



Draft Report
OCTOBER 24, 2024

Classification & Compensation Report

City of Rochelle, IL

Submitted by:

RACHEL SKAGGS
PROJECT MANAGER
4320 WEST KENNEDY BLVD, SUITE 200
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33609
rskaggs@mgt.us

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Job Evaluation Analysis and Job Classification System	1
Salary Survey	2
Draft and Final Report Preparation	2
Future Administration of the Classification and Compensation Plan	2
JOB EVALUATION	3
THE CLASSIFICATION PLAN.....	4
SALARY DATA	5
Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Data Purposes.....	5
Selection of Benchmark Positions for Survey Purposes	6
Salary Survey	6
Appraisal and Use of Salary Data.....	7
COMPENSATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	8
Development of the Compensation Plan.....	8
Compensation Plan Options for the City's Consideration.....	8
Recommendation: Open Range Merit Plan	9
Proposed Compensation Plan and Structure	9
Implementation and Administration of the Compensation Plan	10
Employee Advancement through the Ranges	11
FUTURE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMPENSATION PLAN	12
FUTURE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CLASSIFICATION PLAN	12
Appreciation	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MGT is pleased to have had the opportunity to work with the City of Rochelle 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.

MGT understands the high expectations established in Rochelle for service delivery and competitiveness in recruiting and retaining excellent employees. These factors have been considered in the analysis and reflected in the Study results.

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, MGT 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 Rochelle employees against market data. The following is a brief overview of the process:

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 City Administration to discuss Study methods and expectations, review the current Classification and Compensation Plan and organizational structure, answer questions, and review 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 provided time to complete the questionnaire. The JAQs were returned to MGT within approximately three (3) weeks of distribution.
- **Determined comparable communities and collected compensation data.** MGT, along with the City, determined a logical survey sample of “like” communities that impact the compensation market of Rochelle. Then, MGT designed, and the community sent out the survey for the thirty-two (32) positions covered in the Study.
- **Job Evaluation Analysis and Establishment of a Classification Plan.** Upon return of the JAQs by the City, MGT 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.

Salary 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 Rochelle to the salary ranges of its comparable communities. Prepared comparison calculations at the 50th, 60th, 65th, 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 Rochelle as a payer at the 50th percentile of the salary data from the comparable communities.
- Based on the above data, developed, and recommended new salary schedules.

Draft and Final Report Preparation

- 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.
- This draft report has been prepared by MGT and sent electronically to the City.
- A presentation of these draft findings will be conducted, as requested.
- Once the presentation is made and review comments are returned by the City a final report will be prepared and transmitted electronically.

Future Administration of the Classification and Compensation Plan

- Within the body of this report, MGT has outlined how the City can maintain the Classification and Compensation Plan. MGT 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.

JOB EVALUATION

MGT'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, Finance, etc.) may be compared against each other based upon the same factors.

In conducting the Job Evaluation, 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 they 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 they have a more significant workload than a similar employee in another Department; however, these are employee specific characteristics and not determinants for a position evaluation.

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 Rochelle'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, MGT 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 fits the appropriate level for the position. In other words, a position that supervises ten (10) full-time staff members would receive more points under the "Work of Others" factor than positions that do not supervise. Points for each factor were then totaled for each position. Using this method, the positions were found to fall into distinguishable Skill Levels. Table 1 contains the Classification Plan, including the Position Title, Skill Level, and proposed Grade for the evaluated positions.

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., Office 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 that 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 workforces 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 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 that 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 the 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.

SALARY DATA

The City 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 II) 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 Rochelle.

To determine which municipalities should be used for survey purposes, MGT first considered the following counties: Winnebago, DeKalb, Stephenson, Lee, Ogle, Whiteside, Kane, Kendall, Grundy, Will & Carroll with a population of 5,000 to 75,000.

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Total Possible Points</u>
1. Equalized Assessed Value	25
2. Per Capita Income	25
3. Total Expenditures	25
4. <u>Number of Full Time Employees</u>	<u>25</u>
	100

The four (4) categories listed above were selected to mirror important criteria such as similar financial conditions and employees.

Within each of the four (4) categories, ranges of compatibility were established. For example, the closer a community was to matching the Rochelle's estimated population, the closer the community would be to receiving the maximum of one hundred (100) points. A community whose population was significantly larger or smaller than City'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 Rochelle. A community with zero (0) points was therefore determined to be the least comparable to Rochelle. A more detailed explanation of the methodology used to determine the comparable communities is included in Appendix B.

A cutoff of eighty (80) points was established to select the communities most similar to Rochelle across the four (4) categories. After applying the four (4) criteria, twenty (20) communities achieved eighty (80) or more compatibility points on the comparison scale. The full list of the twenty (20) comparables is below:

Freeport	New Lenox	Huntley
Sterling	Park Forest	Montgomery
Morris	DeKalb	Oswego
Bartlett	Algonquin	Yorkville
Carpentersville	Batavia	Crest Hill
Lockport	Geneva	Plainfield
Romeoville	Tinley Park	

Selection of Benchmark Positions for Survey Purposes

When developing the salary survey, it is important to select positions that are likely to have data available from the surveyed municipalities. These positions are referred to as benchmark positions. Based on the size of the Study and number of positions in Rochelle, MGT recommended limiting the benchmark positions in the survey to approximately thirty-two (32) positions. This is because as the number of positions surveyed increases there tends to be a decline the number of organizations responding to the survey. This decline in response rates is thought to be due to the amount of work organizations need to devote to completing a lengthier survey. Positions recommended as benchmarks are those that:

- 1) Are representative of each occupational grouping (e.g., Administration, Finance, Police, etc.).
- 2) Include multiple numbers of City employees when possible.
- 3) Can be described in a concise manner that accurately identifies the nature of work and level of difficulty.
- 4) Are known to commonly exist in other communities.

After discussion with City Administration, thirty-two (32) positions were selected as benchmark positions for the survey. The benchmark positions are represented in Appendix C.

Salary Survey

After identifying the benchmark positions, the Consultants then prepared and distributed a salary survey to the twenty (20) comparable communities. All of the communities responded to the survey or supplied MGT with a copy of their Compensation Plan/Union Contracts. Table 1 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 observations regarding Table 1 and Appendix C.

- 1) The salary data is information that was available as of May 2024. 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 don't 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, 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) 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 Rochelle'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 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 for 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.

For the purposes of this study, a review of private-sector salary data was also included. MGT subscribes to Salary.com's CompAnalyst online database for up-to-date private sector data. The following employment market area was used in the analysis:

- 1) Rochelle, IL
- 2) All Industries & Public Administration
- 3) 50-100 FTEs

The industry scopes that were applied to the data were as follows:

- 1) August 2024
- 2) Minimum/Maximum
- 3) 50th Percentile Used for Base Salary

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, they systematically advance 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.

Each system provides for advantages and disadvantages which should be evaluated by the community to determine the most appropriate system to be established.

Recommendation: Open Range Merit Plan

MGT typically recommends the adoption of an Open Range Merit Plan. 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.

The Open Range Merit Plan also allows 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 Rochelle's goal to recruit, reward and retain motivated, high-performing employees, the Open Range Merit Plan has been selected for recommendation.

Proposed Compensation Plan and Structure

Within the market analysis, MGT refers to "percentiles" (for example: 50th, 60th, 65th, 75th and 80th percentiles). Percentiles indicate where salaries or salary ranges fall in comparison to the other salaries or salary ranges from the comparable communities. The 50th percentile is the median (or middle) of the data set. When a community is considering which percentile to compensate employees at, they are deciding where they want their employee salaries and salary ranges to fall within the market of comparable communities. For example, if a community selects the 50th percentile, that means they would be paying a fair market rate at the 50th percentile or middle of the comparable communities. If a community selects the 60th percentile, then the salary ranges would be 10% higher than the middle of the market.

An important component in the process of developing a Compensation Plan is understanding and applying the pay philosophy of the City. For the purposes of this study, the City is considering a pay philosophy of compensating employees at the 50th percentile.

The next step in this process is to combine the Skill Levels included in Table 1 with the proposed salary ranges in Table 2. The Classification and Compensation Plan consists of

thirteen (13) pay grades; one (1) being lowest and thirteen (13) being highest and is broken down into the following four (4) bands:

Grades 1 – 4:	Administrative and Technical Staff
Grades 5 – 9:	Supervisors and Advanced Technical Staff
Grades 10 – 12:	Directors and Senior Managers
Grade 13:	City Manager

All proposed pay ranges are open ranges. There is a 10% gradation between all Grades. Grades 1 – 9 have a 35% range spread from minimum to maximum, and Grades 10 – 13 have a 40% range spread from minimum to maximum.

Note: 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 10% 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 1 combines all of the classification and compensation data at the 50th 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, MGT 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 decision 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 implementation adjustments, MGT can provide examples of implementation options.

Employee Advancement through the Ranges

To implement the new Compensation Plan, MGT 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 but should be in the form of a lump sum payment that is a set amount calculated each year and is consistent for all affected employees.

It is recommended that the City set aside funding for a performance-based increase for employees in this Plan. This funding 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 communities used in the survey group for this Study have been determined to be comparable jurisdictions to the City. Therefore, Rochelle can continue to use these jurisdictions as a comparable salary survey group for annual salary comparison purposes until it is determined that they should be reevaluated. It is MGT'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 MGT 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.

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: elimination 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 ensure 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 in order to maintain 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. MGT provides scoring assistance in such cases in accordance with the Study contract.

Appreciation

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

Position:	Skill Level	New Grade	50th Percentile Salary Survey Data		Current Salary Range		Current Salary	Proposed Salary Range 50th Percentile	
	835 - 885	13							
City Manager		13	189,473	252,631	122,316	152,900	182,233	189,000	264,600
	780 - 830	12							
HR Director		12	110,058	158,759	75,049	93,806	94,559	130,680	182,952
Dir of Community Eng. and Assistant to the CM		12	129,379	173,907	107,024	133,813	144,217		
Police Chief		12	136,913	184,322	115,277	144,096	131,568		
Fire Chief		12	135,762	186,387	115,277	144,096	148,512		
Superintendent- Electric Operations/Generation		12			107,024	133,813	132,613		
Public Works Director		12	130,637	175,236	107,024	133,813	138,415		
Superintendent of Water & Water Reclamation		12	104,262	142,770	107,024	133,813	144,612		
	725 - 775	11							
Finance Director/Budget Officer		11	128,239	169,850	107,024	133,813	160,381	118,800	166,320
Director of Advanced Communications Service		11	101,031	136,633	107,024	133,813	143,878		
	670 - 720	10							
Engineer		10	107,907	144,772	107,024	133,813	140,076	108,000	151,200
Community Development Director		10			107,024	133,813	126,485		
Economic Development Director		10	102,766	144,355	107,024	133,813	153,727		
Deputy Police Chief		10							
Assistant Superintendent of Electric		10			107,024	133,813	119,789		
	615 - 665	9							
No Positions in Grade		9						102,487	138,357
	560 - 610	8							
Golf Course Manager		8			85,729	107,134	102,752	93,170	125,780
Airport Manager		8			80,830	100,999	91,957		
Accounting Manager		8	75,159	108,832	75,049	93,806	98,524		
	505 - 555	7							
Building Inspector		7	76,069	103,791	75,049	93,806	92,613	84,700	114,345
Engineer Technician of Services and Support		7	84,414	117,542	63,751	79,705	86,112		
	450 - 500	6							
City Clerk		6	65,920	88,992	75,049	93,806	73,139	77,000	103,950
HR Risk and Safety Coordinator*		6			75,049	93,806	83,797		
Network Specialist III		6	89,650	125,918	63,751	79,705	77,213		
Utility Billing Manager		6	64,372	86,666	75,049	93,806	80,153		
	395 - 445	5							
HR Coordinator		5	68,066	97,577	75,049	93,806		70,000	94,500
GIS Coordinator		5	68,716	97,577	75,049	93,806	84,058		
	340 - 390	4							
Marketing - Fiber		4					52,000	54,571	73,671
Utility Billing Generalist III		4			48,150	60,154	60,154		
Community Development Specialist		4	71,330	97,300	44,707	55,873	72,613		
Accounting Specialist		4	60,320	81,120	56,645	70,790	66,560		
HR Specialist		4					62,858		
Utility Operations Specialist		4	49,440	66,744	56,645	70,790	75,052		
Network Specialist I		4			56,645	70,790	58,296		
	285 - 335	3							

Position:	Skill Level	New Grade	50th Percentile Salary Survey Data		Current Salary Range		Current Salary	Proposed Salary Range 50th Percentile	
Community Service Officer		3	49,440	69,518	44,707	55,873	46,800	49,610	66,974
Part-Time Community Service Officer		3			44,707	55,873	40,706		
Utility Billing Generalist - II		3	50,024	71,121	44,707	55,873	44,200		
Administrative Support - Fire		3	53,235	73,815	44,707	55,873	49,150		
Golf Pro Shop Manager		3							
Administrative Assistant - Police		3			44,707	55,873	48,672		
Administrative Support II		3			39,698	49,650	52,312		
	230 - 280	2							
Utility Billing Specialist I - Translator		2	50,910	68,601	42,125	52,629	40,893	45,100	60,885
Golf Course Maintenance*		2							
Custodian		2	46,078	65,583	35,263	44,067	51,272		
	Up to 225	1							
Filling Station or Railfan Park Attendant*		1			34,252	41,552	29,744	41,000	55,350
Customer Service/Admin Support		1			37,403	46,759	40,019		

*Position was surveyed but not enough salary data was available.

50th Percentile - Proposed Pay Ranges		
Administrative and Technical 10% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread		
	Minimum	Maximum
1	41,000	55,350
2	45,100	60,885
3	49,610	66,974
4	54,571	73,671

Supervisors and Advanced Technical 10% Between Each Grade and a 35% Range Spread		
	Minimum	Maximum
5	70,000	94,500
6	77,000	103,950
7	84,700	114,345
8	93,170	125,780
9	102,487	138,357

Directors and Senior Managers 10% Between Each Grade and a 40% Range Spread		
Grade	Minimum	Maximum
10	108,000	151,200
11	118,800	166,320
12	130,680	182,952

City Manger 40% Range Spread		
Grade	Minimum	Maximum
13	189,000	264,600

APPENDIX A

EMPLOYEE JOB ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE (JAQ)

City of Rochelle, IL

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:	THEIR 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 their 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
Other

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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).

11. 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.

3. How long has this employee worked for you?

4. Additional comments from the employee's immediate supervisor:

Type your name and the date below, then email this form to your Department Head (if applicable) or to City 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 [ORG] Administration. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it before forwarding.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME

DATE

IMPORTANT DATES:

June 18th to July 5th:

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

July 8th to July 19th :

Supervisors and Department Heads review and then submit the JAQs to Human Resources.

July 22nd to July 29th:

Human Resources collects and submits the JAQs to GovHR USA.

Week August 5th and August 12th:

GovHR meets virtually with employees to review their JAQ.

APPENDIX B

1. Equalized Assessed Valuation: Maximum 25 Points						
283.18 Million						
Factor	Minimum Range			Maximum Range		Points
1.50	188.79	283.18		283.18	424.77	25
2.00	141.59	188.78		424.78	566.36	20
2.50	113.27	141.58		566.37	707.95	15
3.00	94.39	113.26		707.96	849.54	10
All Others						0
2. Per Capita Income: Maximum 25 Points						
30,949						
Factor	Minimum Range			Maximum Range		Points
1.50	20,633	30,949		30,949	46,424	25
2.00	15,475	20,632		46,425	61,898	20
2.50	12,380	15,474		61,899	77,373	15
3.00	10,316	12,379		77,374	92,847	10
All Others						0
3. Total Expenditures: Maximum 25 Points						
72.20 Million						
Factor	Minimum Range			Maximum Range		Points
1.50	48.13	72.20		72.20	108.30	25
2.00	36.10	48.12		108.31	144.40	20
2.50	28.88	36.09		144.41	180.50	15
3.00	24.07	28.87		180.51	216.60	10
All Others						0
4. Number of Full Time Employees: Maximum 25 Points						
121						
Factor	Minimum Range			Maximum Range		Points
1.50	81	121		121	182	25
2.00	61	80		183	242	20
2.50	48	60		243	303	15
3.00	40	47		304	363	10
All Others						0
Initial screen:						
Illinois communities in the following counties: Winnebago, DeKalb, Stephenson, Lee, Ogle, Whiteside, Kane, Kendall, Grundy, Will & Carroll with a population of 5,000 to 75,000.						
Sources:						
Illinnois Comptroller Website - Local Government Warehouse						
https://illinoiscomptroller.gov/constituent-services/local-government/local-government-warehouse/landingpage						
US Census Bureau: Population and Per Capita Income						
Google Maps: Proximity						

EAV, Per Capita, Total Expenditures, Total Employees
Add in Kane, Kendall, Grundy and Will Counties

City of Rochelle, IL
Criteria Comparisons - Sorted by Rank 2024

Municipality	EAV (million)	Max. Point s	Per Capita Income	Max. Points	Total Expend. (million)	Max Points	Total Employees	Max. Points	Total Points
Rochelle	283.18	25	30,949	25	72.20	25	121	25	100
Freeport	228.98	25	28,348	25	54.73	25	191	20	95
Sterling	207.47	25	41,261	25	315.23	10	155	25	85
Morris	494.52	20	38,503	25	32.48	15	146	25	85
Bartlett	3,642.47	10	44,559	25	50.44	25	166	25	85
Carpentersville	744.57	10	28,333	25	58.51	25	167	25	85
Lockport	891.79	10	39,118	25	48.53	25	101	25	85
New Lenox	1,017.59	10	45,362	25	50.16	25	110	25	85
Park Forest	133.62	15	25,844	25	46.17	20	151	25	85
DeKalb	794.56	10	26,761	25	92.35	25	237	20	80
Algonquin	1,124.39	10	54,019	20	53.74	25	131	25	80
Batavia	1,186.12	10	50,976	20	99.07	25	166	25	80
Geneva	1,118.01	10	60,161	20	75.03	25	139	25	80
Huntley	1,121.58	10	43,852	25	37.17	20	101	25	80
Montgomery	538.95	20	31,543	25	33.83	15	70	20	80
Oswego	1,054.40	10	42,024	25	39.94	20	116	25	80
Yorkville	623.60	15	39,765	25	33.87	15	87	25	80
Crest Hill	425.52	20	28,447	25	33.31	15	74	20	80
Plainfield	1,611.01	10	48,106	20	63.95	25	136	25	80
Romeoville	1,399.03	10	30,096	25	99.40	25	230	20	80
Tinley Park	1,640.78	10	44,349	25	92.81	25	215	20	80
Channahon	601.69	15	40,721	25	30.39	15	65	20	75
South Elgin	767.67	10	46,005	25	30.52	15	82	25	75
Channahon	601.69	15	40,721	25	30.39	15	65	20	75
Shorewood	673.69	15	42,826	25	33.74	15	74	20	75
Minooka	491.13	20	45,174	25	21.94	0	86	25	70
Plano	271.38	25	34,136	25	13.36	0	70	20	70
Frankfort	1,000.15	10	53,589	20	31.39	15	88	25	70
Minooka	491.13	20	45,174	25	21.95	0	86	25	70
Orland Park	2,277.35	10	45,338	25	121.92	20	263	15	70
Loves Park	35.22	0	33,874	25	35.22	15	102	25	65
Rockton	176.76	20	44,233	25	9.77	0	79	20	65
Roscoe	248.53	25	42,283	25	8.88	0	60	15	65
Elburn	226.91	25	47,332	20	9.00	0	64	20	65
Bolingbrook	2,372.87	10	38,896	25	133.47	20	309	10	65
Rock Falls	85.54	0	31,733	25	30.13	15	77	20	60
Sycamore	487.89	20	39,364	25	30.90	15	2	0	60
Hampshire	254.69	25	55,048	20	11.24	0	49	15	60
North Aurora	609.15	15	42,939	25	21.09	0	64	20	60

City of Rochelle, IL
Criteria Comparisons - Sorted by Rank 2024

Municipality	EAV (million)	Max. Point s	Per Capita Income	Max. Points	Total Expend. (million)	Max Points	Total Employees	Max. Points	Total Points
Rochelle	283.18	25	30,949	25	72.20	25	121	25	100
Saint Charles	999.99	10	59,060	20	160.78	15	299	15	60
Sugar Grove	367.56	25	58,373	20	14.08	0	59	15	60
West Dundee	307.68	25	48,831	20	21.53	0	55	15	60
Frankfort Square	608.47	15	43,315	25	4.53	0	76	20	60
Mokena	890.60	10	48,998	20	27.01	10	76	20	60
Coal City	134.43	15	42,317	25	9.53	0	52	15	55
South Beloit	1.34	0	35,108	25	12.10	0	94	25	50
Dixon	255.13	25	26,524	25	1.09	0	15	0	50
Gilberts	265.16	25	41,529	25	14.46	0	40	0	50
Pingree Grove	290.65	25	44,940	25	10.12	0	25	0	50
Braidwood	134.15	15	39,918	25	8.26	0	46	10	50
Manhattan	282.28	25	41,241	25	15.09	0	26	0	50
Monee	115.13	15	47,092	20	19.00	0	55	15	50
Willowbrook	515.27	20	57,615	20	21.62	0	41	10	50
Sandwich	182.36	20	34,266	25	10.47	0	37	0	45
Machesney Park	445.37	20	33,775	25	18.97	0	21	0	45
Sandwich	182.36	20	34,266	25	10.47	0	37	0	45
Homer Glen	999.99	10	49,558	20	13.21	0	57	15	45
Barrington Hills	401.13	25	73,446	15	7.52	0	24	0	40
Crete	171.94	20	50,173	20	13.10	0	39	0	40
Steger	119.14	15	27,204	25	10.11	0	27	0	40
Genoa	109.12	10	80,408	10	6.32	0	53	15	35
Campton Hills	534.89	20	74,354	15	4.97	0	20	0	35
Boulder Hill	0.00	0	29,263	25	0.00	0	0	0	25
Wilmington	12.81	0	36,538	25	0.00	0	13	0	25
Cortland	84.86	0	37,032	0	5.49	0	26	0	0

City of Rochelle, IL
Top Comparables 80+ Points

Municipality	EAV (million)	Max. Points	Per Capita Income	Max. Points	Total Expend. (million)	Max Points	Total Employees	Max. Points	Total Points
Rochelle	283.18	25	30,949	25	72.20	25	121	25	100
Freeport	228.98	25	28,348	25	54.73	25	191	20	95
Sterling	207.47	25	41,261	25	315.23	10	155	25	85
Morris	494.52	20	38,503	25	32.48	15	146	25	85
Bartlett	3,642.47	10	44,559	25	50.44	25	166	25	85
Carpentersville	744.57	10	28,333	25	58.51	25	167	25	85
Lockport	891.79	10	39,118	25	48.53	25	101	25	85
New Lenox	1,017.59	10	45,362	25	50.16	25	110	25	85
Park Forest	133.62	15	25,844	25	46.17	20	151	25	85
DeKalb	794.56	10	26,761	25	92.35	25	237	20	80
Algonquin	1,124.39	10	54,019	20	53.74	25	131	25	80
Batavia	1,186.12	10	50,976	20	99.07	25	166	25	80
Geneva	1,118.01	10	60,161	20	75.03	25	139	25	80
Huntley	1,121.58	10	43,852	25	37.17	20	101	25	80
Montgomery	538.95	20	31,543	25	33.83	15	70	20	80
Oswego	1,054.40	10	42,024	25	39.94	20	116	25	80
Yorkville	623.60	15	39,765	25	33.87	15	87	25	80
Crest Hill	425.52	20	28,447	25	33.31	15	74	20	80
Plainfield	1,611.01	10	48,106	20	63.95	25	136	25	80
Romeoville	1,399.03	10	30,096	25	99.40	25	230	20	80
Tinley Park	1,640.78	10	44,349	25	92.81	25	215	20	80

APPENDIX C

Administrative Support				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Administrative Assistant	58,414	80,544	72,781
Romeoville	Administrative Assistant	60,987	82,333	72,327
Algonquin	Office Assistant			47,576
Oswego	Administrative Assistant	51,455	73,066	57,412
New Lenox	Receptionist	48,843	69,518	50,796
Lockport	Administrative Assistant	45,650	60,877	51,379
Montgomery	Administrative Assistant	55,016	74,298	
Carpentersville	n/a			
Bartlett	Municipal Services Representative	56,548	82,356	76,569
DeKalb	Administrative Assistant	50,574	73,332	53,745
Morris	Executive Services Administrator			76,357
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Administrative Assistant	57,475	77,591	
Huntley	Administrative Assistant II			76,651
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Administrative Aide			58,495
Sterling	Admin Assistant to the City Clerk	46,350	62,573	
Tinley Park	Administrative Assistant			75,910
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Administrative Support	39,698	55,873	50,044
Range Data				
Average		53,131	73,649	64,166
50th Percentile		53,235	73,815	65,411
60th Percentile		55,629	75,615	72,599
65th Percentile		56,318	77,097	73,250
70th Percentile		56,826	78,477	74,971
75th Percentile		57,243	79,806	76,022
80th Percentile		57,663	80,902	76,267
City Compensation	n/a			
City Compensation	n/a			

City Clerk				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Deputy Clerk/Administrative Assistant	61,042	84,167	84,167
Romeoville	Executive Assistant/Deputy Clerk	70,014	94,520	75,153
Algonquin	Village Clerk \$6,000 per year			
Oswego	Village Clerk	77,219	109,651	95,039
New Lenox	Village Clerk	73,013	98,039	98,039
Lockport	Deputy City Clerk	50,889	67,864	67,864
Montgomery	Executive Assistant/Deputy Clerk	62,109	86,965	69,930
Carpentersville	Assit to the VM & Village Clerk			83,154
Bartlett	City Clerk \$4,500 per year			
DeKalb	Elected			
Morris	City Clerk			99,299
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	Village Clerk			88,736
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Village Clerk			98,490
Sterling	City Clerk	65,920	88,992	
Tinley Park	Clerk Matron			81,715
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	City Clerk	75,049	93,806	73,139
Range Data				
Average		65,744	90,028	85,599
50th Percentile		65,920	88,992	84,167
60th Percentile		68,376	92,309	88,736
65th Percentile		69,605	93,967	91,888
70th Percentile		70,614	95,224	95,039
75th Percentile		71,514	96,279	96,539
80th Percentile		72,414	97,335	98,039

City Compensation	City Clerk	40,334	128,330	
City Compensation	City Clerk	74,081	173,576	

Accounting Specialist				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Finance Assistant	58,414	80,544	80,544
Romeoville	Accountant	76,068	102,692	90,301
Algonquin	Accounts Payable Specialist	64,372	86,666	80,140
Oswego	Staff Accountant	68,716	97,577	75,598
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	Accounts Payable Clerk	50,889	6,787	67,864
Montgomery	Accountant	60,320	81,120	
Carpentersville	Staff Accountant			91,928
Bartlett	Accountant	68,066	99,154	81,531
DeKalb	Accountant	61,662	89,410	63,555
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Accounts Payable Specialist	57,475	77,591	
Huntley	Accountant - Payroll			87,550
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Accounting Assistant			65,968
Sterling	Accounts Payable Specialist	49,440	66,744	
Tinley Park	Staff Accountant			77,131
Yorkville	Accounting Clerk	53,681	72,336	
Rochelle, IL	Accounting Specialist	56,645	70,790	66,560
Range Data				
Average		60,828	78,238	78,374
50th Percentile		60,320	81,120	80,140
60th Percentile		61,662	86,666	80,544
65th Percentile		63,017	88,038	81,038
70th Percentile		64,372	89,410	81,531
75th Percentile		66,219	93,494	84,541
80th Percentile		68,066	97,577	87,550

City Compensation	Finance	73,700	190,669	
City Compensation	Finance	59,214	209,666	

Accounting Manager				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Assistant Director of Finance	94,796	130,710	130,710
Romeoville	Assistant Finance Director	96,275	129,970	123,684
Algonquin	Deputy Chief Financial Officer	115,642	155,259	135,000
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	Chief Accountant	73,013	103,921	103,921
Lockport	Accountant/HR Generalist	60,000	75,000	60,000
Montgomery	Accounting Manager	71,432	100,005	81,557
Carpentersville	Assistant Finance Director			107,069
Bartlett	Chief Accountant	85,758	120,542	120,542
DeKalb	Senior Accountant	75,159	108,832	85,287
Morris	Deputy Treasurer			86,528
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Accounting Supervisor	93,912	126,781	
Huntley	Assistant Director of Finance			113,300
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	Senior Accountant			94,102
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Accounting Manager	75,049	93,806	98,524
Range Data				
Average		85,110	116,780	103,475
50th Percentile		85,758	120,542	105,495
60th Percentile		92,281	125,533	110,808
65th Percentile		94,089	127,419	114,386
70th Percentile		94,442	128,694	118,369
75th Percentile		94,796	129,970	121,328
80th Percentile		95,388	130,266	123,056

City Compensation	Finance	73,700	190,669	
City Compensation	Finance	59,214	209,666	

Accounting Manager (Edited)				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Assistant Director of Finance			
Romeoville	Assistant Finance Director			
Algonquin	Deputy Chief Financial Officer			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	Chief Accountant	73,013	103,921	103,921
Lockport	Accountant/HR Generalist			
Montgomery	Accounting Manager	71,432	100,005	81,557
Carpentersville	Assistant Finance Director			
Bartlett	Chief Accountant	85,758	120,542	120,542
DeKalb	Senior Accountant	75,159	108,832	85,287
Morris	Deputy Treasurer			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Accounting Supervisor	93,912	126,781	
Huntley	Assistant Director of Finance			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	Senior Accountant			94,102
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Accounting Manager (Edited)	75,049	93,806	98,524
Range Data				
Average		79,855	112,016	97,082
50th Percentile		75,159	108,832	94,102
60th Percentile		79,399	113,516	98,029
65th Percentile		81,518	115,858	99,993
70th Percentile		83,638	118,200	101,957
75th Percentile		85,758	120,542	103,921
80th Percentile		87,389	121,790	107,245

City Compensation	Finance	73,700	190,669	
City Compensation	Finance	59,214	209,666	

Finance Director/Budget Officer				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Finance Director/Budget Officer	140,879	194,246	194,246
Romeoville	Finance Director/Budget Officer	125,512	169,443	152,475
Algonquin	Deputy Village Manager/CFO	142,114	195,906	175,962
Oswego	Finance Director/Budget Officer	121,505	182,258	168,051
New Lenox	Finance Director	130,966	170,256	170,256
Lockport	Finance Director/Budget Officer	140,000	160,000	155,625
Montgomery	Finance Director/Budget Officer	118,107	165,350	122,383
Carpentersville	Finance Director/Budget Officer			143,042
Bartlett	Finance Director/Budget Officer	145,959	195,312	195,312
DeKalb	Director of Financial Services	100,130	145,188	123,000
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Finance Director	135,762	190,067	
Huntley	Director of Finance			162,876
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Accounting Services Supervisor			127,305
Sterling	Finance Director	105,060	141,831	
Tinley Park	Finance Director			147,647
Yorkville	Finance Director	99,278	138,588	
Rochelle, IL	Finance Director/Budget Officer	107,024	133,813	160,381
Range Data				
Average		125,439	170,704	156,783
50th Percentile		128,239	169,850	155,625
60th Percentile		133,844	177,457	163,911
65th Percentile		136,398	183,429	167,016
70th Percentile		138,729	187,724	168,933
75th Percentile		140,220	191,112	170,256
80th Percentile		140,703	193,410	173,680

City Compensation	Finance	73,700	190,669	
City Compensation	Finance	59,214	209,666	

Human Resource Specialist				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Benefits & Payroll Specialist	76,069	104,889	84,666
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	Human Resources Generalist	73,139	98,083	86,915
Oswego	Human Resources Generalist	68,716	97,577	79,376
New Lenox	Senior Administrative Assistant	61,303	87,254	87,254
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	Payroll & Benefit Specialist			77,173
Bartlett	Benefits Coordinator	68,066	99,154	99,154
DeKalb	HR Coordinator	61,662	89,140	65,000
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	Human Resources Assistant			59,911
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Human Resources Assistant			81,000
Sterling	Employee Benefits Coordinator	57,680	77,868	
Tinley Park	Human Resources Coordinator			84,380
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	HR Coordinator	75,049	93,806	
Range Data				
Average		66,662	93,424	80,483
50th Percentile		68,066	97,577	82,690
60th Percentile		68,456	97,880	84,495
65th Percentile		68,651	98,032	84,623
70th Percentile		69,601	98,297	85,341
75th Percentile		70,928	98,618	86,352
80th Percentile		72,254	98,940	86,982

City Compensation	Human Resources	n/a	n/a	
City Compensation	Human Resources	n/a	n/a	

HR Risk and Safety Coordinator				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Human Resources Coordinator	61,042	84,167	64,401
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	n/a			
Bartlett	n/a			
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	Human Resources Coordinator			84,380
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	HR Risk and Safety Coordinator	75,049	93,806	83,797
Range Data				
Average		61,042	84,167	74,391
50th Percentile		61,042	84,167	74,391
60th Percentile		61,042	84,167	76,389
65th Percentile		61,042	84,167	77,388
70th Percentile		61,042	84,167	78,387
75th Percentile		61,042	84,167	79,386
80th Percentile		61,042	84,167	80,385

City Compensation	Human Resources	n/a	n/a	
City Compensation	Human Resources	n/a	n/a	

Human Resources Director				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Human Resources Director	123,451	170,219	170,219
Romeoville	Human Resources Manager	114,102	154,038	139,212
Algonquin	Asst Village Manager/HR Director	133,246	177,596	175,962
Oswego	Assistant Village Administrator	121,505	182,258	156,750
New Lenox	Human Resources Director	51,773	170,256	170,256
Lockport	Assistant Finance/HR Director	105,000	120,000	119,313
Montgomery	Assistant Village Administrator	107,370	150,318	107,370
Carpentersville	Human Resources Manager			113,135
Bartlett	Human Resources Director	139,021	185,980	185,980
DeKalb	Human Resources Director	112,745	163,480	130,000
Morris	HR Administrator			60,840
Crest Hill	Human Resources Manager	80,000	100,000	
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Human Resources Manager	102,000	142,800	
Huntley	Director of Human Resources			115,793
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Human Resources Director			130,410
Sterling	Human Resources Director	98,880	133,488	
Tinley Park	Human Resources Director			156,598
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Human Resources Director	107,024	133,813	126,022
Range Data				
Average		107,424	154,203	137,988
50th Percentile		110,058	158,759	134,811
60th Percentile		113,559	167,523	153,121
65th Percentile		115,212	170,225	156,666
70th Percentile		119,284	170,245	158,097
75th Percentile		121,992	172,091	166,852
80th Percentile		123,062	176,128	170,234

City Compensation	Human Resources	67,500	161,857	
City Compensation	Human Resources	56,684	180,066	

City Manager				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	City Administrator			206,373
Romeoville	Village Manager			215,751
Algonquin	Village Manager			233,797
Oswego	Village Administrator			223,330
New Lenox	Village Administrator	175,551	228,216	228,216
Lockport	City Administrator			221,608
Montgomery	Village Administrator	140,868	197,215	195,356
Carpentersville	Village Manager			155,000
Bartlett	City Manager			212,540
DeKalb	City Manager			161,533
Morris	Mayor			114,005
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	City Administrator	166,000	232,400	
Huntley	Village Manager			208,511
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Village Administrator			190,957
Sterling	City Manager	130,000	175,500	
Tinley Park	Village Manager			215,152
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	City Manager	122,316	152,900	182,233
Range Data				
Average		153,105	208,333	198,724
50th Percentile		153,434	212,716	210,526
60th Percentile		160,974	222,016	214,630
65th Percentile		164,743	226,666	215,422
70th Percentile		166,955	228,634	216,337
75th Percentile		168,388	229,262	220,144
80th Percentile		169,820	229,890	222,297

City Compensation	Chief Administrative C	109,772	266,355	
City Compensation	Chief Administrative C	153,032	288,901	

GIS Coordinator				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	GIS Coordinator	83,070	114,542	102,909
Romeoville	GIS Coordinator	85,576	115,529	100,445
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	GIS Specialist	68,716	97,577	85,256
New Lenox	GIS Coordinator	51,773	73,689	62,990
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	GIS Specialist	62,400	87,360	
Carpentersville	n/a			
Bartlett	GIS Administrator	85,758	120,542	92,184
DeKalb	GIS Manager	75,159	108,832	90,000
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	GIS Technician	63,223	85,350	
Huntley	GIS Technician			93,172
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	IT/GIS Specialist			82,206
Sterling	IT Tech	57,680	77,868	
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	GIS Coordinator	75,049	93,806	84,058
Range Data				
Average		70,373	97,921	88,645
50th Percentile		68,716	97,577	91,092
60th Percentile		73,870	106,581	92,382
65th Percentile		76,741	109,974	92,727
70th Percentile		79,906	112,258	93,073
75th Percentile		83,070	114,542	94,990
80th Percentile		84,072	114,937	97,536

City Compensation	Information Technology	55,595	166,192	
City Compensation	Information Technology	86,097	179,414	

Network Specialist				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	IT Network Admin	76,069	104,889	104,889
Romeoville	IT Tech	96,275	129,970	123,449
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	IT Director			139,585
Bartlett	Network Administrator	89,650	125,918	125,918
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	IT Specialist			85,905
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Network Specialist	56,645	70,790	58,296
Range Data				
Average		87,331	120,259	115,949
50th Percentile		89,650	125,918	123,449
60th Percentile		90,975	126,728	124,437
65th Percentile		91,638	127,134	124,930
70th Percentile		92,300	127,539	125,424
75th Percentile		92,963	127,944	125,918
80th Percentile		93,625	128,349	128,651

City Compensation	Information Technology	55,595	166,192	
City Compensation	Information Technology	86,097	179,414	

Custodian				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	n/a			
Romeoville	Custodian	50,506	69,780	59,000
Algonquin	Custodian	48,093	65,503	52,250
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	Custodian	46,078	65,583	58,303
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	Custodian			34,986
Bartlett	n/a			
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	Custodian			44,762
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	Maintenance Worker			50,791
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	Custodian	36,050	48,668	
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	Maintenance Worker	43,362	71,495	
Rochelle, IL	Custodian	35,263	44,067	51,272
Range Data				
Average		44,818	64,206	50,015
50th Percentile		46,078	65,583	51,521
60th Percentile		46,884	67,262	52,250
65th Percentile		47,287	68,101	53,764
70th Percentile		47,690	68,941	55,277
75th Percentile		48,093	69,780	56,790
80th Percentile		48,576	70,123	58,303
City Compensation	n/a			
City Compensation	n/a			

Community Development Specialist				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Planner	69,659	96,049	73,489
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	Senior Planner	82,147	115,006	91,284
Carpentersville	Assistant Dir of CD			95,033
Bartlett	Associate Planner	61,742	89,941	65,907
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Business Development Analyst	73,000	98,550	
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Community Development Specialist	44,707	55,873	72,613
Range Data				
Average		71,637	99,887	81,428
50th Percentile		71,330	97,300	82,387
60th Percentile		72,332	98,050	87,725
65th Percentile		72,833	98,425	90,394
70th Percentile		73,915	100,196	91,659
75th Percentile		75,287	102,664	92,221
80th Percentile		76,659	105,132	92,784

City Compensation	n/a			
City Compensation	n/a			

Dir of Community Engagement & Asst to the City Mgr				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Dir of Community Eng. & Asst to the City Mgr	123,451	170,219	170,219
Romeoville	Dir of Community Eng. & Asst to the City Mgr	125,512	169,443	154,117
Algonquin	Dir of Community Eng. & Asst to the City Mgr	133,246	177,596	144,000
Oswego	Development Services Director	121,505	182,258	152,508
New Lenox	Dir Com Dev/Asst Village Admin	138,824	180,472	180,472
Lockport	Dir of Community & Econ Dev	140,000	160,000	156,505
Montgomery	Dir of Community Eng. & Asst to the City Mgr	118,107	165,350	139,101
Carpentersville	Dir of Community Eng. & Asst to the City Mgr			130,000
Bartlett	Planning & Dev Svcs Dir	145,959	195,312	155,599
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Director of Community Development	135,762	190,067	
Huntley	Deputy Village Manager			162,322
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Community Relations Director			117,141
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	Community Development Director			125,000
Yorkville	Community Development Director	101,485	143,178	
Rochelle, IL	Dir of Community Engagement & Asst to the C	107,024	133,813	144,217
Range Data				
Average		128,385	173,389	148,915
50th Percentile		129,379	173,907	153,313
60th Percentile		134,252	178,746	155,006
65th Percentile		135,385	180,040	155,735
70th Percentile		136,681	181,008	156,233
75th Percentile		138,059	181,811	157,959
80th Percentile		139,060	183,820	161,159

City Compensation	n/a			
City Compensation	n/a			

Dir of Advanced Communication Svcs				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Communication Manager	72,793	100,370	95,138
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	n/a			
Bartlett	Information Systems Coordinator	129,269	172,896	129,269
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	Telecommunications Supervisor			118,483
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Dir of Advanced Communication Svcs	107,024	133,813	143,878
Range Data				
Average		101,031	136,633	114,297
50th Percentile		101,031	136,633	118,483
60th Percentile		106,679	143,886	120,640
65th Percentile		109,502	147,512	121,719
70th Percentile		112,326	151,138	122,797
75th Percentile		115,150	154,765	123,876
80th Percentile		117,974	158,391	124,955

City Compensation	Communications	60,804	129,851	
City Compensation	Communications	69,035	156,693	

Economic Development Director				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Economic Development Manager	99,064	136,592	116,324
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	Economic Development Director	108,487	162,730	123,732
New Lenox	Econ Dev Coordinator	81,400	115,857	115,857
Lockport	Dir of Community & Economic Development	140,000	160,000	156,505
Montgomery	Economic Development Manager	82,147	115,006	108,150
Carpentersville	Business & Community Engagement Coor			79,888
Bartlett	Economic Development Coordinator	102,766	144,355	144,355
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	Business Development Director			101,920
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Director of Economic Development	135,762	190,067	
Huntley	Director of Development Services			142,843
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Economic Development Manager			124,200
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Economic Development Director	107,024	133,813	153,727
Range Data				
Average		107,089	146,373	121,377
50th Percentile		102,766	144,355	120,028
60th Percentile		106,198	153,742	123,919
65th Percentile		107,915	158,436	124,130
70th Percentile		113,942	160,546	129,793
75th Percentile		122,124	161,365	138,182
80th Percentile		130,307	162,184	143,145

City Compensation	Development Services	70,000	189,535	
City Compensation	Development Services	56,677	190,605	

Building Inspector				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Building Inspector	76,069	104,889	90,991
Romeoville	Building Inspector	76,068	102,692	93,194
Algonquin	Building Inspector	79,270	109,094	
Oswego	Building Inspector	68,716	97,577	77,875
New Lenox	Chief Building Inspector	96,711	137,650	133,641
Lockport	Building Inspector	80,000	100,000	86,621
Montgomery	Building Inspector	62,109	86,965	76,752
Carpentersville	Building Official			89,596
Bartlett	Building Inspector	75,055	109,324	109,324
DeKalb	Building Inspector II-AFSCME			80,345
Morris	Building and Zoning Officer			100,963
Crest Hill	Building Inspector – Community Dev	60,000	70,000	
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Building Inspector	77,745	104,956	
Huntley	Building Inspector II			93,172
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Building Official			125,000
Sterling	Bldg / Elec Inspector	61,800	83,430	
Tinley Park	Building Inspector			98,032
Yorkville	Building Code Official	78,685	109,985	
Rochelle, IL	Building Inspector	75,049	93,806	92,613
Range Data				
Average		74,352	101,380	96,577
50th Percentile		76,069	103,791	93,172
60th Percentile		77,075	104,929	94,162
65th Percentile		77,886	105,577	97,064
70th Percentile		78,403	107,853	99,204
75th Percentile		78,831	109,152	100,963
80th Percentile		79,153	109,278	105,980

City Compensation	Building Inspections	69,747	168,002	
City Compensation	Building Inspections	53,719	156,206	

Engineer Technician of Services and Support				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Civil Engineer	83,070	114,542	114,542
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	Civil Engineer	50,000	75,000	67,500
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	n/a			
Bartlett	Civil Engineer	85,758	120,542	91,052
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Associate Civil Engineer	93,912	126,781	
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Engineer Technician	63,751	79,705	86,112
Range Data				
Average		78,185	109,216	91,031
50th Percentile		84,414	117,542	91,052
60th Percentile		85,220	119,342	95,750
65th Percentile		85,624	120,242	98,099
70th Percentile		86,573	121,166	100,448
75th Percentile		87,797	122,102	102,797
80th Percentile		89,020	123,038	105,146

City Compensation	n/a			
City Compensation	n/a			

City Engineer				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Engineering Manager	113,047	155,872	155,872
Romeoville	Capital Projects Engineer	114,102	154,038	152,000
Algonquin	Village Engineer	133,246	177,596	147,444
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	Civil Engineer	96,711	137,650	137,650
Lockport	City Engineer	115,000	135,000	115,000
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	Construction Engineer			90,000
Bartlett	Village Engineer	102,766	144,355	127,400
DeKalb	City Engineer	100,130	145,188	117,875
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	City Engineer/Assistant Director of PW	102,000	142,800	
Huntley	Village Engineer - Development			111,841
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Lead Engineer			119,543
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	Village Engineer			123,000
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	City Engineer	107,024	133,813	140,076
Range Data				
Average		109,625	149,062	127,057
50th Percentile		107,907	144,772	123,000
60th Percentile		113,258	146,958	127,400
65th Percentile		113,627	150,056	132,525
70th Percentile		113,997	153,153	137,650
75th Percentile		114,327	154,497	142,547
80th Percentile		114,641	155,138	147,444

City Compensation	n/a			
City Compensation	n/a			

Director of Public Works				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Director of Public Works	140,879	194,246	194,246
Romeoville	Director of Public Works	125,512	169,443	164,266
Algonquin	Director of Public Works	142,114	195,906	169,509
Oswego	Director of Public Works	121,505	182,258	182,258
New Lenox	Director of Public Works	138,824	180,472	156,248
Lockport	Dir of Public Works & Eng	150,000	170,000	160,000
Montgomery	Director of Public Works	118,107	165,350	157,322
Carpentersville	Director of Public Works			154,381
Bartlett	Director of Public Works	145,959	195,312	195,312
DeKalb	Dir of PW-Streets, Fac & Airport	112,745	163,480	131,328
Morris	Director of Public Works			119,683
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Director of Public Works	135,762	190,067	
Huntley	Dire of Public Works & Eng			159,951
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Director of Public Works			155,250
Sterling	Public Works Superintendent	105,060	141,831	
Tinley Park	Director of Public Works			178,043
Yorkville	Public Works Director	100,653	142,915	
Rochelle, IL	Director of Public Works	107,024	133,813	138,415
Range Data				
Average		128,093	174,273	162,700
50th Percentile		130,637	175,236	159,976
60th Percentile		137,599	181,543	163,413
65th Percentile		139,133	183,429	166,626
70th Percentile		140,263	187,724	170,363
75th Percentile		141,188	191,112	175,909
80th Percentile		141,867	193,410	179,729

City Compensation	Public Works	86,400	178,500	
City Compensation	Public Works	66,997	216,675	

Director of Water and Water Reclamation				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Water & Sewer Utility Superintendent	103,523	142,739	142,739
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	Utilities Superintendent	109,317	150,154	144,119
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	Water & Wastewater Superintendent	105,000	120,000	119,313
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	Water Superintendent			125,000
Bartlett	n/a			
DeKalb	Dir of PW-Utility, Trans & Eng	112,745	163,480	134,456
Morris	Superintendent of Water Department			100,547
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Superintendent of Water/WW	102,000	142,800	
Huntley	Chief Wastewater Operator			110,613
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Superintendent Wastewater			135,533
Sterling	Wastewater Superintendent	98,880	133,488	
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Director of Water and Water Reclamation	107,024	133,813	144,612
Range Data				
Average		105,244	142,110	126,540
50th Percentile		104,262	142,770	129,728
60th Percentile		105,000	142,800	134,671
65th Percentile		106,079	144,638	135,048
70th Percentile		107,159	146,477	135,425
75th Percentile		108,238	148,315	137,335
80th Percentile		109,317	150,154	139,857

City Compensation	Public Works	86,400	178,500	
City Compensation	Public Works	66,997	216,675	

Utility Billing Generalist - Translator				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Customer Service Representative	55,900	77,076	69,645
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	Finance Clerk	40,000	55,000	48,000
Montgomery	Customer Service Specialist	45,469	61,402	47,070
Carpentersville	Customer Service Clerk			37,565
Bartlett	n/a			
DeKalb	Account Technician I-AFSCME			44,249
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Accounts Payable Specialist	57,475	77,591	
Huntley	Billing Coordinator			63,341
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield				
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	Utility Billing Clerk	50,910	68,601	
Rochelle, IL	Utility Billing Generalist - Translator	42,125	52,629	40,893
Range Data				
Average		49,951	67,934	51,645
50th Percentile		50,910	68,601	47,535
60th Percentile		52,906	71,991	48,000
65th Percentile		53,904	73,686	51,835
70th Percentile		54,902	75,381	55,671
75th Percentile		55,900	77,076	59,506
80th Percentile		56,215	77,179	63,341

City Compensation	Utilities	77,600	174,520	
City Compensation	Utilities	104,068	173,579	

Utility Accounting Generalist I				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	n/a			
Romeoville	Utility Billing Clerk	54,457	75,405	68,815
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	Utility Billing Coordinator	55,314	78,546	71,318
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	Finance Clerk	40,000	55,000	48,000
Montgomery	Finance Assistant - UB	50,024	61,402	51,480
Carpentersville	n/a			
Bartlett	Utility Billing Clerk	48,814	71,121	54,080
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	Utility Billing Technician			90,325
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Utility Accounting Generalist I	42,125	52,629	40,893
Range Data				
Average		49,722	68,295	64,003
50th Percentile		50,024	71,121	61,448
60th Percentile		51,797	72,835	68,815
65th Percentile		52,684	73,691	69,441
70th Percentile		53,570	74,548	70,067
75th Percentile		54,457	75,405	70,692
80th Percentile		54,628	76,033	71,318
City Compensation	Utilities	77,600	174,520	
City Compensation	Utilities	104,068	173,579	

Utility Operations Specialist				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	n/a			
Romeoville	n/a			
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	Administrative Assistant	56,579	80,530	58,842
Lockport	Administrative Assistant	40,000	60,000	51,780
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	n/a			
Bartlett	n/a			
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	Water Clerk	42,994	49,317	46,155
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Utility Locator	63,223	85,350	
Huntley	Utility Worker - Wastewater			51,605
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	Utility Billing Specialist	49,440	66,744	
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Utility Operations Specialist	56,645	70,790	75,052
Range Data				
Average		50,447	68,388	52,096
50th Percentile		49,440	66,744	51,693
60th Percentile		52,296	72,258	51,745
65th Percentile		53,724	75,016	51,771
70th Percentile		55,151	77,773	52,486
75th Percentile		56,579	80,530	53,546
80th Percentile		57,908	81,494	54,605

City Compensation	Utilities	77,600	174,520	
City Compensation	Utilities	104,068	173,579	

Utility Billing Manager				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Utility Billing Supervisor	66,660	91,915	91,915
Romeoville	Customer Service/Budget Coor	85,576	115,529	109,147
Algonquin	Utility Billing Coordinator	64,372	86,666	86,135
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	Utility Billing Clerk	50,889	67,864	67,864
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	Utility Billing Specialist			75,703
Bartlett	Utility Billing Coordinator	59,360	86,477	86,477
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	Senior Water Clerk			65,624
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	n/a			
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Utility Billing Supervisor			77,625
Sterling	n/a			
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Utility Billing Manager	75,049	93,806	80,153
Range Data				
Average		65,372	89,690	82,561
50th Percentile		64,372	86,666	81,880
60th Percentile		65,287	88,766	86,203
65th Percentile		65,745	89,815	86,323
70th Percentile		66,202	90,865	86,443
75th Percentile		66,660	91,915	87,837
80th Percentile		70,443	96,638	89,740

City Compensation	Utilities	77,600	174,520	
City Compensation	Utilities	104,068	173,579	

Fire Chief				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Fire Chief	140,879	194,246	194,246
Romeoville	Fire Chief	138,064	186,387	173,422
Algonquin	n/a			
Oswego	n/a			
New Lenox	n/a			
Lockport	n/a			
Montgomery	n/a			
Carpentersville	Fire Chief			148,000
Bartlett	n/a			
DeKalb	Fire Chief	118,945	172,472	161,533
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Fire Chief	135,762	190,067	
Huntley	n/a			
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	Fire Chief	115,360	155,736	
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Fire Chief	115,277	144,096	148,512
Range Data				
Average		129,802	179,782	169,300
50th Percentile		135,762	186,387	167,478
60th Percentile		136,683	187,859	171,044
65th Percentile		137,143	188,595	172,828
70th Percentile		137,604	189,331	175,504
75th Percentile		138,064	190,067	178,628
80th Percentile		138,627	190,903	181,752

City Compensation	Fire Chief	74,962	128,897	
City Compensation	Fire Chief	72,121	212,934	

Community Service Officer				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Community Service Officer	58,414	80,544	61,609
Romeoville	Community Service Officer	54,629	76,220	60,057
Algonquin	Community Service Officer	51,391	74,124	87,806
Oswego	Community Service Officer	32,136	53,560	36,400
New Lenox	Community Service Officer	48,843	69,518	54,941
Lockport	Community Service Officer	40,000	50,000	40,000
Montgomery	Community Service Officer	31,200	35,360	33,800
Carpentersville	Community Service Officer	18,897	20,956	
Bartlett	Community Service Officer	56,548	82,356	72,340
DeKalb	n/a			
Morris	n/a			
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Community Service Officer	52,250	70,538	
Huntley	Community Service Officer			64,929
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	n/a			
Sterling	Community Services Officer	49,440	66,744	
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Community Service Officer	44,707	55,873	46,800
Range Data				
Average		44,886	61,811	56,876
50th Percentile		49,440	69,518	60,057
60th Percentile		51,391	70,538	61,299
65th Percentile		51,820	72,331	62,273
70th Percentile		52,250	74,124	63,601
75th Percentile		53,440	75,172	64,929
80th Percentile		54,629	76,220	67,893

City Compensation	n/a			
City Compensation	n/a			

Police Chief				
Comparable Community	Title & Position Comments	Minimum Rate:	Maximum Rate:	Actual Salary:
Batavia	Police Chief	140,879	194,246	194,246
Romeoville	Police Chief	138,064	186,387	179,920
Algonquin	Police Chief	142,114	195,906	174,901
Oswego	Police Chief	121,505	182,258	166,400
New Lenox	Police Chief	138,824	180,471	180,471
Lockport	Police Chief			168,075
Montgomery	Police Chief	118,107	165,350	165,350
Carpentersville	Police Chief			164,000
Bartlett	Police Chief	145,959	195,312	195,312
DeKalb	Police Chief	118,945	172,472	161,533
Morris	Police Chief			136,822
Crest Hill	n/a			
Freeport	n/a			
Geneva	Chief of Police	135,762	190,067	
Huntley	Chief of Police			167,321
Park Forest	n/a			
Plainfield	Chief of Police			165,600
Sterling	Police Chief	115,360	155,736	
Tinley Park	n/a			
Yorkville	n/a			
Rochelle, IL	Police Chief	115,277	144,096	131,568
Range Data				
Average		131,552	181,821	170,765
50th Percentile		136,913	184,322	167,321
60th Percentile		138,368	187,859	169,440
65th Percentile		138,710	189,515	173,536
70th Percentile		139,441	191,321	176,909
75th Percentile		140,365	193,201	179,920
80th Percentile		141,126	194,459	180,251

City Compensation	Police Chief	74,962	176,294	
City Compensation	Police Chief	78,564	216,675	