranges with minimums and maximums, but without defined percentage increments in between. Employees are advanced through the compensation range based on an annual satisfactory performance evaluation, with the percentage of their increase determined annually by City Administration.

- 3) Blended Merit Plan: This is a Compensation Plan that uses techniques from both a Defined Increment Plan and an Open Range Merit Plan.

In considering which Plan to use, it is important to understand that employees at various levels of responsibility may react differently toward, and be motivated differently by, the Compensation Plan they work under. Management personnel that are goal-oriented may have a higher acceptance of the Open Range Merit Plan, and thus tend to be more comfortable with 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 Plan

Advantages

City: A Defined Increment Plan has the advantage of creating financial predictability because it is easier for management to predict and plan for salary increases on an annual basis.

Employees: Employees like a Defined Increment Plan because it offers security and predictability for advancement through the range. Another advantage 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: The City may feel that a Defined Increment Plan simply rewards compensation increases on a routine basis. However, by tying the increase to a satisfactory performance evaluation, the City can be assured that only employees with acceptable performance will receive a salary increase.

Employees: Employees may feel unmotivated to perform at an above average or at a superior level, knowing their salary increase amount is pre-determined. One way to remove this negative notion 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. Most employees would be considered “average” performers and receive a one (1) increment increase.

Open Range Merit Plan

Advantages

City: The Open Range Merit 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 Merit Plan 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: An Open Range Merit Plan 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 Plan. It is also incumbent on management to ensure that the performance evaluation system is applied fairly and that supervisors receive appropriate training on conducting the evaluation and using the evaluation tool properly.

Blended Merit Plan

There are positives and negatives for both Defined Increment 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 Merit Plans. It is becoming increasingly common for organizations to have a Blended Merit 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. It is also the preferred Plan for organizations that are transitioning from a Defined Increment Plan to an Open Range Merit Plan. The following is one example of a Blended Merit Plan:

Exempt: All exempt employees are in an Open Range Merit Plan.

Non-exempt: Non-exempt employees are in a Blended Merit Plan. In this Plan, salary ranges begin at the minimum with, for example, three (3) 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 two (2) and three (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 two (2) after the initial evaluation and increment three (3) after an additional year of employment.) After that, the employee may advance through the open range as a result of a successful performance evaluation.

Recommendation: Open Range Merit Plan and Blended Plan

GovHR is recommending that the City adopt an Open Range Merit Plan for Grades 6 – 9 and a Blended Plan for Grades 1 - 5. An Open Range Merit Plan has salary ranges with minimums and maximums, but without defined percentage increments in between. Employees are advanced through the ranges based on an annual satisfactory performance evaluation, with the percentage of their increase determined by their supervisor and City Administration. A Blended Plan provides for defined step increments for the first several years, followed by an open range.

Both an Open Range Merit Plan and a Blended Plan allow maximum flexibility for the City relative to recruitment and funding as employees can be hired within the range and the increases provided annually for meritorious performance can fluctuate based on available funding. Given Dyersville's goal to recruit, reward and retain motivated, high-performing employees, the Open Range Merit Plan and a Blended Plan has been selected for recommendation.

Pay Percentile

An important component in the process of developing a Compensation Plan is understanding and applying the pay philosophy of the City. In an effort to recruit and retain employees, GovHR is recommending the new pay plan at the 65th percentile.

Proposed Compensation Plan and Structure

The next step in this process is to combine the JFA scores included in Tables 1 and 2 with the proposed salary ranges in Table 3. The resulting Classification and Compensation Plan consists of nine (9) pay grades; one (1) being lowest and nine (9) being highest and is broken down into the following four (4) bands:

Grades 1 – 3: Administrative and Technical Staff

Grades 4 – 5: Supervisory and Advanced Technical Staff

Grades 6 – 8: Directors and Senior Manager

Grade 9: City Administrator

Grades 1 – 5 are a blended merit plan, while Grades 6 – 9 are open ranges. There is an 7.5% gradation between Grades 1 – 3 and a 5% gradation between Grades 4 – 5. All Grades 1 – 5 have a 30% range spread with a defined step increment of 2% from Step A – Step J and then an open range from Step J to the maximum of the range. There is a 12% gradation between Grades 6 – 8. Grades 6 – 9 have a 40% range spread from minimum to maximum.

Note 1: Different compensation grades may have different ranges from minimum to maximum compensation. It is appropriate for the lower grades in a Compensation Plan to have a smaller spread from minimum to maximum as it is likely that new employees would start at the minimum compensation of the range. Conversely, it is more likely that more experienced employees or Department Head level employees may be hired at a rate above the minimum compensation of a range, thus it is necessary to have a greater spread from minimum to maximum compensation.

Note 2: Gradation refers to the relationship between the minimum compensation of one grade to the minimum compensation of the next grade. In this case, the starting compensation for employees in Grade 2 is 7.5% higher than Grade 1 and so on. The gradation will vary depending upon the relationship between the salary data for the grade, the number of grades in the compensation band and the established compensation range.

Table 2 combines all of the classification and compensation data at the 65th percentile.

Implementation and Administration of the Compensation Plan

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

- 1) Employees whose present compensation is below the minimum compensation of the range for their classification should be raised to the minimum of the range.
- 2) The compensation of employees whose present compensation is within the range for their classification should be slotted into the new Compensation Plan at their current pay rate.

- 3) The compensation of employees whose present compensation is above the maximum compensation of the range should be held at their present rate, without a reduction in compensation, until such time that further market analysis indicates commensurate alignment with the marketplace. However, the City can consider lump sum increases for these employees, which does not impact base compensation levels, until the ranges adjust to include the individual employee compensation rates.

In other studies, GovHR has been asked for ideas on how to address the situation of long-term employees whose current compensation falls near the bottom (within 5 - 10%) of the proposed range. If this occurs, it illustrates that the position has been compensated at less than the market rate for someone with similar tenure. Thus, some communities elect to make additional adjustments for those employees at implementation. This program is discretionary for the City to adopt and only occurs one time, at the implementation of the new Classification and Compensation Plan. If the City wishes to consider such a program, an example is illustrated below:

Service	Adjustment
1 - 3 Years	0%
Over 3 and up to 8 Years	1%
Over 8 and up to 15 Years	2%
Over 15 Years	3%

Employee Advancement through the Ranges

To implement the new Compensation Plan, GovHR recommends that 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:

- 1) Applicants with exceptional background and qualifications.
- 2) A promotion in which the employee’s current compensation is higher than the minimum of the new range.
- 3) In the case of 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 (generally up to the midpoint), depending on their experience and qualifications, and based on the provisions of the City's policies (if applicable). Employees should not be hired below the minimum of their compensation 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 and 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 the City.

The City may also wish to provide a merit bonus for exemplary performance after an employee reaches the maximum compensation for the range. If this option is exercised, then an employee would be eligible to receive a payment after a successful performance evaluation each year. This payment should not be worked into the base salary. It can be in the form of a lump sum payment that is a set amount calculated each year and the same for all employees, such as \$500 for meeting expectations and \$1,000 for exceeding expectations. Another option is to calculate a percentage of the employee's base compensation and provide a lump sum payment equivalent to that amount, such as 1% for meeting expectations and 2% for exceeding expectations.

It is recommended that the City set aside a "merit pool" every year, 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.

Again, 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 Plan. Equally, if not more important, is that supervisors are adequately trained to perform the formal performance evaluation process.

Future Administration of the Compensation Plan

To maintain competitive salary levels there should be an annual review of the City's salary ranges. The twenty-four (24) communities used in the survey group for this Study have been determined to be comparable jurisdictions to the City. Therefore, Dyersville 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. As mentioned earlier, the salary levels for these comparables are current as of April – May 2021. It is GovHR's recommendation that an annual survey of these communities be conducted to determine the percentage increase each organization in the comparable group is granting, either as an annual across-the-board increase to their employees or as a general adjustment to their compensation ranges. The City may wish to provide an across-the-board increase to all employees based on the information received from the comparable communities. If this is the case, then the increases would be granted separately from any merit increase that would be awarded as a result of a successful performance evaluation.

It is the further recommendation of GovHR that the compensation ranges for each grade be increased by the average percentage increase of the comparable group, even if an across-the-board increase is not given to all employees. Employees would continue to advance through the compensation ranges (provided that the employee is not at the maximum of the compensation range) by virtue of a merit increase granted for satisfactory or above satisfactory performance of their job duties. Finally, it is recommended that the City review the compatibility of the municipalities after five (5) years.

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 classifications. Instead, the Plan must be administered continually to adapt it to changing conditions.

Three (3) specific types of changes in the Plan itself are possible: abolition of a position, creation of a position, or a revision of a position.

- 1) When a position in a classification is eliminated or when a position has significantly changed work duties and responsibilities to the extent that the position becomes inappropriate or inaccurate, the position should be abolished.
- 2) New positions should be created when new work situations arise that are not covered by the established positions. However, caution should be exercised in this respect, particularly to assure that new positions are justified, are not merely duplicating established positions, cannot be accommodated through changes in existing positions, and reflect substantially permanent rather than temporary situations.
- 3) The adjustment or revision of a position should be done when there are substantial changes to the requirements of the position or to the nature and complexities of the duties being performed. In this instance, a position may need to be re-scored and move up or down into a new classification.

All changes should be thoroughly evaluated for their effect on employee morale and the integrity of the classification relationships established in the Classification and Compensation Plan. City Administration has been provided with the Job Analysis Questionnaire as well as the Job Factor Scoring Sheet, enabling the City to grade a newly created or revised position. GovHR provides scoring assistance in such cases free of charge for one (1) year after the delivery of this report.

Appreciation

GovHR has appreciated the opportunity to work with the City of Dyersville on this Classification and Compensation Study. A special thank you to the City Administrator and employees for all of the information provided to allow for the analysis and for the significant amount of work and support dedicated to the project.

Table 1: Classification Plan
 City of Dyersville, Iowa

Current Job Title	Recommended Job Title Changes	Grade	Total Score	Skill Level
City Administrator				
City Administrator		9	850	845+
Directors and Senior Managers				
Police Chief		8	790	775-840
Public Works Director			785	65 Points
Assistant Police Chief		7	705	705 - 770
				65 Points
City Clerk/Treasurer		6	635	635 - 700
Library Director			690	65 Points
Police Captain			635	
Supervisory and Advanced Technical				
Assistant Library Director		5	590	565 - 630
Parks and Recreation Director	Parks and Rereation Manager		620	65 Points
Wastewater Operator			585	
Water Operator/Electrician			570	
Police Officer			560	
Street Foreman			565	
<i>No Positions in Grade</i>		4		495 - 560
				65 Points
Administrative and Technical				
Young and Emerging Adult Services Librarian		3	455	425 - 490
Parks/Streets Laborer			450	65 Points
Public Works Crew Member - Water			450	
Public Works Crew Member - Sewer			450	
Deputy Clerk			460	
Administrative Assistant		2	365	355 - 420
				65 Points
<i>No Positions in Grade</i>		1		Up to 350

Table 2: Comprehensive Table
City of Dyersville, IA

Job Title	Skill Level	Grade	Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Current Actual Salary	Proposed Salary Range 65th Percentile	
City Administrator							
City Administrator	845+	9	118,814	176,838	114,444	117,500	170,375
Directors and Senior Managers							
Police Chief	775-840	8	101,786	142,423	81,600	89,062	124,687
Public Works Director	65 Points		86,649	119,669	93,840		
Assistant Police Chief	705 - 770	7	81,522	115,078	70,000	79,520	111,328
	65 Points						
City Clerk/Treasurer	635 - 700	6	54,755	81,072	70,000	71,000	99,400
Library Director	65 Points		86,236	119,669	66,453		
Police Captain			73,628	97,920	-		
Supervisory and Advanced Technical							
Assistant Library Director	565 - 630	5	69,831	100,029	43,457	52,500	68,250
Parks and Recreation Manager	65 Points		62,168	75,983	43,697		
Wastewater Operator			49,129	62,266	55,973		
Water Operator/Electrician			49,728	62,538	54,101		
Police Officer			54,184	62,719	55,115	-	-
Street Foreman			52,057	67,378	48,734		
No Positions in Grade	495 - 560	4	-	-	-	50,000	65,000
	65 Points		-	-	-		
Administrative and Technical							
Young and Emerging Adult Services Librarian	425 - 490	3			33,363	42,758	55,586
Parks/Streets Laborer	65 Points		44,377	54,070	46,467		
Public Works Crew Member - Water/Sewer			44,377	54,070	51,979		
Deputy Clerk			45,383	59,403	43,950		
Administrative Assistant*	355 - 420	2	42,704	54,752	30,306	39,775	51,708
No Positions in Grade	Up to 350	1	-	-	-	37,000	48,100

Table 3: Proposed Compensation Ranges
 City of Dyersville, IA

65th Percentile												
Administrative and Technical												
<i>7.5% Between Grades and 30% Range Spread with a 2% increase between each Step until Step J</i>												
	Step A	Step B	Step C	Step D	Step E	Step F	Step G	Step H	Step I	Step J	Open	Maximum
1	37,000.00	37,740.00	38,494.80	39,264.70	40,049.99	40,850.99	41,668.01	42,501.37	43,351.40	44,218.43		48,100.00
2	39,775.00	40,570.50	41,381.91	42,209.55	43,053.74	43,914.81	44,793.11	45,688.97	46,602.75	47,534.81		51,707.50
3	42,758.13	43,613.29	44,485.55	45,375.26	46,282.77	47,208.42	48,152.59	49,115.65	50,097.96	51,099.92		55,585.56
Supervisors and Advanced Technical												
<i>5% Between Grades and 30% Range Spread with a 2% increase between each Step until Step J</i>												
	Step A	Step B	Step C	Step D	Step E	Step F	Step G	Step H	Step I	Step J	Open	Maximum
4	50,000.00	51,000.00	52,020.00	53,060.40	54,121.61	55,204.04	56,308.12	57,434.28	58,582.97	59,754.63		65,000.00
5	52,500.00	53,550.00	54,621.00	55,713.42	56,827.69	57,964.24	59,123.53	60,306.00	61,512.12	62,742.36		68,250.00
Directors and Senior Managers												
<i>12% Between Grades and 40% Range Spread Open Range</i>												
	Minimum											Maximum
6	71,000.00											99,400.00
7	79,520.00											111,328.00
8	89,062.40											124,687.36
City Administrator												
<i>45% Range Spread Open Range</i>												
	Minimum											Maximum
9	117,500.00											170,375.00

APPENDIX A

EMPLOYEE JOB ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE (JAQ)

City of Dyersville, Iowa

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 order of importance and group "like" tasks together (e.g., "clerical duties including word processing, opening mail, filing, etc." or "front desk responsibilities including greeting visitors, answering telephones and routing calls, etc."). Job duties:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

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

Feel free to add more numbers/duties if necessary.

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

- LEVEL 1: Level of knowledge that is below what is normally attained through high school graduation.
- LEVEL 2: High school diploma (GED) or equivalent.
- LEVEL 3: High school, plus elementary technical training, acquired on the job or through one year or less of technical or business school.
- LEVEL 4: Extensive technical or specialized training such as would be acquired by an Associate’s Degree or two years of technical or business school.
- LEVEL 5: Completion of four-year college degree program.
- LEVEL 6: Additional professional level of education beyond a four-year college program, such as a CPA or Professional Engineer (P.E.) training.
- LEVEL 7: 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:

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

- | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| LEVEL 1: | LEVEL 2: | LEVEL 3: | LEVEL 4: | LEVEL 5: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than 1 Year | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 3 Years | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 to 6 Years | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 to 10 Years | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 10 Years |

What is the minimum number of years required?

What specific experience is necessary?

FACTOR 3. Independent Judgment and Decision Making

Part 1: How much discretion do you have in making decisions with or without the input or direction of your supervisor?

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

Part 2: 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 minor costs in terms of time, money, or public/employee good will.
- MODERATE: Moderate 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.
- CRITICAL: Critical goals and objectives of the Organization would be adversely and very seriously affected. Error could likely result in critical financial loss, property damage, or bodily harm/loss of life.

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

- LEVEL 1: Position involves only the execution of policies or use of existing procedures.
- LEVEL 2: May provide some input to supervisor when policies and procedures are updated.
- LEVEL 3: Position involves some development of policies/procedures for the Department and/or the interpretation or explanation of departmental policies for others in the organization or residents.
- LEVEL 4: 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.
- LEVEL 5: Position involves significant or primary responsibility for the development of policies and procedures for an entire department, plus occasional participation in the development of policies which affect other departments in the organization.
- LEVEL 6: 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:

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

- LEVEL 1: Position requires that my daily work load and activities are assigned to me by my supervisor.
 - LEVEL 2: Position requires that I plan my own daily work load and work independently according to established procedures or standards.
 - LEVEL 3: Position requires that I plan my own daily work load and those of others in the department (first-level supervision).
 - LEVEL 4: 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 planning).
 - LEVEL 5: 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 planning).
-

FACTOR 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?

- LEVEL 1: Position involves interaction with fellow workers on routine matters with relatively little public contact.
- LEVEL 2: Position involves frequent internal and external contact, but generally on routine matters such as furnishing or obtaining information.
- LEVEL 3: 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.
- LEVEL 4: 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.
- LEVEL 5: 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.
- LEVEL 6: Position involves frequent internal and external contacts in which I act as the spokesperson for the department and am authorized to make commitments of significant resources on behalf of the department.
- LEVEL 7: Position involves frequent internal and external contacts where I represent the entire organization and am authorized to make commitments in matters of broad or critical interest to the entire organization.

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

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

FACTOR 7. Supervision Given:

Do you supervise or assign work to other employees? Yes No

If yes:

- LEVEL 1: 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?
- LEVEL 2: Position is responsible for the supervision of one full time or several part time employees.
- LEVEL 3: Position is responsible for the supervision of two to five full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- LEVEL 4: Position is responsible for the supervision of six to 15 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- LEVEL 5: Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 16 to 29 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- LEVEL 6: Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 30 to 50 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- LEVEL 7: 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:

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

Demand	No	Yes	How often? (Rarely, Occasionally or Daily)
Lifting 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? (Rarely, Occasionally or Daily)
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"/>

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

- LEVEL 1: Position has no responsibility for, or use of, technology.
- LEVEL 2: Position has some basic use of computers for data entry and some use of the telephone, copier, etc.
- LEVEL 3: Position has daily use of computers for data entry and use of the telephone, fax machine, copier, etc. Position has daily use of light equipment such as push mowers, weed whackers, pole saws, custodial equipment, etc.
- LEVEL 4: 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.
- LEVEL 5A: 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, SCADA or telecommunications software.
- LEVEL 5B: Position uses, troubleshoots, and/or repairs 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 or public safety equipment.
- LEVEL 6: Position is responsible for advanced computer programming, system security, maintenance, training, and purchasing of items such as computers, printers, scanners, etc., for the computer system for the organization (IT personnel).
- LEVEL 7: Position is responsible for 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).

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 the file name of "JobTitle.LastName.FirstName" 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.
- 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 Village Administration. 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 City Manager. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it before forwarding.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME **DATE**

IMPORTANT DATES:

March 24th – April 7th:

Employees complete and submit the JAQs to their Supervisors. Please save file as follows: JobTitle.LastName.FirstName.

April 7th – 14th:

Supervisors and Department Heads review and then submit the JAQs to City Administration.

April 15th – 22nd:

City Administration reviews and then submits the JAQs to GovHR USA.

APPENDIX B

1. Population: Maximum 15 Points						
4,329						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	2,886	4,329	4,329	6,494	15	
2.00	2,165	2,885	6,495	8,658	11	
2.50	1,732	2,164	8,659	10,823	7	
3.00	1,443	1,731	10,824	12,987	3	
All Others					0	
2. Median Household Income: Maximum 15 Points						
\$61,400						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	40,933	61,400	61,400	92,100	15	
2.00	30,700	40,932	92,101	122,800	11	
2.50	24,560	30,699	122,801	153,500	7	
3.00	20,467	24,559	153,501	184,200	3	
All Others					0	
3. Total Valuation: Maximum 15 Points						
\$310,978 Thousand						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	207,319	310,978	310,978	466,467	15	
2.00	155,489	207,318	466,468	621,956	11	
2.50	124,391	155,488	621,957	777,445	7	
79.88	103,659	124,390	777,446	932,934	3	
All Others					0	
4. Property Tax Revenue: Maximum 15 Points						
\$2,202 Thousand						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	1,468	2,202	2,202	3,303	15	
2.00	1,101	1,467	3,304	4,404	11	
2.50	881	1,100	4,405	5,505	7	
3.00	734	880	5,506	6,606	3	
All Others					0	
5. Total Expenditures (Less Capital Projects): Maximum 15 Points						
\$8,238 Thousand						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	5,492	8,238	8,238	12,357	15	
2.00	4,119	5,491	12,358	16,476	11	
2.50	3,295	4,118	16,477	20,595	7	
3.00	2,746	3,294	20,596	24,714	3	
All Others					0	

6. Salaries and Wages Paid: Maximum 15 Points					
\$1,262 Thousand					
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points
1.5	841	1,262	1,262	1,893	15
2.0	631	840	1,894	2,524	11
2.5	505	630	2,525	3,155	7
3.0	421	504	3,156	3,786	3
All Others					0

7. Proximity to Dyersville: Maximum 10 Points	
	Points
0 - 50 Miles from Dyersville	10
51 - 100 Miles from Dyersville	8
101 - 150 Miles from Dyersville	6
151+ Miles from Dyersville	2

Initial Screen:
 Cities in Allamakee, Benton, Black Hawk, Bremer, Buchanan, Cedar, Chickasaw, Clayton, Clinton, Delaware, Des Moines, Dubuque, Fayette, Henry, Howard, Iowa, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Jones, Keokuk, Lee, Linn, Louisa, Muscatine, Poweshiek, Scott, Tama, Van Buren, Washington and Winneshiek Counties with populations between 2,000 and 10,000. Plus Cedar Rapids, Dubuque, Marion and North Liberty at the request of the City

Sources:

(1) Iowa Department of Management - 2020 Annual Financial Reports for: Property Tax Revenue, Total Expenditures and Salaries Paid <https://dom-localgov.iowa.gov/afr-search>

(2) Iowa Department of Management - 2019 City Taxable & TIF Valuation by Class AY2109/FY2021 for Total Valuation: <https://dom.iowa.gov/document/city-taxable-tif-valuation-class-ay2019fy2021>

(2) Iowa Data Center: 2019 Estimated Population. <https://www.iowadatacenter.org/data/estimates/2019/pop-est-2019>

(3) U.S. Census Bureau: Median Household Income - Past 12 Months in 2019 dollars. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=income%20per%20capita&g=0400000US19.160000&tid=ACSST5Y2019.S1901&hidePreview=false>

(4) Google Maps: Proximity

Note:
 Each of the eight criterion contain ranges to assess comparability with the City's data. For example, each of the four ranges for the City's population is developed using a factor of .5 percent (+/-). To determine the population range that will receive a score of 15 (most similar to the City), the City's population is multiplied by 1.5 (maximum range) and divided by 1.5 (minimum range). The City's population is then multiplied and divided by 2.0, 2.5 and 3.0 to determine ranges of decreasing similarity (and subsequently decreasing "comparability points").

Dyersville, IA
Criteria Comparisons - Sorted by Rank

City	Population	Max. Points	Median HH Income	Max. Points	Total Valuation	Max. Points	Prop. Tax Revenue	Max. Points	Total Exp.	Max. Points	Salaries Paid	Max. Points	Proximity	Max. Points	Total Points
Dyersville	4,329	15	61,400	15	310,978	15	2,202	15	8,238	15	1,262	15	0	10	100
Le Claire	3,965	15	86,250	15	288,034	15	2,287	15	8,771	15	1,260	15	93	8	98
Mount Vernon	4,466	15	71,552	15	165,548	11	1,821	15	9,058	15	1,704	15	49	10	96
Asbury	5,747	15	100,871	11	294,720	15	2,349	15	5,507	15	1,221	15	23	10	96
Manchester	4,986	15	51,773	15	219,023	15	2,666	15	7,335	15	2,354	11	20	10	96
West Burlington	2,890	15	45,469	15	208,936	15	1,501	15	7,441	15	1,525	15	130	6	96
Maquoketa	5,990	15	44,610	15	217,334	15	2,740	15	8,255	15	2,002	11	48	10	96
Camanche	4,365	15	50,804	15	190,135	11	1,997	15	5,792	15	1,512	15	85	8	94
Tiffin	4,157	15	78,713	15	234,293	15	2,006	15	6,549	15	667	11	84	8	94
Independence	6,124	15	54,097	15	232,994	15	3,246	15	10,565	15	2,629	7	41	10	92
Monticello	3,880	15	53,068	15	154,684	7	1,912	15	5,681	15	1,692	15	21	10	92
Anamosa	5,537	15	41,603	15	148,084	7	1,826	15	6,386	15	1,645	15	33	10	92
Oelwein	5,900	15	41,849	15	190,267	11	2,616	15	10,493	15	2,408	11	57	8	90
Williamsburg	3,164	15	71,055	15	160,262	11	1,458	11	7,632	15	1,026	15	99	8	90
Cresco	3,739	15	50,000	15	131,062	7	1,929	15	6,460	15	1,615	15	99	8	90
Eldrige	6,846	11	71,961	15	430,845	15	2,570	15	14,766	11	2,412	11	79	8	86
DeWitt	5,192	15	53,580	15	279,742	15	3,002	15	12,969	11	2,576	7	68	8	86
Waukon	3,625	15	45,942	15	142,697	7	1,767	15	12,431	11	1,486	15	68	8	86
New Hampton	3,406	15	46,913	15	151,925	7	1,841	15	12,659	11	1,836	15	94	8	86
Vinton	5,075	15	48,068	15	171,069	11	3,206	15	10,996	15	2,740	7	67	8	86
West Branch	2,492	11	61,964	15	162,313	11	1,768	15	3,804	7	1,072	15	68	8	82
Wilton	2,824	11	52,538	15	121,355	3	1,531	15	7,177	15	972	15	71	8	82
Evansdale	4,743	15	49,786	15	145,977	7	1,141	11	4,633	11	1,217	15	62	8	82
Tipton	3,223	15	64,013	15	127,992	7	1,652	15	13,501	11	2,164	11	57	8	82
Bellevue	2,209	11	61,071	15	110,172	3	1,219	11	8,250	15	1,367	15	47	10	80
Hudson	2,468	11	88,347	15	130,238	7	1,124	11	6,908	15	762	11	72	8	78
Washington	7,230	11	52,697	15	258,063	15	3,806	11	13,424	11	3,121	7	117	6	76
Grundy Center	2,670	11	63,819	15	104,503	3	1,331	11	4,524	11	1,104	15	93	8	74
Solon	2,690	11	81,691	15	154,277	7	1,280	11	4,233	11	758	11	58	8	74
Cascade	2,329	11	53,508	15	112,007	3	871	3	6,572	15	935	15	16	10	72
Decorah	7,576	11	62,336	15	362,918	15	4,986	7	12,011	15	3,789	0	79	8	71
West Liberty	3,766	15	54,365	15	95,168	0	1,354	11	12,630	11	2,015	11	72	8	71
West Union	2,305	11	48,250	15	94,892	0	1,160	11	5,493	15	823	11	62	8	71
Kalona	2,537	11	58,446	15	120,732	3	1,157	11	7,269	15	548	7	105	6	68
Robins	3,537	15	131,078	7	232,492	15	1,462	11	4,081	7	428	3	56	8	66
Tama	2,732	11	50,792	15	67,371	0	1,068	11	3,616	7	954	15	109	6	65
Grinnell	9,116	7	46,750	15	374,492	15	4,076	11	17,875	7	3,721	3	131	6	64
Marengo	2,466	11	54,180	15	73,549	0	1,063	11	3,990	7	703	11	97	8	63
Fairfax	2,856	11	97,643	11	153,681	7	792	3	5,447	11	658	11	71	8	62
Fort Madison	10,321	7	42,694	15	314,155	15	4,384	11	18,657	7	5,425	0	147	6	61
Center Point	2,555	11	80,577	15	105,850	3	1,177	11	3,028	3	594	7	54	8	58
Mount Pleasant	8,668	7	51,350	15	340,487	15	3,889	11	22,210	3	4,462	0	135	6	57
Toledo	2,143	7	39,767	11	72,125	0	1,037	11	3,540	7	863	15	106	6	57
Belle Plain	2,440	11	49,471	15	72,216	0	1,038	11	2,995	3	771	11	102	6	57

Dyersville, IA
Criteria Comparisons - Sorted by Rank

City	Population	Max. Points	Median HH Income	Max. Points	Total Valuation	Max. Points	Prop. Tax Revenue	Max. Points	Total Exp.	Max. Points	Salaries Paid	Max. Points	Proximity	Max. Points	Total Points
Dyersville	4,329	15	61,400	15	310,978	15	2,202	15	8,238	15	1,262	15	0	10	100
La Porte	2,240	11	60,298	15	71,299	0	1,056	11	2,592	0	809	11	65	8	56
Hiawatha	7,420	11	48,191	15	517,625	11	6,196	0	14,805	11	4,105	0	59	8	56
Jesup	2,703	11	72,500	15	100,341	0	1,431	11	3,028	3	596	7	52	8	55
Sumner	1,962	7	64,018	15	67,612	0	876	3	3,928	7	707	11	76	8	51
New London	1,839	7	54,226	15	45,786	0	522	0	4,021	7	915	15	133	6	50
Fairfield	10,425	7	40,920	11	359,586	15	5,446	7	21,605	3	4,365	0	148	6	49
Wapello	1,999	7	66,429	15	56,180	0	740	3	3,491	7	732	11	104	6	49
Waverly	10,198	7	64,949	15	493,733	11	6,189	0	17,590	7	5,182	0	87	8	48
Lisbon	2,247	11	73,194	15	99,518	0	766	3	2,644	0	612	7	48	10	46
Postville	2,053	7	51,250	15	52,989	0	750	3	3,077	3	612	7	58	8	43
Keokuk	10,157	7	39,779	11	351,402	15	4,921	7	28,058	0	5,615	0	177	2	42
Columbus Junction	1,837	7	47,151	15	37,319	0	483	0	2,290	0	526	7	100	8	37
Dubuque	57,882	0	54,234	15	2,988,184	0	25,907	0	145,523	0	44,397	0	27	10	25
North Liberty	19,501	0	83,949	15	1,138,922	0	10,308	0	31,815	0	7,417	0	68	8	23
Cedar Rapids	133,562	0	58,511	15	7,374,030	0	101,724	0	519,837	0	100,359	0	62	8	23
Marion	40,359	0	72,150	15	1,859,164	0	23,330	0	60,845	0	16,639	0	51	8	23

Dyersville, IA
 Top Comparables - Score of 85 or Higher

City	Population	Max. Points	Median HH Income	Max. Points	Assessed Valuation	Max. Points	Prop. Tax Revenue	Max. Points	Total Exp.	Max. Points	Salaries Paid	Max. Points	Proximity	Max. Points	Total Points
Dyersville	4,130	15	61,400	15	253,643	15	2,202	15	8,238	15	1,262	15	0	10	105
Mount Vernon	4,451	15	71,552	15	142,394	11	1,821	15	9,058	15	1,704	15	49	8	99
Asbury	5,557	15	100,871	11	265,765	15	2,349	15	5,507	15	1,221	15	23	10	99
Manchester	5,019	15	51,773	15	197,549	15	2,666	15	7,335	15	2,354	11	20	10	99
Le Claire	3,971	15	86,250	15	185,338	15	2,287	15	8,771	15	1,260	15	93	2	97
Monticello	3,837	15	53,068	15	130,429	11	1,912	15	5,681	15	1,692	15	21	10	97
Camanche	4,334	15	50,804	15	192,685	15	1,997	15	5,792	15	1,512	15	85	6	96
Oelwein	5,979	15	41,849	15	158,911	11	2,616	15	10,493	15	2,408	11	57	8	95
Maquoketa	6,010	15	44,610	15	206,337	15	2,740	15	8,255	15	2,002	11	48	8	94
Independence	6,056	15	54,097	15	223,988	15	3,246	15	10,565	15	2,629	7	41	8	94
Anamosa	5,476	15	41,603	15	133,277	11	1,826	15	6,386	15	1,645	15	33	8	94
West Burlington	2,927	15	45,469	15	181,158	15	1,501	15	7,441	15	1,525	15	130	2	93
Tiffin	3,351	15	78,713	15	204,903	15	2,006	15	6,549	15	667	11	84	6	92
DeWitt	5,203	15	53,580	15	222,527	15	3,002	15	12,969	11	2,576	7	68	6	89
Cresco	3,768	15	50,000	15	129,398	11	1,929	15	6,460	15	1,615	15	99	2	88
Vinton	5,103	15	48,068	15	173,882	15	3,206	15	10,996	15	2,740	7	67	6	88
Waukon	3,671	15	45,942	15	125,890	7	1,767	15	12,431	11	1,486	15	68	6	87
Eldrige	6,529	11	71,961	15	401,481	11	2,570	15	14,766	11	2,412	11	79	6	85

APPENDIX C

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	City Administrator				
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Years in Position:	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			95,598.36	17.00	
Camanche			87,125.00	4.00	
Cresco					n/a
DeWitt			108,729.12	18.50	
Dubuque			228,393.00	28.00	City Manager
Eldrige			106,204.80	1.00	
Hiawatha	104,300.00	156,400.00	138,600.00	8.00	City Manager
Independence			110,274.32	6.00	City Manager
Manchester			103,875.00	15.00	City Manager
Marion	152,679.00	224,528.00	184,000.00	13.00	
Monticello			95,000.00		
Mount Vernon			103,912.40	5.00	
New Hampton					n/a
North Liberty			172,573.56	13.50	
Oelwein			111,461.52	5.00	
Tiffin	78,000.00	106,766.40	106,768.00	6.00	
Waukon			85,000.00	1.50	City Manager
West Burlington			80,774.98	15.00	
Williamsburg			70,000.00	0.50	City Manager
Dyersville			114,443.75	17.00	
Range Data					
Average	111,659.67	162,564.80	116,958.24	9.81	
50th Percentile	104,300.00	156,400.00	106,204.80		
60th Percentile	113,975.80	170,025.60	107,944.67		
65th Percentile	118,813.70	176,838.40	109,347.20		
70th Percentile	123,651.60	183,651.20	110,511.76		
75th Percentile	128,489.50	190,464.00	111,461.52		
Actual Data					
Average	93,566.59	140,349.89			
50th Percentile	84,963.84	127,445.76			
60th Percentile	86,355.74	129,533.61			
65th Percentile	87,477.76	131,216.64			
70th Percentile	88,409.41	132,614.11			
75th Percentile	89,169.22	133,753.82			

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	City Clerk/Treasurer				
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Years in Position:	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			63,003.20	20.00	City Clerk
Camanche			53,549.49	3.00	
Cresco			70,145.14	10.00	City Clerk
DeWitt			75,610.56	24.50	Director of Finance
Dubuque			85,000.00	0.50	City Clerk
Eldrige			68,078.40	20.00	
Hiawatha	62,400.00	93,600.00	71,800.00	2.00	City Clerk
Independence			54,207.66	5.00	
Manchester			61,401.00	18.50	
Marion	51,478.00	75,703.00	64,979.00	3.00	City Clerk/Records Manager
Monticello			66,307.00	26.50	
Mount Vernon			79,444.29	22.00	
New Hampton			57,234.84	3.00	City Clerk
North Liberty	92,042.11	129,977.45	116,480.00	15.50	Assistant City Administrator/City Clerk
Oelwein			82,349.04	15.00	
Tiffin	37,876.80	54,579.20	54,580.26	4.00	
Waukon			49,398.00		Finance Director /Treasurer
West Burlington			54,044.64	28.00	City Clerk
Williamsburg			57,000.00	4.00	
Dyersville			69,500.00	20.00	
Range Data					
Average	60,949.23	88,464.91	67,611.19	12.47	
50th Percentile	56,939.00	84,651.50	64,979.00		
60th Percentile	60,215.60	90,020.60	67,724.12		
65th Percentile	61,853.90	92,705.15	69,525.12		
70th Percentile	65,364.21	97,237.75	71,138.06		
75th Percentile	69,810.53	102,694.36	73,705.28		
Actual Data					
Average	60,850.07	74,372.30			
50th Percentile	58,481.10	71,476.90			
60th Percentile	60,951.71	74,496.53			
65th Percentile	62,572.61	76,477.63			
70th Percentile	64,024.25	78,251.86			
75th Percentile	66,334.75	81,075.81			

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	City Clerk/Treasurer				
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Years in Position:	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			63,003.20	20.00	City Clerk
Camanche			53,549.49	3.00	
Cresco			70,145.14	10.00	City Clerk
DeWitt			75,610.56	24.50	Director of Finance
Dubuque			85,000.00	0.50	City Clerk
Eldrige			68,078.40	20.00	
Hiawatha	62,400.00	93,600.00	71,800.00	2.00	City Clerk
Independence			54,207.66	5.00	
Manchester			61,401.00	18.50	
Marion	51,478.00	75,703.00	64,979.00	3.00	City Clerk/Records Manager
Monticello			66,307.00	26.50	
Mount Vernon			79,444.29	22.00	
New Hampton			57,234.84	3.00	City Clerk
North Liberty					Assistant City Administrator/City Clerk
Oelwein			82,349.04	15.00	
Tiffin	37,876.80	54,579.20	54,580.26	4.00	
Waukon			49,398.00		Finance Director /Treasurer
West Burlington			54,044.64	28.00	City Clerk
Williamsburg			57,000.00	4.00	
Dyersville			69,500.00	20.00	
Range Data					
Average	50,584.93	74,627.40	64,896.25	12.29	
50th Percentile	51,478.00	75,703.00	63,991.10		
60th Percentile	53,662.40	79,282.40	66,661.28		
65th Percentile	54,754.60	81,072.10	68,181.74		
70th Percentile	55,846.80	82,861.80	69,938.47		
75th Percentile	56,939.00	84,651.50	71,386.29		
Actual Data					
Average	58,406.63	71,385.88			
50th Percentile	57,591.99	70,390.21			
60th Percentile	59,995.15	73,327.41			
65th Percentile	61,363.56	74,999.91			
70th Percentile	62,944.62	76,932.31			
75th Percentile	64,247.66	78,524.91			

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Deputy City Clerk			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			45,968.00	
Camanche			39,977.60	
Cresco			45,052.80	
DeWitt			61,048.00	City Clerk
Dubuque	45,614.00	59,508.00	59,508.00	Assistant City Clerk
Eldrige				n/a
Hiawatha	41,000.00	57,400.00	47,600.00	Deputy Clerk/Administrative Coordinator
Independence			39,478.40	
Manchester			53,788.00	
Marion				n/a
Monticello			44,928.00	
Mount Vernon			59,529.60	
New Hampton			43,430.40	
North Liberty	49,636.76	70,247.30	61,713.60	Deputy City Clerk/Adm Ass't/Utility Billing Clerk
Oelwein				n/a
Tiffin	35,006.40	41,267.20	41,262.00	
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington			39,561.60	Utility Clerk/Deputy City Clerk
Williamsburg			48,000.00	
Dyersville			43,950.20	
Range Data				
Average	42,814.29	57,105.63	48,723.07	
50th Percentile	43,307.00	58,454.00	45,968.00	
60th Percentile	44,691.20	59,086.40	47,760.00	
65th Percentile	45,383.30	59,402.60	48,578.80	
70th Percentile	46,016.28	60,581.93	52,630.40	
75th Percentile	46,619.69	62,192.83	56,648.00	
Actual Data				
Average	43,850.76	53,595.37		
50th Percentile	41,371.20	50,564.80		
60th Percentile	42,984.00	52,536.00		
65th Percentile	43,720.92	53,436.68		
70th Percentile	47,367.36	57,893.44		
75th Percentile	50,983.20	62,312.80		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Administrative Assistant			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			36,649.60	
Camanche				n/a
Cresco			34,278.40	
DeWitt			21.20	Deputy City Clerk
Dubuque	36,795.00	48,131.00		Secretary - multiple people in position.
Eldrige				na
Hiawatha	38,200.00	53,500.00	46,400.00	Administrative Coordinator
Independence			33,654.40	Associate Clerk
Manchester				n/a
Marion	45,967.00	67,599.00	56,653.00	
Monticello			39,790.40	City Secretary
Mount Vernon	41,225.60	54,891.20		
New Hampton				n/a
North Liberty	42,868.80	61,484.80	45,843.20	
Oelwein	44,782.40	52,166.40	44,782.40	
Tiffin	25,334.40	34,112.00	36,602.00	
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington			39,187.20	
Williamsburg			36,000.00	Utility Billing Clerk
Dyersville			30,305.60	
Range Data				
Average	39,310.46	53,126.34	37,488.48	
50th Percentile	41,225.60	53,500.00	37,918.40	
60th Percentile	42,211.52	54,334.72	39,549.12	
65th Percentile	42,704.48	54,752.08	40,539.20	
70th Percentile	43,251.52	56,209.92	43,284.80	
75th Percentile	43,825.60	58,188.00	45,047.60	
Actual Data				
Average	33,739.64	41,237.33		
50th Percentile	34,126.56	41,710.24		
60th Percentile	35,594.21	43,504.03		
65th Percentile	36,485.28	44,593.12		
70th Percentile	38,956.32	47,613.28		
75th Percentile	40,542.84	49,552.36		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Parks and Recreation Director			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche				n/a
Cresco			53,601.60	
DeWitt			75,274.08	
Dubuque	101,816.00	133,140.00	133,140.00	Leisure Services Manager
Eldrige			49,504.00	
Hiawatha	53,100.00	74,400.00	68,800.00	
Independence			72,622.05	
Manchester			59,425.00	
Marion	94,316.00	138,700.00		
Monticello			53,000.00	
Mount Vernon			71,337.91	
New Hampton			60,642.40	
North Liberty	84,988.63	120,000.11	104,083.20	Dir Parks, Buildings, Grounds & Recreation Director
Oelwein			65,077.92	
Tiffin	69,347.20	69,347.20	69,351.00	
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington				n/a
Williamsburg				n/a
Dyersville			43,696.68	
Range Data				
Average	80,713.57	107,117.46	71,989.17	
50th Percentile	84,988.63	120,000.11	68,800.00	
60th Percentile	88,719.58	125,256.07	69,748.38	
65th Percentile	90,585.05	127,884.04	70,940.53	
70th Percentile	92,450.53	130,512.02	71,851.57	
75th Percentile	94,316.00	133,140.00	72,622.05	
Actual Data				
Average	64,790.25	79,188.08		
50th Percentile	61,920.00	75,680.00		
60th Percentile	62,773.54	76,723.22		
65th Percentile	63,846.48	78,034.58		
70th Percentile	64,666.41	79,036.72		
75th Percentile	65,359.85	79,884.26		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Parks and Recreation Director (Edited)			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche				n/a
Cresco			53,601.60	
DeWitt			75,274.08	
Dubuque				Leisure Services Manager
Eldrige			49,504.00	
Hiawatha	53,100.00	74,400.00	68,800.00	
Independence			72,622.05	
Manchester			59,425.00	
Marion	94,316.00	138,700.00		
Monticello			53,000.00	
Mount Vernon			71,337.91	
New Hampton			60,642.40	
North Liberty				Dir Parks, Buildings, Grounds & Recreation Director
Oelwein			65,077.92	
Tiffin	69,347.20	69,347.20	69,351.00	
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington				n/a
Williamsburg				n/a
Dyersville			43,696.68	
Range Data				
Average	72,254.40	94,149.07	63,512.36	
50th Percentile	69,347.20	74,400.00	65,077.92	
60th Percentile	74,340.96	87,260.00	68,800.00	
65th Percentile	76,837.84	93,690.00	69,075.50	
70th Percentile	79,334.72	100,120.00	69,351.00	
75th Percentile	81,831.60	106,550.00	70,344.46	
Actual Data				
Average	57,161.12	69,863.60		
50th Percentile	58,570.13	71,585.71		
60th Percentile	61,920.00	75,680.00		
65th Percentile	62,167.95	75,983.05		
70th Percentile	62,415.90	76,286.10		
75th Percentile	63,310.01	77,378.90		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Public Works Director					
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Years in Position:	Engineer?	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			78,266.24	2.00	No	
Camanche			72,000.00	0.50	No	
Cresco			59,499.96	0.50	No	
DeWitt			76,263.60	12.00	No	
Dubuque	86,736.00	113,380.00	113,380.00	5.00	N/A	Public Works Director
Eldrige			78,728.00	20.00	No	
Hiawatha	61,600.00	92,400.00	85,900.00	21.00	No	Public Works Superintendent
Independence			65,000.00	2.00	No	Bldg. Insp./Street Superintendent
Manchester			66,144.00	6.00		Water/Wastewater Sup.
Marion	98,467.00	144,804.00	144,142.00	10.50	No	
Monticello			54,075.00	1.50	No	
Mount Vernon			78,405.50	1.00	No	
New Hampton			75,000.00	0.50	No	
North Liberty	84,988.63	120,000.11	104,318.93			Street Superintendent
Oelwein			104,645.40	22.00	No	Utility Superintendent
Tiffin			61,683.00	27.00	No	
Waukon						n/a
West Burlington			68,717.74	2.00	No	
Williamsburg					No	
Dyersville			93,938.96	2.00	Yes	
Range Data						
Average	82,947.91	117,646.03	81,539.37	8.34		
50th Percentile	85,862.32	116,690.06	76,263.60			
60th Percentile	86,386.53	118,676.09	78,349.80			
65th Percentile	86,648.63	119,669.10	78,534.50			
70th Percentile	87,909.10	122,480.50	80,162.40			
75th Percentile	89,668.75	126,201.08	85,900.00			
Actual Data						
Average	73,385.44	89,693.31				
50th Percentile	68,637.24	83,889.96				
60th Percentile	70,514.82	86,184.78				
65th Percentile	70,681.05	86,387.95				
70th Percentile	72,146.16	88,178.64				
75th Percentile	77,310.00	94,490.00				

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Public Works - Street Foreman			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche				n/a
Cresco			54,038.40	Street Superintendent
DeWitt			56,659.20	Street Maintenance Lead Person
Dubuque	52,249.60	59,363.20		Foreman
Eldrige				n/a
Hiawatha	48,400.00	67,800.00	58,300.00	Public Works Foreman
Independence			55,577.60	Street Foreman
Manchester			61,144.00	Street Superintendent
Marion	69,420.00	102,089.00	91,953.00	Streets Supervisor
Monticello				n/a
Mount Vernon			62,483.20	Lead Operator
New Hampton			48,984.00	Street superintendent
North Liberty				n/a
Oelwein			60,382.40	Utility Lead
Tiffin	37,128.00	50,668.80	50,660.00	
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington			58,198.40	Maintenance Coordinator
Williamsburg				n/a
Dyersville			48,734.40	
Range Data				
Average	51,799.40	69,980.25	59,852.75	
50th Percentile	50,324.80	63,581.60	58,198.40	
60th Percentile	51,479.68	66,112.64	58,300.00	
65th Percentile	52,057.12	67,378.16	59,341.20	
70th Percentile	53,966.64	71,228.90	60,382.40	
75th Percentile	56,542.20	76,372.25	60,763.20	
Actual Data				
Average	53,867.47	65,838.02		
50th Percentile	52,378.56	64,018.24		
60th Percentile	52,470.00	64,130.00		
65th Percentile	53,407.08	65,275.32		
70th Percentile	54,344.16	66,420.64		
75th Percentile	54,686.88	66,839.52		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Public Works Crew Member			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			49,296.00	Water/Wastewater 1
Camanche	38,979.20	51,334.40		
Cresco			45,052.80	Laborer
DeWitt			50,544.00	Street Laborer
Dubuque				
Eldrige			51,500.80	Equipment Operator
Hiawatha	37,500.00	52,500.00	53,700.00	Public Works Equipment Operator/Laborer
Independence	47,153.60	48,755.20		Streets Laborer
Manchester			52,374.40	Heavy Equipment Operator
Marion	61,456.00	90,376.00	58,759.00	Utility Maintenance Specialist
Monticello	41,600.00	44,200.00		
Mount Vernon	41,225.60	54,891.20		Min is Operator I and Max is Operator III
New Hampton			44,574.40	
North Liberty	39,728.00	70,241.60	51,230.40	Min is Laborer I and Max is Laborer III
Oelwein	40,788.80	49,400.00		
Tiffin	28,995.20	37,169.60	37,170.00	
Waukon				
West Burlington	47,923.20	53,248.00	53,248.00	Equipment Operator
Williamsburg	52,000.00	59,000.00		
Dyersville			46,467.20	
Range Data				
Average	43,395.42	55,556.00	49,768.16	
50th Percentile	41,225.60	52,500.00	51,230.40	
60th Percentile	41,600.00	53,248.00	51,500.80	
65th Percentile	44,376.80	54,069.60	51,937.60	
70th Percentile	47,153.60	54,891.20	52,374.40	
75th Percentile	47,538.40	56,945.60	52,811.20	
Actual Data				
Average	44,791.35	54,744.98		
50th Percentile	46,107.36	56,353.44		
60th Percentile	46,350.72	56,650.88		
65th Percentile	46,743.84	57,131.36		
70th Percentile	47,136.96	57,611.84		
75th Percentile	47,530.08	58,092.32		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Water Plant Operator			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche				n/a
Cresco			45,052.80	Laborer
DeWitt			56,763.20	
Dubuque	50,024.00	61,651.20		Plant Operator
Eldrige			70,470.40	Water Plant Super
Hiawatha	41,600.00	65,200.00	58,700.00	Water Operator
Independence			65,000.00	Water/WWTP Superintendent
Manchester			48,880.00	
Marion			102,764.00	Water Superintendent
Monticello			61,000.00	Water/Wastewater Superintendent
Mount Vernon	41,225.60	54,891.20		Min is Operator I and Max is Operator III
New Hampton			47,673.60	
North Liberty	49,628.80	70,241.60	71,094.40	
Oelwein	44,324.80	55,723.20		
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington	52,374.40	58,198.40	58,198.40	Utility Coordinator
Williamsburg				Contracted Out.
Dyersville			54,100.80	
Range Data				
Average	46,529.60	60,984.27	62,326.98	
50th Percentile	46,976.80	59,924.80	58,700.00	
60th Percentile	49,628.80	61,651.20	61,000.00	
65th Percentile	49,727.60	62,538.40	63,000.00	
70th Percentile	49,826.40	63,425.60	65,000.00	
75th Percentile	49,925.20	64,312.80	67,735.20	
Actual Data				
Average	56,094.28	68,559.68		
50th Percentile	52,830.00	64,570.00		
60th Percentile	54,900.00	67,100.00		
65th Percentile	56,700.00	69,300.00		
70th Percentile	58,500.00	71,500.00		
75th Percentile	60,961.68	74,508.72		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Waste Water Operator			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche				n/a
Cresco			45,052.80	Laborer
DeWitt			58,219.20	
Dubuque	50,024.00	61,651.20		Plant Operator
Eldrige			69,451.20	Wastewater Superintendent
Hiawatha				n/a
Independence	47,153.60	48,755.20		
Manchester			57,179.20	
Marion	48,963.00	64,112.00	58,249.00	Equipment Operator
Monticello	43,160.00	50,648.00		
Mount Vernon			78,401.73	Wastewater Superintendent
New Hampton			44,886.40	
North Liberty	49,628.80	70,241.60	52,020.80	
Oelwein	44,324.80	55,723.20		
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington			61,089.60	Assistant Public Works Director
Williamsburg				n/a
Dyersville			55,972.80	
Range Data				
Average	47,209.03	58,521.87	58,283.33	
50th Percentile	48,058.30	58,687.20	58,219.20	
60th Percentile	48,963.00	61,651.20	58,243.04	
65th Percentile	49,129.45	62,266.40	58,817.12	
70th Percentile	49,295.90	62,881.60	59,953.36	
75th Percentile	49,462.35	63,496.80	61,089.60	
Actual Data				
Average	52,454.99	64,111.66		
50th Percentile	52,397.28	64,041.12		
60th Percentile	52,418.74	64,067.34		
65th Percentile	52,935.41	64,698.83		
70th Percentile	53,958.02	65,948.70		
75th Percentile	54,980.64	67,198.56		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Police Chief				
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Years in Position:	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			77,299.56	20.00	
Camanche			80,500.00	4.00	
Cresco			69,133.74	10.00	
DeWitt			85,697.04	10.00	
Dubuque	101,816.00	133,140.00	133,140.00	11.00	
Eldrige			84,697.60	15.00	
Hiawatha	82,200.00	123,300.00	107,600.00	14.00	
Independence			71,335.12	4.00	
Manchester			84,510.00	7.00	
Marion	106,636.00	156,818.00	148,864.00	2.00	
Monticello			77,900.00	10.00	
Mount Vernon			86,164.98	28.00	
New Hampton			61,907.00	2.50	
North Liberty	101,209.12	142,911.71	126,921.60	8.50	
Oelwein			106,728.00	19.00	
Tiffin					n/a
Waukon					n/a
West Burlington			74,622.60	3.00	
Williamsburg			81,000.00	40.00	
Dyersville			81,599.92	19.00	
Range Data					
Average	97,965.28	139,042.43	91,648.31	12.24	
50th Percentile	101,512.56	138,025.86	84,510.00		
60th Percentile	101,694.62	140,957.37	85,297.26		
65th Percentile	101,785.66	142,423.12	85,884.22		
70th Percentile	102,298.00	144,302.34	90,277.58		
75th Percentile	103,021.00	146,388.28	106,728.00		
Actual Data					
Average	82,483.48	100,813.14			
50th Percentile	76,059.00	92,961.00			
60th Percentile	76,767.54	93,826.99			
65th Percentile	77,295.79	94,472.64			
70th Percentile	81,249.83	99,305.34			
75th Percentile	96,055.20	117,400.80			

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Assistant Police Chief			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury			65,739.70	
Camanche			67,000.00	
Cresco			54,225.60	
DeWitt			75,990.24	Captain
Dubuque	82,118.00	107,390.00		Assistant Police Chief
Eldrige			67,745.60	Police Sergeant
Hiawatha				n/a
Independence			70,208.99	
Manchester			65,977.60	Lieutenant
Marion	81,267.00	119,410.00		Deputy Police Chief
Monticello			64,792.00	
Mount Vernon				n/a
New Hampton				n/a
North Liberty	79,357.44	113,221.88		Lieutenant
Oelwein				n/a
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington				n/a
Williamsburg			69,500.00	
Dyersville			70,000.00	
Range Data				
Average	80,914.15	113,340.63	66,797.75	
50th Percentile	81,267.00	113,221.88	67,000.00	
60th Percentile	81,437.20	114,459.50	67,596.48	
65th Percentile	81,522.30	115,078.32	68,096.48	
70th Percentile	81,607.40	115,697.13	68,798.24	
75th Percentile	81,692.50	116,315.94	69,500.00	
Actual Data				
Average	60,117.97	73,477.52		
50th Percentile	60,300.00	73,700.00		
60th Percentile	60,836.83	74,356.13		
65th Percentile	61,286.83	74,906.13		
70th Percentile	61,918.42	75,678.06		
75th Percentile	62,550.00	76,450.00		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Police Captain			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title/Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche				n/a
Cresco				n/a
DeWitt			66,497.60	Sergeant
Dubuque	73,860.00	96,574.00		Police Captain
Eldrige			62,171.20	Police Corporal
Hiawatha	67,000.00	100,600.00		Position is second in command.
Independence			64,162.80	
Manchester			69,201.00	
Marion				n/a
Monticello				n/a
Mount Vernon			65,811.20	Sergeant
New Hampton				n/a
North Liberty	69,221.73	97,990.81		Sergeant
Oelwein	84,849.72	87,474.00		
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington				Police Sergeant
Williamsburg			68,700.00	
Dyersville			67,600.00	
Range Data				
Average	73,732.86	95,659.70	66,090.63	
50th Percentile	71,540.87	97,282.41	66,154.40	
60th Percentile	72,932.35	97,707.45	66,497.60	
65th Percentile	73,628.09	97,919.97	67,048.20	
70th Percentile	74,958.97	98,251.73	67,598.80	
75th Percentile	76,607.43	98,643.11	68,149.40	
Actual Data				
Average	59,481.57	72,699.70		
50th Percentile	59,538.96	72,769.84		
60th Percentile	59,847.84	73,147.36		
65th Percentile	60,343.38	73,753.02		
70th Percentile	60,838.92	74,358.68		
75th Percentile	61,334.46	74,964.34		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Police Officer			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title/Position Comments:
Asbury		56,123.60	56,123.60	
Camanche	56,676.98	59,996.54		Min is 3rd Class and Max is 1st Class
Cresco			52,520.00	
DeWitt			60,881.60	6 officers - actual is the average of the 6.
Dubuque	57,075.20	63,440.00		
Eldrige			58,156.80	
Hiawatha	54,412.80	51,064.00		
Independence	48,443.20	56,992.00		
Manchester	58,260.80	63,648.00		
Marion	51,846.00	74,190.00		
Monticello	49,275.20	62,129.60		
Mount Vernon	44,907.20	60,590.40		
New Hampton	41,412.80	51,168.00		
North Liberty	53,268.80	72,176.00		
Oelwein	48,068.80	55,182.40		
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington	43,825.00	54,781.00		
Williamsburg	58,000.00	65,400.00		
Dyersville			55,806.40	Actual average.
Range Data				
Average	51,190.21	60,491.54	56,920.50	
50th Percentile	51,846.00	60,293.47	57,140.20	
60th Percentile	53,497.60	61,821.76	57,750.16	
65th Percentile	54,184.00	62,719.28	58,055.14	
70th Percentile	55,318.47	63,460.80	58,429.28	
75th Percentile	56,676.98	63,596.00	58,838.00	
Actual Data				
Average	51,228.45	62,612.55		
50th Percentile	51,426.18	62,854.22		
60th Percentile	51,975.14	63,525.18		
65th Percentile	52,249.63	63,860.65		
70th Percentile	52,586.35	64,272.21		
75th Percentile	52,954.20	64,721.80		

Anamosa, Le Claire, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Library Director			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche			45,947.20	
Cresco			36,379.20	
DeWitt			59,452.92	
Dubuque	86,736.00	113,380.00	113,380.00	
Eldrige				
Hiawatha	62,800.00	94,300.00	87,200.00	
Independence			71,622.00	
Manchester			72,155.00	
Marion	86,302.00	126,915.00		
Monticello			43,050.00	
Mount Vernon				n/a
New Hampton			43,678.00	
North Liberty	84,988.63	120,000.11	101,940.80	
Oelwein			74,168.64	
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington				n/a
Williamsburg			46,000.00	
Dyersville			66,453.09	
Range Data				
Average	80,206.66	113,648.78	66,247.81	
50th Percentile	85,645.32	116,690.06	65,537.46	
60th Percentile	86,039.33	118,676.09	71,941.80	
65th Percentile	86,236.33	119,669.10	72,457.05	
70th Percentile	86,345.40	120,691.60	73,564.55	
75th Percentile	86,410.50	121,728.83	77,426.48	
Actual Data				
Average	59,623.03	72,872.59		
50th Percentile	58,983.71	72,091.21		
60th Percentile	64,747.62	79,135.98		
65th Percentile	65,211.34	79,702.75		
70th Percentile	66,208.09	80,921.00		
75th Percentile	69,683.83	85,169.13		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Assistant Library Director			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				n/a
Camanche				n/a
Cresco				n/a
DeWitt			30,160.00	Library Assistant II
Dubuque	59,508.00	77,896.00	77,896.00	Librarian II
Eldrige				n/a
Hiawatha				n/a
Independence			53,164.80	
Manchester			39,104.00	
Marion	71,253.00	104,784.00		Deputy Library Director
Monticello				n/a
Mount Vernon				n/a
New Hampton				n/a
North Liberty	69,221.73	97,990.81	81,660.80	
Oelwein			38,126.40	
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington				n/a
Williamsburg			34,000.00	
Dyersville			43,457.26	
Range Data				
Average	66,660.91	93,556.94	50,587.43	
50th Percentile	69,221.73	97,990.81	39,104.00	
60th Percentile	69,627.98	99,349.45	47,540.48	
65th Percentile	69,831.11	100,028.77	51,758.72	
70th Percentile	70,034.24	100,708.09	58,111.04	
75th Percentile	70,237.37	101,387.41	65,530.40	
Actual Data				
Average	45,528.69	55,646.17		
50th Percentile	35,193.60	43,014.40		
60th Percentile	42,786.43	52,294.53		
65th Percentile	46,582.85	56,934.59		
70th Percentile	52,299.94	63,922.14		
75th Percentile	58,977.36	72,083.44		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

Detailed Salary Data
City of Dyersville, Iowa

Position:	Circulation Clerk			
Comparable Community	Minimum Range	Maximum Range	Actual Salary	Title (if different) & Position Comments:
Asbury				
Camanche				
Cresco	18,096.00	25,708.80		Clerk
DeWitt			15.70	Circulation Manager
Dubuque	20,467.20	21,715.20		Library Clerk (part time)
Eldrige				
Hiawatha	15,900.00	22,200.00	15,800.00	
Independence	22,880.00	26,832.00		Part-Time Front Desk Clerks
Manchester			33,571.20	
Marion			18,512.00	Part-Time Library Clerk
Monticello			29,432.00	Teen/Adult Services
Mount Vernon				n/a
New Hampton	17,680.00	28,184.00		
North Liberty	27,913.60	39,811.20	28,246.40	Library Assistant II
Oelwein				n/a
Tiffin				n/a
Waukon				n/a
West Burlington				n/a
Williamsburg			19,300.00	
Dyersville			33,363.20	
Range Data				
Average	20,489.47	27,408.53	20,696.76	
50th Percentile	19,281.60	26,270.40	19,300.00	
60th Percentile	20,467.20	26,832.00	24,667.84	
65th Percentile	21,070.40	27,170.00	27,351.76	
70th Percentile	21,673.60	27,508.00	28,483.52	
75th Percentile	22,276.80	27,846.00	28,839.20	
Actual Data				
Average	18,627.08	22,766.43		
50th Percentile	17,370.00	23,160.00		
60th Percentile	22,201.06	29,601.41		
65th Percentile	24,616.58	32,822.11		
70th Percentile	25,635.17	34,180.22		
75th Percentile	25,955.28	34,607.04		

Anamosa, Le Clarie, Maquoketa, Vinton, and Cedar Rapids did not respond to the salary and benefit survey.

APPENDIX D

Insurance Benefits:		Medical											
Comparable Community:	Type of Plan:	What Carrier do you Cover?	Employee Only Coverage:				Family Coverage :				Does your municipality offer any health insurance deductible reimbursements or HSA contributions? Other additional comments:	Is your plan an ACA compliant plan?	
			Total Monthly Premium	Paid by Municipality	Paid by Employee	OOPM	Total Monthly Premium	Paid by Municipality	Paid by Employee	OOPM			
Asbury	HMO/HSA	Medical Associates	450.00	365.20	84.80		1,750.00	1,471.25	278.75			The Plan to the left is a fully funded plan, the premium cost is dependent on age (\$400-500 for single and \$1,500 - \$2,000 for family). The City also offers an HSA plan and the City contributes to the HSA account (\$2,250 for single and \$4,500 for family).	Yes
Camanche	HMO with a PPO upgrade available at employee cost	Wellmark	393.36	361.89	31.47	4,900.00	1,232.71	1,134.09	98.62	9,800.00		Premiums are age based, amount on left is for age 51 for single coverage and for family it shown at 2 parents age 35 plus two children under 14 years old. OOPM is \$6,900 for single and \$13,800 for family and the City contributes \$2,000/\$4,000 to HSA towards that amount.	Yes
Cresco	PPO	Wellmark	573.78	500.68	73.10		1,595.00	328.00	1,267.00			Yes, we buy the deductible down to \$1500 and \$2700 oop. We do offer an HSA option (different rates than above) and put \$600 into an HSA account for an employee. We don't have any employees currently taking the HSA option.	Yes
DeWitt	PPO	United Healthcare	847.60	762.84	84.76	300.00	2,500.50	2,250.45	250.05	600.00		Deductible is \$1500/\$3000 but the City reimburses 80% and employees are eligible for reimbursement of up to \$500 of their OOPM.	No - Grandfathered
Dubuque	PPO	Wellmark	720.12	612.10	108.02	800.00	1,836.41	1,560.95	275.46	2,400.00			Yes
Eldridge	PPO	Wellmark BCBS	538.70	457.90	80.81	325.00	1,213.02	1,031.07	181.95	650.00		Deductible is \$5,000 for single and \$10,000 for family and the City buys down to the \$325/\$650	Yes
Hiawatha	HMO	Wellmark	388.38	378.38	10.00	1,000.00	1,173.00	1,148.00	25.00	2,000.00		We are partially self funded and offer an FSA for health and dependent care. OOPM is \$6,350 for single and \$12,700 for family but the City uses a HRA to buy those maximums down to \$1,000 for single and \$2,000 for family.	Yes
Independence	PPO	Wellmark Blue Cross/Blue Shield	520.30	462.50	57.80	750.00	1,162.00	1,022.00	140.00	1,500.00		No	Yes
Manchester	HMO	Wellmark BCBS	442.97	442.97	0.00		1,359.48	1,062.92	296.56			The City reimburses a portion of the deductible to the employee.	No
Marion	PPO	Wellmark BCBS	534.69	463.02	71.67		1,344.23	1,172.56	171.67			Wellness incentives, if they complete wellness incentives, their premium can drop by \$30-45.	Yes
Monticello	PPO	Wellmark BCBS	560.27	560.27	0.00	500.00	1,719.46	1,098.19	621.27	1,000.00		Buy down plan - employee buys the deductible down to \$500/\$1,000.	No - Grandfathered
Mount Vernon	PPO	Wellmark BCBS	477.29	391.39	85.90	750.00	1,392.38	1,141.76	250.62	1,500.00		Flex Spending is offered to employees. Partially self-funded. High Deductible and OOP Max but the City self-funds back to the benefits.	Yes
New Hampton	PPO with partial self insurance	BCBS	718.62	620.62	98.00		1,597.00	1,379.00	218.00				Yes
North Liberty	PPO	Wellmark Blue Cross/Blue Shield	480.75	418.25	62.50	1,000.00	1,403.01	1,220.62	182.39	3,000.00		OOPM is \$3,000 for single and \$9,000 for family - the City provides up to \$2,000 per covered person on the plan for this amount. Family coverage OOPM is based on 4 people on the plan. Different amount paid by municipality for union employees \$408.64 for single and \$1,192.56 for family.	Yes
Oelwein			748.51	653.45	95.06	750.00	1,817.29	1,643.35	173.94	1,500.00			
Tiffin	HMO	Blue Cross & Blue Shield										No. City covers at 100% for single coverage.	Yes
West Burlington	PPO	Wellmark BCBS - Blue Choice	523.92	143.42	143.42		1,057.78	914.32	143.46			Different amount paid by municipality for union employees \$170 for single and \$1,021.24 for family.	Yes
Williamsburg	PPO	Wellmark Blue Cross Blue Shield	687.89	637.89	50.00	1,500.00	1,747.00	1,660.00	87.00	3,000.00		No	Yes
Dyersville	HMO	Medical Associates	970.40	873.36	97.04	1,000.00	2,488.72	2,239.85	248.87	3,000.00		Includes Dental.	Yes
Average:			587.64	505.90	66.90	1,131.25	1,523.55	1,249.33	274.22	2,450.00			

*Certain information is missing and was requested but no response was received.
*Waukon did not respond to the benefit section of the survey.

Insurance Benefits:		Dental						
Comparable Community:	Type of Plan:	Employee Only Coverage			Family Coverage			Comments:
		Total Monthly Premium	Paid by Municipality	Paid by Employee	Total Monthly Premium	Paid by Municipality	Paid by Employee	
Asbury	PPO							Included in medical.
Cresco	PPO	36.00	0.00	36.00	133.10	0.00	133.10	
DeWitt		28.30	0.00	28.30	98.50	0.00	98.50	
Dubuque	PPO	35.84	0.00	35.84	107.62	0.00	107.62	
Hiawatha	PPO	25.63	25.63	0.00	86.02	86.02	0.00	
Independence	PPO	29.72	29.72	0.00	109.52	109.52	0.00	
Manchester	Blue Dental	26.91	26.91	0.00	90.13	26.91	63.22	
Marion	Blue Dental							Included in medical or an additional cost for buy-up.
Monticello	Blue Dental	37.70	37.70	0.00	126.86	37.30	89.56	
Mount Vernon	PPO	26.72	21.92	4.80	94.96	77.88	17.08	
North Liberty	PPO	36.84	32.05	4.79	127.94	111.31	16.63	
Oelwein								Voluntary - employees pay 100%
Tiffin	HMO							Employees pay 1% of premium for employee only coverage and 50% for family coverage.
West Burlington	PPO	22.55	22.55	0.00	78.40	78.40	0.00	
Williamsburg	PPO	79.10	79.10	0.00	133.40	133.40	0.00	
Dyersville								Included in medical.
Average:		35.03	25.05	9.98	107.86	60.07	47.79	

*Camanche, Eldridge, and New Hampton did not respond to this question.

*Waukon did not respond to the benefit section of the survey.

Sick, Holiday, and Personal Days			
Comparable Community	Sick Days/Year	Holidays/Year	Personal Days/Year
Asbury	12.00	11.00	0.00
Camanche	20.00	10.00	4.00
Cresco	12.00	10.50	0.00
DeWitt	12.00	11.00	4.00
Dubuque	12.00	12.00	2.00
Eldridge	12.00	10.00	5.00
Hiawatha	12.00	11.00	2.00
Independence	24.00	11.50	2.00
Manchester	12.00	10.00	3.00
Marion	12.00	11.00	2.00
Monticello	12.00	8.00	4.00
Mount Vernon	14.00	10.00	3.00
New Hampton	11.25	8.50	4.00
North Liberty	12.00	11.00	3.00
Oelwein	18.00	9.00	4.00
Tiffin	12.00	10.00	2.00
Waukon			
West Burlington	12.00	10.00	0.00
Williamsburg	12.00	12.00	1.00
Dyersville	12.00	10.00	2.00
Average:	13.43	10.34	2.47

**Waukon did not respond to this question.*

Vacation Time						
Comparable Community:	0 - 6 Years	7 -12 Years	13 - 17 Years	18 - 25 Years	25+ Years	Comments
Asbury	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	After 6 months = 1 week; After 1 year = 1 more week; After 2 years = 2 weeks; After 5 years = 3 weeks; After 10 years = 4 weeks
Camanche						5 days
Cresco	11.00	13.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	After 1 year: 80 hours. After 2 years 88 hrs. After 5 years 104 hrs. After 10 yrs. 120 hrs. After 15 yrs. 144 hrs. After 20 yrs. 160 hrs.
DeWitt	10.00	15.00	20.00	25.00	25.00	after one year 5 days; after 2 years 10 days; after 5 years 15 days; after 10 years 20 days; after 18 years 25 days
Dubuque	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	After one year of service: two weeks; After eight years of service: three weeks; After fifteen years of service: four weeks
Eldridge	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	1 week - 1 year; 2 weeks - 2 years; 3 weeks - 8 years; 4 weeks - 15 years
Hiawatha	15.00	20.00	20.00	25.00	25.00	beginning hire date 3.08 hours per pay period (10 days); beginning 3 years 4.62 hours per pay period (15 days); beginning 10 years 6.15 hours per pay period (20 days); beginning 18 years 7.69 hours per pay period (25 days)
Manchester	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	25.00	After 1 year = 80 hours, after 7 years 4.62 hrs/pay period; after 14 years = 6.15 hrs/pay; after 24 years 7.69 hrs/pay. Maximum of 240 hours.
Marion	15.00	20.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	4 years = 80 hours; 5 years = 120 hours; 10 years = 160 hours; 16 years = 200 hours.
Monticello	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	After 1 year = 1 week; after 2 years = 2 weeks; after 10 years = 3 weeks; after 15 years = 4 weeks.
Mount Vernon	10.00	15.00	20.00	25.00	25.00	1-5 Years = 80 hours; 6-10 years = 120 hours; 11-19 = 160 hours; After 20 years = 200 hours.
Independence	13.00	15.00	18.00	20.00	25.00	Regular Full-time: 10 days after 1 year, 13 days after 5 years, 15 days after 10 years, 18 days after 15 years, 20 days after 20 years, 25 days after 25 years.
New Hampton	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	after 1 year = 1 week, 2 years = 2 weeks, six years = 3 weeks, 14 years = 4 weeks
North Liberty	10.00	20.00	22.00	23.00	25.00	40 hours after 6 months; 80 hours after 1 year; 120 hours after 5 years; 160 hours after 10 years; At 15 years, 8 add'l hours for each year of service up to 19 years; 200 maximum each year thereafter
Oelwein	10.00	15.00	20.00	25.00	25.00	over 1 year - 5 days; over 2 years - 10 days; over 7 years - 15 days; over 16 years - 20 days; over 20 years - 25 days
Tiffin	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	after 1 year - 5 days; after 2 years - 10 days; after 5 years - 15 days; after 10 years - 20 days
West Burlington	10.00	15.00	20.00	25.00	25.00	Union: After 1 year 5 days, 2-6 years 12 days, 7-14 years 18 days, after 15 years 24 days. Non-Union: After 1 year 5 days, 2-6 years 10 days, 7-14 years 15 days, 15-19 years 20days, 20 or more years 25 days.
Williamsburg	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	30.00	One (1) = Eighty (80); Five (5) = One hundred twenty (120); Twelve (12) = One hundred sixty (160); Eighteen (18) = Two hundred (200); Twenty-five (25) = Two hundred forty (240)
Dyersville	10.00	15.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	One week after 1 year of service; two weeks after 3 years of service; three weeks after 8 years of service and 4 weeks after 17 years.
Average:	10.78	15.72	19.89	21.83	23.06	

*Waukon did not respond to the benefit section of the survey.