



HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES, INC.
Management Consultants to Local Government

*Nine Bartlet Street, Suite 186
Andover, Massachusetts 01810*

Town of Shirley, Massachusetts

COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION STUDY

FINAL REPORT

January, 2015



HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES, INC.
Management Consultants to Local Government

*Nine Bartlet Street, Suite 186
Andover, Massachusetts 01810*

January 14, 2015

Personnel Board
Town of Shirley
Town Hall
7 Keady Way
Shirley, MA 01464

Dear Members of the Personnel Board,

Human Resources Services, Inc. is pleased to present this *Compensation and Classification Study* to the Town of Shirley, Massachusetts. The study was for approximately 40 position titles representing more than 60 employees. This report represents the culmination of a comprehensive position and compensation review and update for jobs in a variety of functional areas throughout the Town's organization.

In particular, we wish to thank the Board of Selectmen, Town Administrator, Town employees, department heads, and Personnel Board who have contributed to this effort. We respectfully thank Holly Haase for her professional input and coordination of the project to help bring the study to a successful conclusion.

Thank you again for the opportunity to have been of service to the Town of Shirley, MA. HRS will remain available to answer any procedural questions the Town may have in the implementation of the study's recommendations.

Very truly yours,

Aleksandra E. Stapczynski
President

HRS CONSULTANT TEAM

Aleksandra E. Stapczynski

Project Manager and Principal Consultant

Anthony Torrisi

Senior Management Consultant

Carol M. Granfield

Senior Management Consultant

(Municipal Resources, Inc.)

The project team conducted the following analytical activities:

- The consultants met with the Personnel Board, employee members and town officials at the onset of the study to determine the parameters of the project and expected outcomes of the study. Orientation sessions were conducted.
- The project team immediately began an intensive process of interviewing a majority of employees in each position category. The consultants also interviewed supervisory and department head level officials as needed. The project team supplemented this input through the use of employee position analysis questionnaires.
- The project team collected salary and other pay related information from each of the comparable communities; these were used as the basis for this analysis and are provided as attachments to this report.
- The project team also reviewed initial findings, recommendations and issues with the Personnel Board and Town Administrator. Preliminary and draft reports were submitted for review.

HRS
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PROJECT REPORT.....	7
III. CLASSIFYING AND COMPENSATING POSITIONS.....	10
IV. IMPLEMENTATION AND OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.....	18
V. CONCLUSION.....	24

Separate Documents Submitted:

Job Descriptions

Rating Manual and Ratings

Position Analysis Questionnaire

ATTACHMENTS

PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION PLAN
PROPOSED COMPENSATION PLAN
COMPENSATION COMPARISONS CHARTS
COMPARATIVE SALARY MARKET DATA

DISCLAIMER

Although every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and completeness of this report, Human Resources Services, Inc. cannot be responsible for any errors of positions, salaries, and wages of other organizations; positions and salaries are always changing. Nor can we be responsible for the changes in any laws or regulations that may affect the positions studied.

TOWN OF SHIRLEY, MASSACHUSETTS COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION STUDY

I. Introduction

A. Scope of Services

The Town of Shirley engaged Human Resources Services, Inc. to conduct a compensation and classification study for approximately 40 position titles in town service, excluding schools. This study was commissioned to re-examine the responsibilities, work performed, and market pay rates for each position included in the study. In general, the study involved developing a thorough job analysis and audit for each position, classifying those positions according to a uniform point analysis standard, surveying the market of comparable municipalities to determine rates of compensation offered, and developing and recommending new compensation and classification plans, system, and tools applicable for all positions town-wide. Job descriptions were also reviewed and written as part of the total process.

A position compensation and classification plan is an essential and vital component of a comprehensive municipal personnel system. Its validity is critical to the effectiveness of municipal personnel policies, to employee morale, and ultimately, to the delivery of municipal services. The proposed plans represents a systematic, formalized procedure for developing equitable job groupings and equitable compensation levels for all positions. The plan is based upon the underlying assumption that individuals should receive “equal pay for equal work.”

However, implementation of a position compensation and classification plan should not be viewed as the final step in achieving job equity. The plan must be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that decisions regarding position requirements

and compensation accurately reflects the municipality's current service needs while continuing to maintain the integrity and relevance of the plan.

Human Resources Services, Inc. has reviewed the current job duties and compensation levels for *approximately* 40 positions in the Town of Shirley. The plan furnished in this report has been developed through an objective evaluation of position content and a systematic comparison of job value within the organization. Job descriptions, through the PAQ (position analysis questionnaire) process, have been revised in a standardized format to reflect more accurately actual job content and to enhance their usefulness as tools in decisions involving pay, recruitment, promotion, and evaluations.

For maximum effectiveness, the relationship between consultant and client must be a cooperative effort. While Human Resources Services, Inc. assumes responsibility for all final recommendations, client input has been actively sought, carefully weighed and incorporated into the report whenever possible.

B. Study Process

This project included the following steps:

- *Organizational Meetings* with town officials to discuss the goals and objectives of the study.
- *Orientation Meetings* with town officials and the employees covered in the study to explain project activities, objectives, methodology. This meeting also gave employees an opportunity to meet HRS consultants and ask questions.

- A thorough *Job Analysis Process* which involved reviewing position duties and responsibilities (essential functions) utilizing position analysis questionnaires and on-site interviews.
- Preparation of new *Job Descriptions*. These should be reviewed by management and employees.
- A thorough *Job Evaluation Process*. Position rating and ranking utilizing HRS' rating manual.
- Development of a *Classification Plan*. Position assignment to grades based on a system of objective evaluation.
- Thorough *Market Analysis* using comparable municipalities jointly selected by town officials and HRS.
- Establishment of *Compensation Schedule* using comparative wage data as a guide.
- Several *meetings* with the *Town Administrator, Personnel Board, and other key Department Heads* to discuss pay policies and review draft work products (i.e. classification plan, salary schedule, comparative data, cost implementations and other related materials).
- Preparation of minimum estimated *Implementation Costs*.

- Provision of guidelines for updating and maintaining the plan.
- Final preparation of *Report* to the Town with explanation of recommendations and methodology.
- Final *Presentations* to Town Officials to explain findings, recommendations, and methodology.

The following documents have been prepared for the Town of Shirley:

- Proposed Classification Plan
- Proposed Compensation Plan
- Compensation Comparisons Charts
- Market Data Analysis Chart
- Position Analysis Question (PAQ)
- Job Descriptions for each Position
- Evaluation Materials and Documents
- Position Rating Manual

II. Project Report

A. Details of the Methodology

In Shirley, the evaluation of position classifications and compensation levels was undertaken for employees in the areas of general government, public works, public safety, library services, finance, social services, and recreation services. The employees were asked to complete position analysis questionnaires (PAQ) describing their duties, working conditions, physical requirements, supervision, required education, training, and experience, and tools, equipment, technology requirements of the job. Following an analysis of these completed PAQs, on-site interviews were held with the employees. Position descriptions were drafted throughout the duration of the study and forwarded to the Town for review. Final position descriptions incorporate pertinent information from questionnaires, interviews, and draft commentary.

Throughout this process position rating was done by the consultant team using HRS' Municipal Position Classification and Rating Manual. A copy of this manual is provided to the Town as a separate document. Initial classification rankings of positions were discussed with Town officials. The process of the job rating is based solely on the duties and responsibilities of the position and has no relationship to the abilities, performance or longevity of the employee currently holding the job.

At the same time, salary/wage data from communities comparable to Shirley was gathered and analyzed for as many positions as possible. Ranking of the market data was also conducted by position title. The consultant team worked in conjunction with the Town Administrator and Personnel Board, and Department Heads to determine a list of comparable communities to survey. A special effort was made to include enough communities from the region to ensure significant salary

comparisons. The sources for the profile data to select those communities included the Massachusetts Municipal Association and the Department of Revenue, as well as the U.S. Bureau of Labor/Statistics. All of the communities selected are within a 60 miles radius of Shirley, Massachusetts. In some instances supplemental data was also provided to the Town as needed for additional pay data benchmarking.

B. Comparable Communities

The following primary communities were included in the comparative data analysis. Additional communities were also added for supplemental data as needed and is included in the attachments.

<i>Mass. Town/City</i>
Ashburnham
Ayer
Boylston
Groton
Harvard
Lancaster
Leicester
Lunenburg
Pepperell
Sterling
Stow
Templeton
Tyngsborough
Westminster
West Boylston

III. Classifying and Compensating Positions

A. The Classification Plan

It is important to consider the objectives of (1) **Job Analysis** and (2) **Job Evaluation** when reviewing the proposed classification plan. Building the classification plan involved both job analysis and job evaluation.

Of critical importance in the process of reviewing jobs are the inherent job factors and the particular skills or quality of work required of the position. A thorough **Job Analysis** produces, in general, five kinds of basic information to aid in this process:

1. information about the *nature of the work* (e.g., essential functions and purpose/objective of the position)
2. the *level of the work* (e.g., degree of complexity and accountability)
3. *job requirements* (e.g., the knowledge, skills, abilities and other special requirements/characteristics needed to perform the job)
4. *job qualifications* (e.g., minimum education, training and experience needed to qualify)
5. *working conditions* (e.g., the psychological, emotional and physical demands placed on employees by the work environment).

As stated earlier, information about each position studied was obtained through detailed position analysis questionnaires (PAQ) and employee interviews. Employees were asked to describe their positions in detail on the PAQ form.

Job Evaluation is a process that establishes the relative value of jobs within an organization. There may be several reasons for carrying out this process; the main ones are: (1) to establish the correct rank order or groupings of jobs, (2) to establish the relative distance between jobs within the ranking, (3) to provide an objective measurement of job size for comparison with other jobs and enable salary comparisons to be made.

Job evaluation is the process whereby positions are analyzed, measured and compared against a common set of criteria in a systematic and objective manner. Job evaluation does not produce a rate of pay. Rather, it produces a ranking of jobs in terms of “job content” around which a salary structure can be established. Similarly, the evaluation process does not measure an individual’s performance. The evaluation looks at the job, not the job holder; it assumes that the job is being performed to a fully acceptable standard and that all the identified requirements of a job are being met.

Using a point-factor evaluation system, positions were rated by two consultants and then ranked and assigned a grade. Fourteen rating factors were used to rate all of the positions. These factors, detailed in HRS’ Municipal Position Classification and Rating Manual, measured the requirements of each position in the following areas. The following are capsule descriptions of each rating factor. The manual describes

each factor in great detail and by degree.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

This factor measures the totality of the surroundings and/or circumstances under which the job must be performed, the degree of difficulty which this imposes, and their representative or exceptional nature.

BASIC KNOWLEDGE, TRAINING AND EDUCATION

This factor measures the basic knowledge or “scholastic content” however it may have been acquired, essential as background or training to perform the job.

PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS AND EFFORT

This factor measures the type and range of problem solving which the position consistently requires.

PHYSICAL SKILLS AND EFFORT

This factor measures the degree of physical effort or exertion required in the performance of essential work functions under regular conditions.

EXPERIENCE

Experience measures the length of time usually or typically required for the position, with the specified “basic knowledge, training and education,” to perform the essential work functions effectively under normal supervision.

INTERACTIONS WITH OTHERS/CUSTOMER SERVICE

This factor measures the relative level of human interaction and the responsibility which goes with the job for meeting, dealing with, and influencing other persons.

CONFIDENTIALITY

This factor measures the discretion and integrity required by those positions which have access to privileged information handled or obtained in the normal performance of duties.

OCCUPATIONAL RISKS

This factor measures the relative degree of exposure to hazards which might cause injury on the job.

COMPLEXITY

This factor considers how difficult it is to perform the essential functions of the job. Jobs are made more difficult by the range and diversity of the assignment of duties, various uses of information technology, the specificity and relevance of guidelines for performing the work, and the nature or thinking challenge required to accomplish the work.

SUPERVISION RECEIVED

This factor evaluates the nature of the instructions, direction, control and/or monitoring which a position receives.

SUPERVISION GIVEN

In rating supervision given, a number of factors are considered: (1) type of supervision; (2) accountability; (3) responsibility for personnel actions; (4) budget development and control through subordinates.

SUPERVISION SCOPE

This factor is used to evaluate the extent, breadth and depth of direction, monitoring and review given.

JUDGMENT AND INITIATIVE

This factor measures the degree of independent action required by the position and the extent to which duties are dictated by standard practice or the exercise of judgment.

ACCOUNTABILITY

In every position there inherently exists the possibility of error, whether through omission, commission, or direction. In rating this factor, the following is considered: the likelihood of errors; the possibility of error detection; and the probable effect of errors based on the degree to which the work is checked, either by the procedures themselves, by supervision, or by succeeding operations.

As mentioned previously, job rating is not synonymous with performance evaluation. The position, not the incumbent, is evaluated, assigned points and a grade derived. The process described in the HRS Rating Manual, submitted as a separate report, increases the uniformity and objectivity in the application of judgments about positions and the groupings of positions. This process can be used to update the proposed classification plan, to determine how to place new positions on the plan, and to re-grade a current position with adjusted duties to a different grade. Samples of the *Position Rating Summary Sheet* are included in the Manual along with the *Points Assigned to Factor Degrees*. A custom *Grade Determination and Conversion Scale* was developed for Shirley.

B. Market Survey and Developing the Compensation Plan

Human Resources Services, Inc. conducted a thorough salary survey and market analysis to determine the market competitiveness for positions included in this study. To measure the pay rates among competitors for these positions, HRS distributed custom survey documents to comparable communities, those identified above.

All of the comparative data is FY-13 information and detailed on the attached pages. A cost of living factor has been added to the pay plans for FY-14 and FY-15 respectively to make the proposed plan current. Comparative data is good for two-three years. For each position analyzed, data points were collected from the labor market. The data points indicate the amount of salary information for each position surveyed. In some instances: (1) the Town did not have a comparable position; or (2) the consultants determined that the position was not comparable to the position in Shirley. HRS used professional discretionary judgment when comparing positions to the comparable data. If there was less than two data points of salary information for a position, HRS placed more emphasis on the position rating when placing the position on the compensation/classification plan. While this market analysis and information provides the Town with benchmark salary data to set the parameters for compensation decisions, the client must also consider the “uniqueness” of certain positions in the organization as well as the Town’s ability to pay. The following is the analysis definitions for the data collected and presented in the attached charts.

- All comparative market data collected is FY-13 salary and wage information.
- Certain salary/wage data collected has been pro-rated to hourly for comparative purposes only. Certain salary/wage data collected has been annualized for comparative purposes only.
- For each position analyzed, data points are collected from the labor market. The **Data Points** indicates the amount of salary information for each position surveyed. In other words, the number of municipalities that reported data for a particular position.
- In each cell, the top number indicates the minimum salary the community pays and the bottom number indicates the maximum salary the community pays.
- The **Average** is the sum of survey readings divided by the number of municipalities reporting. The **Average** shows the average minimum salary among the comparables over the average maximum salary/wage among the comparables.

- The **Range** shows the lowest minimum salary among the comparable communities and highest maximum salary among the comparables.
- The **Median** shows the midpoint of the minimum salary among the comparable communities and the midpoint of the maximum salary among the comparable communities. In an array of survey readings, sorted from low to high, this is the reading that is at the mid-point or middle of the data indicating that 50% of survey participants pay at or below this salary rate.
- The **75% Percentile** shows the 75th percentile of minimum and 75th percentile of maximum. The percentile rank looks at the array of data points and gives each data point a percentile rank, where the lowest data point is 0% and the highest data point is 100%. In an array of survey readings, sorted from low to high, this indicates that 75% of the surveyed market pays at or below this salary rate.
- The **90% Percentile** shows the 90th percentile of minimum and 90th percentile of maximum. The percentile rank looks at the array of data points and gives each data point a percentile rank, where the lowest data point is 0% and the highest data point is 100%. In an array of survey readings, sorted from low to high, this indicates that 90% of the surveyed market pays at or below this salary rate.
- In some instances where data is not shown: (1) the community/organization did not have a comparable position; (2) the consultants determined that the position was not comparable; or (3) the information was not made available to the consultants.

C. Description of Compensation and Classification Plan

Setting the rates of pay for jobs on the position hierarchy results in what is called a “pay structure”. When reviewing or developing pay rates, a number of major policy decisions will need to be made. For example: How should the Town pay level relate to the market? For what does the Town want to pay? (i.e. job content, seniority, performance, cost of living, etc.) How does the Town currently pay its employees? The resulting compensation plan should reflect the Town’s pay policies, the market place, internal job values, and the financial ability of the Town to pay at a given level.

The proposed compensation and classification plan is presented on the attached pages. Pay ranges were set for groups of positions which the consultants determined should be paid equally. There are 16 grades on the compensation plan. The total increase from minimum to maximum within each grade is *approximately 22% percent*. Overall, there is 10% between grades. The plan provides 9 steps for incremental pay increases from minimum to maximum. Comparative data was considered to set the grade parameters, while the classification process controlled the internal assignment of positions to progressive compensation levels. Currently, most Towns similar to Shirley operate within the context of a traditional step system, and/or minimum-mid-max system. The step plan provides for better uniformity of movement within the ranges based on performance achievement; and it is easier to track, plan, and budget using a traditional step system. In general the pay ranges on the new proposed salary schedule were developed utilizing the market data average as a guide. The step system can also be tied to a performance system. The schedule shows both the hourly and annual rates for employees; minimum, mid range, and maximum ranges, as well as a step system.

This is a base salary plan and does not include compensation for longevity, special pay, benefits, or other compensation. It is up to the Town to determine its ability to pay with regards to implementation of this proposed compensation plan. At a minimum, those employees falling below the grade range should be brought into the entry level of the grade ranges as soon as possible.

The consultants discussed the proposed classification and compensation plans with the Personnel Board and Town Administrator. The suggestions and comments received were given careful consideration and the preliminary recommendations were given a second review in light of the Town officials' response. However, the basic integrity of the plan was not allowed to be compromised by subjective evaluation.

IV. Implementation and Other Recommendations

The following sections are intended to assist and guide the Town in implementing the proposed classification and compensation plan. Successful implementation will require a concerted effort by the Town officials and employees to make equitable judgments in a consistent and objective manner.

1. Initial Placements for Current Employees

The placement of two or more positions on a certain grade represents a judgment that those positions should be compensated comparably within the range provided. The range is like a scale providing the Town with the opportunity to make distinctions between employees (not positions) based upon established criteria, applied consistently. These criteria might include job performance, special abilities, experience, longevity, and/or any other factors determined by the Town.

For initial placement of incumbents within the plan, the Town should assign employees to be placed at their current salary in order to not reduce the pay of any current employee. The Town should also realize that this minimum approach may not recognize certain distinguishing factors among employees.

2. Salaries Below Pay Range (Green Circle)

If the salary of an employee is below the minimum of the grade range at the time of implementation, every effort should be made to bring it into the range. In cases where this increase would result in excessive increases, it would be more practical to raise the salary in steps over a period of two fiscal years.

3. Salaries Above Pay Range (Red Circle)

To maintain morale and a sense of fairness, HRS recommends the Town not reduce the compensation level of any current employee. If an employee's current salary falls above the upper limit of the recommended grade range, the Town should maintain the employee's salary above the maximum for the grade until the employee retires or separates from the Town. This is called "red-circling" a position. New employees can be hired at the appropriate lower pay rate. HRS recommends a single administrative policy be adopted and subsequently applied in all cases.

4. Cost-of-Living Increases vs. Range Movement

Here, it is important to distinguish between (1) a cost-of-living increase and (2) a salary-range increase. A cost-of-living increase is intended to recognize and respond to a general rise in the cost of goods and services experienced by the general population. Each year, the Town should determine an appropriate cost-of-living adjustment and apply that increase across the entire compensation schedule. A salary-range increase addresses the issue of how employees move along the percentile levels within a grade from minimum to maximum, based on performance. The compensation plan should consist of two components: (1) the range adjustment factor (RAF); and (2) the movement-increase factor (MIF), which is based on merit. The RAF is the movement of the salary range, while the MIF is the movement through the salary range. A salary-range increase consists of the sum of these two components, plus their interaction or compounding result; thus a salary/wage adjustment.

5. Classification vs. Market-Based Systems

The most common method for valuing jobs and placing them within a grading structure is a market-driven approach. However, today many Towns are becoming concerned about the internal equity of positions and are looking at classification systems to assist in correcting this problem of “internal pay equity.”

6. Vacancies

When a vacancy develops, it is a good time to automatically review the position. This may involve a job analysis and updating the job description and reviewing the market for the particular position.

7. Update and Maintain the Classification and Compensation Plan

The Town should maintain and update the classification and compensation plan. This would include the following tasks:

- Conduct regular position reviews to assure positions have current functional job descriptions that are based on job content.
- Conduct job analysis of new positions to assure these positions are properly assigned to a grade.
- Review positions to ensure internal equity in relationship to other Town classifications.
- Conduct periodic salary surveys to ensure market competitiveness. The salary range updates are designed to relieve any upward pressure on range minimums and maximums that may impede the Town’s ability to attract, motivate, and retain its workforce. Updates to the salary ranges are referred to as “Market Adjustments”.

8. FLSA Status

While HRS has reviewed the FLSA Status (exempt/non-exempt status) of the positions included in the study and has provided this information to the Town as part of its overall analysis, further review of borderline positions by its labor counsel is recommended. Most of the positions studied would be non-exempt status.

9. Union Positions

If there are any union positions included, it is important to note that while they are placed on the town-wide classification plan for internal equity purposes; the compensation for union positions must be negotiated through the collective bargaining process.

10. Performance Appraisal and Merit-Increase.

It was not within the scope of services for HRS to develop a performance appraisal “tool” for the Town of Shirley. However, HRS has provided the Town with sample systems as a guide in developing such instruments. A *Management by Objectives System* would be an appropriate methodology for employees engaged in high-level managerial or professional positions. A *Uniform Performance Criteria System* is the most commonly used methodology and is best suited to positions where employees consistently perform the same type of work on a fairly regular basis. This format works well for clerical, public works, administrative, secretarial, technical and other non-exempt positions.

Employees at normal starting range through the mid-point receive an annual performance review. If the employee receives a satisfactory review or meets expectations, he/she moves within the range. When an employee is at the 75th

percentile, he/she is evaluated based on high levels of merit. Movement from the 75th percentile to maximum should be based on outstanding or better performance. The employee's evaluation must be better than satisfactory in order to receive merit pay. The intent is to reward employees for performance above and beyond that required for the position. Evaluations should cover the previous fiscal year and take effect with the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1.

11. Determination of Individual Wages/Salaries (Some general guidelines.)

a) New Employees

Applicants with qualifying experience are normally hired close to the normal starting rate of the new range. Applicants with outstanding qualifications may be hired at the wage/salary within the range for the position, but normally no higher than the midpoint of the range. In rare cases, for positions that are very difficult to recruit, it may be necessary to hire at the 75th Percentile.

b) Transfers

Employees transferred to a position at the same level as their present position will normally receive the same salary paid at the time of the transfer.

c) Transfer to a Lower Salary Grade

Employees transferred by necessity (such as reduction in staff), rather than for inadequate performance, should receive their present salary, although this may exceed the maximum for the lower classification.

d) Promotional Increases

If employees are promoted on a “trial” or “acting” basis, the promotional increase may be deferred until they have demonstrated their ability to handle the duties of the higher classification.

V. Final Conclusion

The Town's compensation plan is one of the most important elements in its personnel system. Combining a sound compensation system with an effective job evaluation process contributes to the overall effectiveness of an organization as well as the Town's ability to attract and retain qualified employees and applicants. Employee wages and benefits are among the largest investments made by most organizations, including municipalities. Factors typically included in a compensation philosophy include the characteristics or principles of an ideal compensation plan. In broad terms, the Town's compensation philosophy and plan should address the following basic principles: *fair, competitive, consistent, motivating, fiscally responsible, and ongoing*. HRS believes that it has provided the town with a solid compensation and classification system. Our summary recommendations include these four components:

- The proposed classification structure
- The proposed compensation plan
- The new job descriptions
- The proposed job evaluation methodology for internal equity purposes

In closing, the proposed compensation plan includes a competitive pay structure, which has worked towards incorporating the market findings while also considering the internal job value of positions. A regularly well-administered program of compensation management will assist the Town to achieve the following objectives: (1) attract and retain competent employees; (2) clarify for employees what is expected of them; (3) motivate employees to improve their performance in the responsibilities assigned to them; (4) ensure that the salaries paid are internally fair and externally competitive; and (5) provide a means for budgeting and controlling

salary expense.

Human Resources Services, Inc. has provided the Town with the methodology, guidelines and tools to maintain the compensation and classification plan. Used together, job evaluation and salary surveys equip the Town with the information needed to maintain a sound and consistent pay structure. Thus, the employees are assured of being compensated on an equitable basis compared with their internal colleagues in the organization, and are assured that their compensation is on par with external competitors too. While both job evaluation and salary surveys attempt to achieve consistency in the wage structure, they use different criteria to evaluate consistency (i.e. internal vs. external comparison). This methodology works at striking a balance between internal and external pay equity.

Please review the attached key documents to this report.

ATTACHMENTS



TOWN OF SHIRLEY PROPOSED FY2015 PAY PLAN

GRADE	POSITIONS		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9
1	None	Hourly	11.91	12.21	12.52	12.83	13.15	13.48	13.82	14.17	14.52
		Weekly (40 hrs)	476.40	488.40	500.80	513.20	526.00	539.20	552.80	566.80	580.80
		Annual (2088 hrs)	24,868.08	25,494.48	26,141.76	26,789.04	27,457.20	28,146.24	28,856.16	29,586.96	30,317.76
2	MART Driver	Hourly	13.10	13.43	13.77	14.11	14.46	14.82	15.19	15.57	15.96
		Weekly (40 hrs)	524.00	537.20	550.80	564.40	578.40	592.80	607.60	622.80	638.40
		Annual (2088 hrs)	27,352.80	28,041.84	28,751.76	29,461.68	30,192.48	30,944.16	31,716.72	32,510.16	33,324.48
3	Custodian Library Aide MART Dispatcher	Hourly	14.41	14.77	15.14	15.52	15.91	16.31	16.72	17.14	17.57
		Weekly (40 hrs)	576.40	590.80	605.60	620.80	636.40	652.40	668.80	685.60	702.80
		Annual (2088 hrs)	30,088.08	30,839.76	31,612.32	32,405.76	33,220.08	34,055.28	34,911.36	35,788.32	36,686.16
4	Police Matron Ambulance Billing Clerk Finance Comm. Administrative Secretary Recreation Secretary Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary	Hourly	15.85	16.25	16.66	17.08	17.51	17.95	18.40	18.86	19.33
		Weekly (40 hrs)	634.00	650.00	666.40	683.20	700.40	718.00	736.00	754.40	773.20
		Annual (2088 hrs)	33,094.80	33,930.00	34,786.08	35,663.04	36,560.88	37,479.60	38,419.20	39,379.68	40,361.04
5	Board of Assessor's Clerk Conservation Secretary Planning Assistant Selectmen's Secretary	Hourly	17.44	17.88	18.33	18.79	19.26	19.74	20.23	20.74	21.26
		Weekly (40 hrs)	697.60	715.20	733.20	751.60	770.40	789.60	809.20	829.60	850.40
		Annual (2088 hrs)	36,414.72	37,333.44	38,273.04	39,233.52	40,214.88	41,217.12	42,240.24	43,305.12	44,390.88
6	Assistant Accountant Assistant Collector Assistant Librarian Assistant Treasurer Health Inspections/Office Manager Police Dept Executive Secretary Public Works Assistant Sewer Dept Office Manager/Assistant Veteran's Services Officer Youth Services Librarian	Hourly	19.18	19.66	20.15	20.65	21.17	21.70	22.24	22.80	23.37
		Weekly (40 hrs)	767.20	786.40	806.00	826.00	846.80	868.00	889.60	912.00	934.80
		Annual (2088 hrs)	40,047.84	41,050.08	42,073.20	43,117.20	44,202.96	45,309.60	46,437.12	47,606.40	48,796.56
7	Ambulance Director Community Development Coordinator Council on Aging Director Executive Assistant to the Selectmen	Hourly	21.10	21.63	22.17	22.72	23.29	23.87	24.47	25.08	25.71
		Weekly (40 hrs)	844.00	865.20	886.80	908.80	931.60	954.80	978.80	1,003.20	1,028.40
		Annual (2088 hrs)	44,056.80	45,163.44	46,290.96	47,439.36	48,629.52	49,840.56	51,093.36	52,367.04	53,682.48
8	Conservation Agent	Hourly	23.21	23.79	24.38	24.99	25.61	26.25	26.91	27.58	28.27
		Weekly (40 hrs)	928.40	951.60	975.20	999.60	1,024.40	1,050.00	1,076.40	1,103.20	1,130.80
		Annual (2088 hrs)	48,462.48	49,673.52	50,905.44	52,179.12	53,473.68	54,810.00	56,188.08	57,587.04	59,027.76

GRADE	POSITIONS		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9
9	Town Clerk	Hourly	25.53	26.17	26.82	27.49	28.18	28.88	29.60	30.34	31.10
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,021.20	1,046.80	1,072.80	1,099.60	1,127.20	1,155.20	1,184.00	1,213.60	1,244.00
		Annual (2088 hrs)	53,306.64	54,642.96	56,000.16	57,399.12	58,839.84	60,301.44	61,804.80	63,349.92	64,936.80
10	Building Inspector Library Director Principal Assessor	Hourly	28.08	28.78	29.50	30.24	31.00	31.78	32.57	33.38	34.21
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,123.20	1,151.20	1,180.00	1,209.60	1,240.00	1,271.20	1,302.80	1,335.20	1,368.40
		Annual (2088 hrs)	58,631.04	60,092.64	61,596.00	63,141.12	64,728.00	66,356.64	68,006.16	69,697.44	71,430.48
11	Accountant/Budget Officer Information Technology Administrator Police Lieutenant Town Collector Treasurer/Benefits Coordinator	Hourly	30.89	31.66	32.45	33.26	34.09	34.94	35.81	36.71	37.63
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,235.60	1,266.40	1,298.00	1,330.40	1,363.60	1,397.60	1,432.40	1,468.40	1,505.20
		Annual (2088 hrs)	64,498.32	66,106.08	67,755.60	69,446.88	71,179.92	72,954.72	74,771.28	76,650.48	78,571.44
12	None	Hourly	33.98	34.83	35.70	36.59	37.50	38.44	39.40	40.39	41.40
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,359.20	1,393.20	1,428.00	1,463.60	1,500.00	1,537.60	1,576.00	1,615.60	1,656.00
		Annual (2088 hrs)	70,950.24	72,725.04	74,541.60	76,399.92	78,300.00	80,262.72	82,267.20	84,334.32	86,443.20
13	Fire Chief Public Works Director	Hourly	37.38	38.31	39.27	40.25	41.26	42.29	43.35	44.43	45.54
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,495.20	1,532.40	1,570.80	1,610.00	1,650.40	1,691.60	1,734.00	1,777.20	1,821.60
		Annual (2088 hrs)	78,049.44	79,991.28	81,995.76	84,042.00	86,150.88	88,301.52	90,514.80	92,769.84	95,087.52
14	Police Chief	Hourly	41.12	42.15	43.20	44.28	45.39	46.52	47.68	48.87	50.09
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,644.80	1,686.00	1,728.00	1,771.20	1,815.60	1,860.80	1,907.20	1,954.80	2,003.60
		Annual (2088 hrs)	85,858.56	88,009.20	90,201.60	92,456.64	94,774.32	97,133.76	99,555.84	102,040.56	104,587.92
15	Town Administrator	Hourly	45.23	46.36	47.52	48.71	49.93	51.18	52.46	53.77	55.11
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,809.20	1,854.40	1,900.80	1,948.40	1,997.20	2,047.20	2,098.40	2,150.80	2,204.40
		Annual (2088 hrs)	94,440.24	96,799.68	99,221.76	101,706.48	104,253.84	106,863.84	109,536.48	112,271.76	115,069.68
16	None	Hourly	49.75	50.99	52.26	53.57	54.91	56.28	57.69	59.13	60.61
		Weekly (40 hrs)	1,990.00	2,039.60	2,090.40	2,142.80	2,196.40	2,251.20	2,307.60	2,365.20	2,424.40
		Annual (2088 hrs)	103,878.00	106,467.12	109,118.88	111,854.16	114,652.08	117,512.64	120,456.72	123,463.44	126,553.68

	Shirley FY13	Points	Average	Range	Median	75th Perc.	90th Perc.	% Diff. Avg.	
POSITION TITLE									
1	Police Chief	37.30 50.95	6 12	32.44 46.78	26.34 58.85	32.34 46.87	35.97 50.60	37.75 54.68	15% 9%
2	Public Works Director	33.91 46.29	7 10	31.73 42.57	25.10 49.66	32.42 44.66	34.82 46.09	35.48 47.10	7% 9%
3	Fire Chief	28.03 38.26	8 11	31.23 40.48	24.11 51.77	31.38 40.31	35.30 43.22	37.17 48.50	-10% -5%
4	Police Lieutenant	28.03 38.26	3 5	32.85 35.77	31.03 40.02	31.21 33.97	33.76 38.63	35.29 39.46	-15% 7%
5	Information Technology Administrator	25.48 34.81	3 3	28.29 34.89	21.25 44.83	27.37 33.30	31.81 39.07	34.47 42.52	-10% 0%
6	Accountant/Budget Officer	23.16 31.63	8 13	26.68 35.42	19.07 41.18	27.09 36.32	29.51 38.14	30.64 40.14	-13% -11%
7	Treasurer/Benefits Coordinator	23.16 31.63	3 3	24.25 32.27	17.26 37.87	27.74 35.31	27.75 36.59	27.75 37.35	-5% -2%
8	Tax Collector	23.16 31.63	2 2	21.48 28.16	17.26 32.69	21.48 28.16	23.59 30.43	24.85 31.79	8% 12%
9	Treasurer/Tax Collector (Benchmark)		10 11	26.02 33.29	19.16 41.75	26.14 32.39	29.43 36.74	30.77 37.27	
10	Town Clerk	26.08	7 11	21.98 27.39	17.26 36.85	23.80 27.25	25.14 30.30	26.08 32.30	-5%
11	Principal Assessor	23.16 31.63	6 8	25.28 32.77	19.07 38.81	27.17 33.51	27.65 36.94	28.67 38.15	-8% -3%
12	Library Director	21.05 28.75	8 12	24.69 31.15	19.01 36.85	25.06 31.43	26.41 33.21	28.46 36.12	-15% -8%
13	Building Inspector	21.05 28.75	11 15	25.44 32.44	20.69 37.87	25.47 32.44	27.05 34.74	28.93 36.76	-17% -11%
14	Executive Assistant to the Selectmen	19.14 26.12	9 9	18.70 23.39	15.62 28.62	18.07 22.17	19.13 23.28	22.25 28.15	2% 12%
15	Assistant Assessor	17.40 23.77	11 11	17.04 21.76	14.27 25.37	16.87 22.17	18.90 23.66	19.13 24.29	2% 9%
16	Conservation Agent	17.40 23.77	11 11	20.64 26.82	14.07 32.11	20.58 26.31	23.32 29.56	23.80 31.79	-16% -11%
17	Police Dept Executive Secretary	17.40 23.77	11 12	16.38 20.94	12.89 25.20	16.42 21.50	17.90 22.19	19.13 23.18	6% 13%
18	Youth Services Librarian	17.40 23.77	12 12	18.12 23.04	14.06 27.91	18.45 23.09	19.59 25.07	20.20 26.50	-4% 3%
19	Reserve Police Officer	17.40 23.77	1 2	15.92 21.48	15.92 22.19	15.92 21.48	15.92 21.84	15.92 22.05	9% 11%
20	Council on Aging Director	17.40 23.77	13 15	19.92 25.27	14.06 32.83	20.40 26.22	22.52 28.82	24.17 31.15	-13% -6%
21	Assistant Accountant	15.82 21.64	7 8	15.96 20.14	14.07 23.28	15.62 20.02	16.55 21.18	17.77 22.29	-1% 7%
22	Assistant Treasurer	15.82 21.64	10 10	16.67 21.35	13.72 24.29	16.64 21.04	18.49 23.23	18.91 24.06	-5% 1%
23	Community Development Coordinator (Insufficient Data)	15.82 21.64	0 0						
24	Assistant Collector	15.82 21.64	10 11	16.25 20.67	13.72 24.29	15.88 20.33	17.01 21.80	18.80 23.28	-3% 5%
25	Health Inspections/Office Manager	15.82 21.64	6 8	17.00 22.95	12.47 27.91	17.55 22.55	19.11 25.86	19.97 27.51	-7% -6%
26	Public Works Assistant	15.82 21.64	11 12	16.54 20.88	13.72 24.29	16.42 20.46	17.97 22.45	18.66 23.33	-4% 4%
27	Planning Administrator (Paraprofessional in Shirley)	15.82 21.64	3 3	19.02 24.20	16.42 28.16	17.49 22.26	20.32 25.21	22.01 26.98	-17% -11%
28	Sewer Dept Office Manager/Assistant	15.82 21.64	5 6	15.69 21.03	13.72 24.29	16.19 20.87	17.05 23.46	17.25 24.26	1% 3%
29	Assistant Librarian	15.82 21.64	10 10	16.36 20.99	11.35 24.75	16.99 21.31	17.67 22.00	18.35 22.51	-3% 3%
30	Conservation Secretary	14.38 19.63	10 10	14.81 18.69	11.22 21.71	14.75 18.74	16.56 20.79	17.69 21.17	-3% 5%
31	Finance Committee Administrative Secretary	14.38 19.63	1 1	13.20 17.88	13.20 17.88	13.20 17.88	13.20 17.88	13.20 17.88	9% 10%
32	Selectmen's Secretary	14.38 19.63	7 7	16.46 21.61	12.47 28.03	16.00 21.12	17.14 21.59	19.14 24.33	-13% -9%
33	Board of Assessor's Clerk	14.38 19.63	6 7	14.97 19.91	12.47 21.87	14.84 19.87	15.91 21.29	16.83 21.77	-4% -1%
34	Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary	14.38 19.63	11 11	15.11 19.19	10.55 24.29	16.00 20.88	17.52 21.41	17.70 21.71	-5% 2%
35	Custodian	11.88 16.23	7 8	12.93 16.81	10.31 21.12	12.78 16.05	14.59 17.88	14.88 19.68	-8% -3%
36	Library Aide	11.88 16.23	11 11	12.62 16.28	9.44 19.39	13.04 16.39	13.65 17.60	13.96 18.80	-6% 0%

	Position Title by functional area	Shirley FY13	Ashburnham	Ayer	Bolton	Boylston	Groton	Harvard	Lancaster	Leicester	Lunenburg	Pepperell	Sterling	Stow	Templeton	Tyngsborough	Westminster	W Boylston	
	Market Survey																		
1	Police Chief	37.30 50.95	34.97 44.48	43.75		28.11 37.96	39.19 48.50		49.76	50.21		55.00	36.31 51.77		26.34 36.06	58.85	29.71 39.77	45.23	
2	Public Works Director	33.91 46.29	34.97 44.48	43.10	49.66		36.24 44.83		30.37 35.74			45.67	32.42 46.23		25.10 34.35	34.68 46.81	28.36 34.83		
3	Fire Chief	28.03 38.26	34.97 44.48	40.81		24.11 32.55	39.19 48.50	33.00 40.31					27.37 33.30		25.10 34.35		29.76 41.95	38.35	
4	Police Lieutenant	28.03 38.26					31.21 38.63				31.03 32.58		27.37 40.02			33.97	33.66		
5	Information Technology Administrator	25.48 34.81					36.24 44.83							21.25 26.55					
6	Accountant/Budget Officer	23.16 31.63	29.98 38.14	41.18			29.36 36.32	26.43 32.30	39.85	34.59	32.53	35.80		25.85 40.22	32.18 40.22		27.74 37.87	22.84 28.07	19.07 26.70
7	Treasurer/Benefits Coordinator	23.16 31.63	27.75 35.31													17.26 23.64	27.74 37.87		
8	Tax Collector	23.16 31.63	25.69 32.69													17.26 23.64			
9	Treasurer/Tax Collector (Benchmark)				32.00 41.75	19.16 25.82	29.60 36.63	26.43 32.30	24.49 28.83		28.93 35.58	30.63 37.27	25.85 36.85					20.91 27.67	22.23 31.12
10	Town Clerk	26.08	23.80 30.27		30.32			26.43 32.30	27.25	21.13	20.29		24.43 29.72	25.85 36.85		17.26 23.64	18.20 24.45	17.88 25.02	
11	Principal Assessor	23.16 31.63		38.81			29.60 36.63			26.49			27.37 33.29		26.97 33.73	20.92 28.63	27.74 37.87		19.07 26.70
12	Library Director	21.05 28.75	25.69 32.69			22.37 30.16	29.36 36.32		32.85	25.62	28.44		24.43 29.72	25.85 36.85		19.01 25.99	28.13	28.07 34.28	22.76 32.76
13	Building Inspector	21.05 28.75	23.80 30.28	33.90	25.40 33.14	20.69 27.94	29.60 36.63		25.11 29.54	26.53		28.93 35.58	25.47 30.99		20.92 28.63	27.74 37.87	26.36 32.41	32.44	
14	Executive Assistant to the Selectmen	19.14 26.12	22.03 28.03			16.42 22.17	23.13 28.62		18.90 22.25	18.07 21.57	17.25 21.22	19.13 23.28					17.71 21.54	15.62 21.87	
15	Assistant Assessor	17.40 23.77	18.89 24.03			16.42 22.17		14.07	20.26 24.75				19.13 23.28	17.05 24.29	20.36 25.37	14.27 19.52	16.87 20.52	15.52 19.11	14.49 20.33
16	Conservation Agent	17.40 23.77	23.80 30.28	22.34	20.16 26.31	17.71 23.94	14.07	20.26 24.75					23.14 28.16	22.52 32.11	25.65 31.79	15.70 21.49	20.58 25.02	23.50 28.85	
17	Police Dept Executive Secretary	17.40 23.77	17.49 22.26			16.42 22.17	20.37 25.20		18.14 21.32	14.35 17.14	17.66 21.71	19.13 23.28	12.89 18.37	17.05 21.67	20.36 26.19	14.27 18.78	16.87 21.54	15.52 19.11	14.49 20.33
18	Youth Services Librarian	17.40 23.77			16.98 22.14	14.06 18.99		20.26 24.75	18.14 21.32	14.35 17.14	18.76 23.06	19.62 23.87	19.58 27.91	21.25 26.55		17.71 21.54	18.12 23.12	17.88 26.04	
19	Reserve Police Officer	17.40 23.77				15.92 20.77								22.19					
20	Council on Aging Director	17.40 23.77	20.40 25.96	26.22	20.16 26.31	14.06 18.99	26.53 32.83	23.14 28.27	18.14 21.32	19.93	22.34 27.47	24.43 29.72	22.52 32.11		14.27 19.52	21.76 29.37	15.52 19.11	15.67 21.95	
21	Assistant Accountant	15.82 21.64		20.95					16.23 19.10	14.07 16.80		19.13 23.28			14.27 19.52	16.87 20.52	15.52 19.11	15.62 21.87	
22	Assistant Treasurer	15.82 21.64	18.89 24.03			15.20 20.54			16.23 19.10	15.50 18.51	18.76 23.06	19.13 23.28	17.05 24.29		13.72 18.78	17.71 21.54		14.49 20.33	
23	Community Development Coordinator (Insufficient Data)	15.82 21.64																	
24	Assistant Collector	15.82 21.64		19.87		15.20 20.54			16.23 19.10	15.50 18.51	18.76 23.06	19.13 23.28	17.05 24.29		13.72 18.78	16.87 20.52	15.52 19.11	14.49 20.33	
25	Health Inspections/Office Manager	15.82 21.64		20.49		17.71 23.94				27.34		17.38 21.15	19.58 27.91	20.36 25.37	12.47 17.07			14.49 20.33	
26	Public Works Assistant	15.82 21.64	16.19 20.59	19.00	18.66 23.34	16.42 22.17	16.28 20.14				17.66 21.71	19.13 23.28	17.05 24.29	18.28 19.54	13.72 18.78		14.11 17.39	14.49 20.33	
27	Planning Administrator (Paraprofessional in Shirley)	15.82 21.64	17.49 22.26			16.42 22.17						23.14 28.16							
28	Sewer Dept Office Manager/Assistant	15.82 21.64	16.19 20.59	24.23								17.38 21.15	17.05 24.29		13.72 18.78	14.10 17.15			
29	Assistant Librarian	15.82 21.64	17.49 22.26		16.48 21.50	16.42 22.17		20.26 24.75	18.14 21.32	17.72 21.15		17.51 21.29	14.81 21.12		11.35 15.54			13.40 18.80	
30	Conservation Secretary	14.38 19.63			16.00 20.88		16.75 20.50		17.96 21.11	15.50 18.51	17.66 21.71			14.00 18.97	12.47 17.07	13.41 16.32	13.08 16.11	11.22 15.70	
31	Finance Committee Administrative Secretary	14.38 19.63												13.20 17.88					
32	Selectmen's Secretary	14.38 19.63	22.03 28.03		16.00 20.88		17.21 21.30						14.81 21.12		12.47 17.07		17.06 21.01	15.62 21.87	
33	Board of Assessor's Clerk	14.38 19.63		19.87	16.00 20.88	14.06 18.99					17.66 21.71			14.00 18.97	12.47 17.07			15.62 21.87	
34	Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary	14.38 19.63			16.00 20.88		17.70 21.66		17.96 21.11	10.55 12.58	17.66 21.71	17.38 21.15	17.05 24.29		12.47 17.07	14.80 18.00	11.21 13.80	13.40 18.80	
35	Custodian	11.88 16.23	14.98 19.06	15.17		12.06 16.39						14.37 17.48	14.81 21.12		10.31 14.12	12.78 15.45		11.22 15.70	
36	Library Aide	11.88 16.23	13.88 17.67			12.06 16.39		12.18 14.85	13.96 16.45		9.44 11.61	15.94 19.39	11.19 15.96	13.04 17.54	10.31 14.12	13.41 16.32		13.40 18.80	

SUPPLEMENTAL MARKET SURVEY										
Town	Assistant Town Clerk		Mart Dispatcher		Mart Driver		Veterans Agent		Library Page	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Ashburnham	17.15	21.82								
<i>Ashland</i>					12.75	12.75	25.13	25.13		
<i>Athol</i>									8.00	8.00
Ayer	19.42	19.42								
<i>Belchertown</i>	17.72	25.45			11.00	15.80	15.24	20.82	8.00	8.00
Bolton					14.67	14.67	stipend	4500		
Boylston									8.51	8.78
<i>Charlton</i>	18.00	23.00					13.89	17.76	8.00	8.00
<i>Dunstable</i>									11.35	11.50
Groton	20.49	25.09			17.25	21.11	stipend	1700	8.98	11.00
Harvard			13.62	16.65	12.90	13.31	stipend	1000	8.75	13.03
<i>Hopkinton</i>					11.30	15.00	stipend	4800	8.92	8.92
Lancaster	15.76	18.54			11.48	11.48	stipend	3000		
Leicester	15.20	18.15			11.17	13.34				
<i>Littleton</i>			11.08	12.00	13.86	15.00				
<i>Ludlow</i>					13.84	17.30	18.85	28.28	8.75	8.75
Lunenburg	17.31	21.28							9.25	11.38
<i>Maynard</i>									8.50	8.50
<i>Millbury</i>									8.03	8.28
<i>Northbridge</i>	22.30	27.10			11.67	14.19	21.85	26.56		
Pepperell	19.42	23.63								
<i>S. Hadley</i>	17.75	26.63			11.30	16.95	20.75	31.13	9.00	9.00
<i>Sterling</i>	14.75	22.32					stipend			
<i>Sturbridge</i>							stipend	3400		
Templeton	13.07	17.89			10.81	14.80				
<i>Townsend</i>	15.06	15.06			12.53	13.29				
<i>Upton</i>							stipend	6500		
Westminster	12.82	15.79			12.82	12.82				
<i>W. Boylston</i>	13.14	18.43			12.07	16.13				
COUNT	16	16	2	2	16	16	6	6	13	13
AVERAGE	16.84	21.23	12.35	14.33	12.59	14.87	19.29	24.95	8.77	9.47

towns in italics are additional survey communities