

CITY OF FRANKLIN
COMMON COUNCIL MEETING*
FRANKLIN CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
9229 W. LOOMIS ROAD, FRANKLIN, WISCONSIN
AGENDA**
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2015 AT 6:30 P.M.

- A. Call to Order and Roll Call
- B. Citizen Comment Period
- C. Presentation of the Mayor's 2016 Recommended Budget and Review of the Budget Preparation Timetable.
- D. Presentation of the Draft Final Report of the City of Franklin Employee Classification and Compensation Study.
- E. Adjournment

*Notice is given that a majority of the Personnel Committee and Finance Committee may attend this meeting to gather information about an agenda item over which the Personnel Committee and Finance Committee has decision-making responsibility. This may constitute a meeting of the Personnel Committee and Finance Committee per State ex rel. Badke v. Greendale Village Board, even though the Personnel Committee and Finance Committee will not take formal action at this meeting.

**Supporting documentation and details of these agenda items are available at City Hall during normal business hours.

[Note: Upon reasonable notice, efforts will be made to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals through appropriate aids and services. For additional information, contact the City Clerk's office at (414) 425-7500.]

APPROVAL 	REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION	MEETING DATE 9/22/2015
REPORTS & RECOMMENDATIONS	Presentation of the Mayor's 2016 Recommended Budget and Review of the Budget Preparation Timetable	ITEM NUMBER C.

The Mayor's 2016 Recommended Budget will be presented to the Common Council for it to forward to the Committee of the Whole in accordance with Section 13-2, "Preparation of Budget" of the City of Franklin Municipal Code.

The Director of Administration will present an "overview of [the] budget and major budget initiatives" as set forth in the 2016 Budget Preparation Timetable as adopted by the Common Council. The presentation will primarily consist of a PowerPoint presentation on the budget and review of the budget timetable.

Note that the budget timetable indicates that following the presentation, Aldermen will "determine or identify additional materials or information needed for 10/5 budget discussions." This will enable staff to prepare advance information as may be requested and also inform department heads as to who is expected to be in attendance. A copy of the budget timetable is attached for your convenience.

A copy of the Mayor's 2016 Recommended Budget document will be provided at the meeting.

COUNCIL ACTION REQUESTED

Motion to forward consideration of the Mayor's 2016 Recommended Budget to the Committee of the Whole.

Provide other direction to staff, as appropriate, relative to additional materials or information needed for the October 5th budget discussions.

<p>APPROVAL</p> 	<p>REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION</p>	<p>MEETING DATE</p> <p>9/22/2015</p>
<p>REPORTS & RECOMMENDATIONS</p>	<p>Presentation of the Draft Final Report of the City of Franklin Employee Classification and Compensation Study</p>	<p>ITEM NUMBER</p> <p>D.</p>

The Draft Final Report of the Franklin Classification and Compensation Study as prepared by GovHR, USA was provided to the Common Council members on September 16, 2015 and placed to the Employee Extranet website on September 18, 2015. Joellen Earl of GovHR, USA will provide a presentation on the document and its conclusions at the Special Common Council meeting of September 22, 2015. Joellen will provide a broad compensation structure that establishes ranges and general points on implementation. After the consultant's presentation, the Director of Administration will provide the discussion and recommendations on implementation and more detailed perspectives on the functional and fiscal impacts of commencing a new compensation and classification plan. More details on the implementation plan will be discussed as part of the budget discussions commencing at the Committee of the Whole budget meeting on October 5th.

Between September 22nd and October 5th, various employee meetings will be held to ensure that employees are provided an ample opportunity to understand and discuss the Classification and Compensation Study as presented by the consultant and the implementation strategy that is recommended.

COUNCIL ACTION REQUESTED

This item will be included in the Committee of the Whole's discussion on the Proposed 2016 budget.

Additional Action if Desired: Forward to Personnel Committee for recommendation.



CITY OF FRANKLIN

EMPLOYEE CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY

DRAFT FINAL REPORT

AUGUST 2015



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION – Pages 1 to 3

- Scope of Work – Page 1

II. POSITION CLASSIFICATION PLAN – Pages 4 to 5

III. JOB EVALUATION – Pages 6 to 8

- Fair Labor Standards Act Compliance – Page 7
- Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance – Page 7

IV. SALARY AND BENEFITS SURVEY – Pages 9 to 17

- Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions for Survey Purposes – Page 9
- Salary Survey – Page 12
- Appraisal and Use of the Salary Survey Data – Page 13
- Benefits Survey – Page 14
- Benefits Survey Findings – Page 15

V. PAY PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS – Pages 18 to 25

- Development of the Pay Plan – Page 18
- Pay Plan Options for the City's Consideration – Page 18
- Defined Increment, Open-Range, and Blended Pay Plans – Page 18
- Pay Philosophy – Page 20
- Pay Compression – Page 21
- Proposed Pay Plan and Structure – Page 21
- Implementation and Administration of the Pay Plan for Current Employees – page 22
- Employee Advancement Through the Ranges – Page 22
- Future Administration of the Pay Plan – Page 23
- Future Administration of the Classification Plan – Page 24

TABLES

Table 1 – Classification Plan – Page 26

Table 2 – Comprehensive Table – Page 29

Table 3 – Proposed Pay Ranges and Pay Plan – Page 33

Table 4 – Percentile Comparison – Page 37

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Job Analysis Questionnaire

Appendix B – Comparable Community Analysis

Appendix C – Detailed Salary Survey Data – Public Sector

Appendix D – Salary Survey Data – Private Sector

Appendix E – Plan Update Response – Act 10

Appendix F – Detailed Benefits Survey Data

Appendix G – City of Franklin Initial Pay Philosophy

I. INTRODUCTION

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

It was the City's goal to update its existing classification and compensation system utilizing modern "best practices" in support of the City's mission and strategic objective to attract and retain a highly talented, effective and motivated workforce. The City administration worked closely with the GovHR USA Consultants throughout the process and the result is a report that is well thought out and comprehensive. The Study recommendations were fully customized to reflect the unique resources, challenges and goals of the City of Franklin. As GovHR USA has completed its analysis on behalf of the City, we are pleased to present the results of our findings and to make recommendations for consideration by City officials.

Scope of Work

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

I. Job Evaluation Analysis and Job Classification System

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

- **Study preparation conference call.** Met with the Director of Administration and Human Resources Coordinator (Project Team) to discuss study methods and objectives and the current job descriptions and compensation plans. Determined problem areas, answered questions, and reviewed the scope and schedule of work.
- **Material distribution.** Prepared a memorandum of explanation which was distributed to employees, followed by a series of meetings in mid-March with employees to distribute and explain the Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) forms and to discuss the scope and purpose of the Study. Employees were then allowed two weeks to complete the questionnaire. These questionnaires were reviewed by each employee's Supervisor and Department Head for comments as well as City administration for approval of content, and returned to GovHR USA within approximately four weeks of distribution.
- **Determined comparable communities and prepared and distributed the compensation survey.** Working with the Project Teams, determined a logical survey sample of "like" communities that impact the compensation market for City.
- **Met with City Council in early March to discuss comparable communities and private sector entities, pay philosophy and pay plan structure.**
- **Designed and distributed the compensation survey for 37 benchmark job classifications and selected benefits to 14 municipalities, the North Shore Fire Department and eight private sector entities.**
- **Job evaluation analysis and establishment of job classification system.** Upon return of the JAQs by the City, GovHR USA performed the following:
 - Read each JAQ and corresponding Job Description in its entirety.
 - In mid-April, interviewed in person at least one person in each classification covered by the Study, as well as the Department Heads with regard to jobs under their jurisdiction, to further understand the scope, requirements and responsibilities of every job.
 - Applied a measurement system of job evaluation factors to all classifications, which formed the basis for internal rankings of classifications.
 - Upon completion of the job evaluation measurements, a new Classification Plan was developed.

II. Survey Analysis

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

- Tabulated, summarized, and analyzed comparative compensation information obtained through the salary survey. The salary range minimums and maximums provided by the comparables for each classification were analyzed at the 50th, 55th, 60th, 65th, 70th and 75th percentiles to identify the "market-rate" wages paid by comparable communities. Data have been displayed for each jurisdiction regarding each surveyed classification, summarized in an overall table (Table 2 – Comprehensive Table), and analyzed to develop salary ranges that establish Franklin as an "above average" payer at the 70th percentile when competing for talent with comparable municipalities.

- Based on the above data, developed and recommended new salary schedules and titles.

III. Draft and Final Report Preparation

- A preliminary analysis of the data and recommended classification and compensation plan was shared with the Project Team. Over several conference calls, feedback from the team was reviewed and incorporated into the recommendations.
- This draft final report has been prepared by the Consultant and sent electronically to the City.
- On September 22, 2015, GovHR will present these draft findings to the Common Council and Personnel Committee, answer questions and gather feedback.
- After making any needed revisions, this report will be finalized and issued in electronic and hard copy formats.

II. THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION PLAN

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

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

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

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

III. JOB EVALUATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Current Title

Proposed New Title

Account Clerk	Payroll Clerk
Information Systems Director	Information Systems Manager
Planner I	Assistant Planner
Planner II	Associate Planner
Secretary (Engineering)	Administrative Assistant
Secretary (Fire)	Confidential Fire Administrative Assistant
Secretary (Public Works)	Administrative Assistant
Senior Planner	Principal Planner

Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance

The City requested that all job descriptions be reviewed to determine compliance with the FLSA and the ADA. With regard to the FLSA, it was determined that the majority of job descriptions are categorized correctly currently. There are only three positions for which GovHR recommends a change:

- Assistant Director of Public Works – non-Exempt to Exempt;
- Planner II and Planner – Exempt to non-Exempt.

With regard to the ADA, the Consultants reviewed the detail of each job description as it relates to physical requirements and working conditions. Again, the majority of job descriptions meet the spirit of the law. However, the Consultants advised the City that it should cross reference the responses on the employees individual JAQs to make sure none of the specific requirements have changed. Further, there are only a few job descriptions where additional wording will need to be added to bring the City into full compliance with the law. GovHR will furnish the City with a list of those job descriptions that need additional wording.

IV. SALARY AND BENEFITS SURVEY

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

Selection of Comparable Jurisdictions and Private Sector Entities for Survey Purposes

Selecting jurisdictions and private sector entities for the comparison group is an important element in a compensation study. When selecting jurisdictions to serve as survey comparables, it is important to use relevant and consistent criteria to evaluate the other jurisdictions to assure that those chosen as comparables will be the most similar to Franklin. Public sector municipalities are preferred over private sector companies as comparable due to the following reasons:

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

Franklin requested both public and private sector data. The survey was sent to eight private sector companies that were personally contacted by the Director of Administration. Out of the eight requests made for data, only two companies responded, which is a response rate of 25%. The data received are informational and are included as Appendix D of the report.

Note: When reviewing the Salary Survey data in Appendix D, keep in mind the following:

If there are two pages with the same title it is because the data were changed. If any data were changed, the specific piece of data was highlighted and removed. If data were removed, it was because the Consultant determined it was not applicable. Thus, a notation of N/A in columns where data were removed means "not applicable". If a N/A appears where no data were removed it is because the responding entities indicated there were no comparable positions for which to report data. Thus, in these instances, N/A means "not available".

The Consultants chose communities within the following parameters: located within approximately 75 miles of the City, essentially South of Green Bay to the State Line (West and South) with populations of more than 20,000 and less than 70,000. To all these communities, the following criteria were then applied:

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Total Possible Points</u>	<u>Factor Weight</u>
1. Population	15	15%
2. Municipal Property Tax Levy	15	15%
3. Equalized Value	15	15%
4. Basic Spending	15	15%
5. Municipal Property Tax Rate	15	15%
6. Proximity in Miles to Franklin	15	15%
7. General Obligation Debt	5	5%
8. Shared Revenue	5	5%
	<hr/>	
	100	100%

The eight (8) categories were selected to mirror important criteria that reflected the following:

- *Similar financial conditions:* 70% of the criteria involve financial criteria and equalized valuation (property value/worth of community).
- *Population:* 15% of the criteria involve population comparison.
- *Proximity:* 15% of the criteria reflect proximity to Franklin.

Within each of the eight (8) categories, ranges of compatibility were established (Appendix B) for each jurisdiction. For example, the closer a community is to matching the City of Franklin's estimated population, the closer the community would be to receiving the maximum of 15 points. A community whose population is significantly larger or smaller than Franklin's population would receive fewer or even zero points. Thus, a municipality achieving a total of 100 points would be considered **most**

comparable to the City of Franklin. A community with zero points would therefore be deemed least comparable to the Franklin. The Cities of New Berlin and Greenfield scored 98 and 97 points respectively indicating they are significantly comparable to Franklin. In fact, all of the communities chosen had a comparability score of 70 points or higher which is excellent for purposes of comparison.

A total of 33 communities were initially selected using the geographic area and population parameters noted above to form the comparison group. Included in those 33 communities were those that Franklin regularly uses for purposes of comparison:

Brookfield	Muskego
Caledonia	New Berlin
Cudahy	Oak Creek
Greendale	South Milwaukee
Greenfield	St. Francis
Hales Corners	West Allis
Menomonee Falls	West Milwaukee
Mount Pleasant	

A cutoff of 70 points was established to select the communities most strongly similar to Franklin across the eight (8) categories. After applying the eight (8) criteria, the following 14 communities achieved 70 or more compatibility points when compared to Franklin. They are as follows, in alphabetical order:

Brookfield	Mequon
Caledonia	Muskego
Fitchburg	New Berlin
Fond du Lac	Oak Creek
Greenfield	Sun Prairie
Menomonee Falls	Wauwatosa
Mount Pleasant	West Bend

The following communities that were traditionally used by Franklin for the purposes of comparison did not score at least 70 points and therefore were not used in the comparison:

Cudahy
Greendale
Hales Corners
South Milwaukee
St. Francis
West Allis
West Milwaukee

Finally, the North Shore Fire Department was also added to the salary and benefits survey as the City wished to ensure the acquisition of enough information for positions within the Fire Service.

The Salary Survey

After selecting the above referenced municipalities as our source for salary and benefit survey data, the Consultants then selected 37 classifications for the purposes of gathering minimum and maximum salary data from the comparable entities. These classifications were chosen as “benchmarks” to achieve representation from the current positions to provide an overall basis for comparison. “Benchmarks” selected are those that:

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

The detailed survey data for each position are contained in Appendix C. Table 2 provides a summary of the benchmark salary survey data. Also displayed in Table 2 are Franklin’s classifications grouped into one of fourteen pay grades according to JFA scores, as well as the recommended salary range minimums and maximums associated with each grade. It is important to make a few observations regarding the survey data and the recommended pay ranges.

1. All jurisdictions and the North Shore Fire Department responded to the survey by providing data for a 100% response rate.
2. The salary data from the comparables reflects their wage ranges and actual salaries as of April to July 2015. The new recommended salary ranges for Franklin were developed using the salary data from the comparables.
3. All of the comparable entities surveyed were asked if their classification and compensation plans had been updated since the passage of Act 10. Seven of the entities responded yes, six

responded no and two did not respond. A list of the comparable entities and their responses is included as Appendix E.

4. Some of the comparable communities provided salary ranges for comparison purposes, while others communities (those that don't utilize salary ranges as part of their pay plans) provided actual salaries for the surveyed positions. The salary range minimums and maximums collected from the comparable communities were analyzed to determine the 50th, 55th, 60th, 65th, 70th and 75th percentiles to identify wage ranges for "average" and "above-average" payers. [Definition: the Nth percentile represents the salary that is higher than N% of the salaries provided by comparable municipalities.] Any actual salaries provided by the comparable communities were not analyzed simply because there was abundant salary range information available, which are the preferred data for analysis.
5. Part-time salaries included in Table 2 have been converted to a 40-hour workweek for comparability. Upon implementation of this pay plan, the wages should be pro-rated according to actual hours worked per week.
6. Several positions are currently being paid salaries that are below the recommended salary range minimums. These positions are highlighted in bolded green font in Table 2. There are no incumbents in positions in the City of Franklin that are paid above the recommended maximum for a pay range.

Appraisal and Use of Salary Survey Data

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

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

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

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

The Benefits Survey

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

- Health Insurance
- Dental Insurance
- Life Insurance
- Retirement
- Disability
- Holidays and Personal Days
- Sick Leave
- Vacation
- Bereavement Leave
- Other Types of Leave
- Employee Assistance Plan
- Length of Service Awards
- Other Benefits

Benefits Survey Findings

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

Health Insurance – Franklin pays less for employee only and family plans. Further analysis of plan design is necessary to determine if the plans are truly similar to the comparable entities. However, of the information provided, Franklin's Annual Deductible, Co-pay and Out-of-Pocket maximums are considerably less than the average of the comparable entities. Also, the employee/City contributions exactly match the average of those paid in the comparable entities at 13%/87% respectively.

Dental Insurance – Franklin pays less on average for the total premium. Again, it is recommended that plan design be reviewed. Further, the average employee contribution is 45% for employee and family plans. Franklin's contributions are 0% and 62% respectively, which is more generous for the employee plan and less generous for the family plan.

Life Insurance – Most of the comparable communities offered life insurance at one times annual salary and four offered it at five times annual salary. In both cases, the entities paid 100% of the equivalent of one times annual salary. Franklin offers two times annual salary and pays 100% of the cost. This is more generous than all of the other comparable entities.

Retirement – all responding entities indicate participation in the Wisconsin Retirement System, with two, including Franklin, specifically indicating for sworn personnel only.

Retiree Health Benefits – all of the responding entities that allow retiree health benefits offer a conversion of sick leave into a retiree health savings account or to fund premiums except for Wauwatosa, West Bend and Franklin. Wauwatosa provides a municipal contribution depending upon the date of hire, West Bend provides a varying benefit but based on what is available for

active employees and Franklin offers a benefit for some groups of employees at 75% based on the cost of the plan at the time of retirement.

Disability – About half of the entities offer disability insurance. All, including Franklin, require employees to pay 100% of the cost with the exception of New Berlin where the City pays 50% of the cost up to \$56,000 of salary.

Paid time off – Only Mequon and Oak Creek offer paid time off. Paid time off is an aggregate amount of time off rather than individual amounts set aside. For example, Mequon may give 30 days of annual paid time off for vacation, personal and sick leave as opposed to having allotments for each type of paid leave.

Holidays and Personal Days – Franklin offers 9 holidays to the average of 9.25, although Public Works employees receive 10 holidays in Franklin. The average amount of personal days is 2.35 to Franklin's 5 days. However, in Franklin employees who have worked less than 5 years only receive 4 days, which is still higher than the average of 2.35.

Sick leave – the average is just over 11 days to Franklin's 12 days. Some respondents also included the maximum accrual even though the question was not asked. Of the four who responded the maximum accumulation averaged 125. In Franklin the maximum is 180 days, although the accrual for management employees is unlimited.

Vacation leave – Franklin is below average at two milestone dates for vacation leave. At ten years, the average is 18.9 days to Franklin's 15. At 20 years the average is 25 days to Franklin's 20; however, after 22 years most employees in Franklin can buy a fifth year of vacation by trading in a pre-established amount of sick leave.

Bereavement leave – Franklin's leave of 3 days is equivalent to the comparable entities, although the definition of family member is more restrictive than several of the other entities.

Other leave – Franklin is comparable in this area with other leaves available such as Family and Medical Leave, Jury and Military Leave.

Employee Assistance – most comparable jurisdictions offer an Employee Assistant Plan (EAP).

Length of Service Awards – half of the comparable entities offer length of service awards. Three of the respondents have programs similar to Franklin with monetary awards being added at milestone dates. One entity had a more generous program and one had a less generous program than Franklin.

Other Benefits – Most of the jurisdictions offered a clothing allowance and tuition reimbursement. Many offered a wellness program. Franklin offers a clothing allowance but does not offer tuition reimbursement or a wellness program.

In summary, the benefits offered to Franklin employees are more generous than the comparable entities in several cases. There are some benefits that are on par with the comparable entities and some that are less generous. It should be noted that the analysis of the benefits offered does not rank the perceived value of each benefit by City employees. For example, Franklin does not participate in the Wisconsin Retirement System for non-sworn employees and offers a more limited definition as it relates to bereavement leave. Employees may view the participation in the retirement system as more beneficial than an expanded definition of bereavement leave, meaning for whom leave can be taken. Thus, when looking at all benefits, it is recommended that a full understanding of the benefit offered (i.e. medical insurance plan design) as well as the perceived value of the benefit by the City's employees be considered.

Appendix F contains all of the survey information collected for the benefits portion of the study.

V. PAY PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Development of the Pay Plan

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

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

Pay Plan Options for the City's Consideration

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

Defined Increment, Open-Range, and Blended Pay Plans

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

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

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

DEFINED INCREMENT MERIT PLAN

Advantages

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

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

Disadvantages

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

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

OPEN-RANGE MERIT PLAN

Advantages

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

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

Disadvantages

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

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

BLENDED MERIT PLAN

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

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

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

Pay Philosophy

An important component in the process of developing a pay plan is understanding and applying the pay philosophy that has been adopted by the local government jurisdiction. In Franklin, the Common Council adopted a pay philosophy that initially indicates the City desires to compensate employees at an above-average rate, or at the 70th percentile. While a pay philosophy was discussed by the Common Council, the final decision is yet to be made at which

time the level or type of payer will be determined. Table 4 includes the salary survey data at various percentiles for the purposes of comparison and illustration. Specifically, at the 50th, 60th, 65th and 70th percentiles. For purposes of discussion, salary ranges have been calculated at the 70th percentile based on preliminary direction from the Common Council and have been included on Table 2. Salary survey data at the 65th and 70th percentiles have also been included on Table 2 for purposes of comparison. A copy of the Common Council's initial pay philosophy is attached as Appendix G.

Pay Compression

A second item that presents itself when studying pay in a community is pay compression, especially within the ranks of public safety employees. The Consultants reviewed all of the pay plans for public safety personnel whether or not their positions were covered within the study. The recommended pay ranges for all public safety ranks within the study have been set at a level that addresses any potential compression issues. In most cases, the maximum salary of a lower rank is below the midpoint salary for the next highest rank. For example, Patrol Officer to Sergeant and Sergeant to Captain, within the Police Department.

It should be noted that there will be overlap in salary ranges. It is virtually impossible to ensure that employee in a higher rank will make more, in all cases, than an employee in a lower rank. This phenomenon is generally attributed to long-term employees serving in lower ranks. Keeping an eye on the wages of the lowest rank employees will ensure that the compression issue is addressed in the long run.

Proposed Pay Plan and Structure

The next step in this process is to combine the Job Factor Analysis (JFA) scores included in Tables 1 and 2 with the proposed salary ranges in Table 3. The JFA scores were categorized into 14 skill level/pay grades, which recognize significant and definable differences in the level of duties and responsibilities and group classifications according to these factors.

Table 3 outlines the Proposed Salary Schedule for this report. The plan's 14 pay grades (1 being lowest, 14 being highest) are grouped into four categories:

- Grades 1 – 3 – Clerical and Support
- Grades 4 – 6 – Administrative and Technical
- Grades 7 – 10 Supervisory and Advanced Technical
- Grades 11 – 14 – Executive and Management

The minimum and maximum salary for each pay grade has been provided in Table 3. There is a 7.5% gradation between each Grade within each category (deviations can vary between categories). Grades 1 – 6 have a 30% spread from minimum to maximum, Grades 7 – 10 have a 32.5% spread, and Grades 11 – 14 have a spread of 35% from minimum to maximum salary.

Implementation and Administration of the Pay Plan for Current Employees

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

1. Employees whose present pay is below the minimum pay of the range for their classification should be raised to the minimum of the range.
2. The pay of employees whose present pay is within the range for their class should be slotted into the new pay plan at the current pay (if the position is assigned to an open-range merit plan) or moved to the next highest defined increment (if the position is in the defined-increment portion of the blended plan).

Employee Advancement through the Ranges

It is recommended that the following procedure be implemented.

The starting salary of the range (Minimum) is the normal hiring/promoting rate. Exceptions to this starting point should be limited to hiring situations involving applicants with exceptional background and qualifications; a promotional increase in which the employee's current pay is higher than the

minimum of the new range; or a labor market situation where it is impossible to recruit qualified candidates at the minimum. In these cases, employees may be appointed to their positions anywhere within the defined range, depending on their experience and qualifications. Employees should not be hired below the minimum of their pay range.

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

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

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

Future Administration of the Pay Plan

In order to maintain competitive salary levels and salary ranges, there should be a periodic (annual or bi-annual) review of Franklin's salary ranges. The 14 municipal entities used in the survey group for this Study have been determined to be comparable jurisdictions to Franklin. Therefore, Franklin can continue to use these jurisdictions as a comparable salary survey group for annual salary comparison purposes, until it is determined that they are no longer valid comparables. It is GovHR USA's recommendation that an annual "survey" of these jurisdictions be conducted to determine the percentage increase each organization in the comparable group may be granting as an "across-the-board increase" to their employees.

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

Future Administration of the Classification Plan

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

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

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

APPRECIATION

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

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Position Title	Grade	JFA Total	Range	Recommended New Title
Executive and Management				
Director of Administration	14	810	790 and above	
Fire Chief		795	(35 points)	
Police Chief		795		
Assistant Fire Chief				
Assistant Fire Chief	13	770	750 to 785	
City Engineer/DPW Director		755		
Police Inspector		755		
Battalion Chief				
Battalion Chief	12	730	710 to 745	
Captain of Police		730		
Director of Finance and Treasurer		725		
Director of Clerk Services				
Director of Clerk Services	11	705	670 to 705	
Director of Health and Human Services		680		
Library Director		680		
Supervisory and Advanced Technical				
Building Inspector	10	665	615 to 665	
Sewer & Water Superintendent		665	(50 points)	
Information Services Director		645		Information Systems Manager
Assistant City Engineer		635		
Economic Development Director		630		
Planning Manager		630		
Department of Public Works Superintendent		615		
Emergency Services Communication Supervisor				
Emergency Services Communication Supervisor	9	585	560 to 610	
Police Sergeant		570		
Senior Planner		570		Principal Planner
Public Health Nurse Supervisor		565		
Project Engineer		560		
Electrical Inspector				
Electrical Inspector	8	550	505 to 555	
Plumbing Inspector		550		
First Assistant Building Inspector		545		
Adult Services Librarian/Assistant Director		540		
Human Resources Coordinator		520		
Accounting Supervisor		505		
Engineering Tech IV		505		
Deputy Treasurer				
Deputy Treasurer	7	485	450 to 500	
Assistant Superintendent of Public Works		480		
Assistant Building Inspector		470		
Building Maintenance Superintendent		460		
Sanitarian		460		
Engineering Tech III		455		
Library Circulation Supervisor		455		
Mechanic I		455		

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 1

Position Title	Grade	JFA Total	Range	Recommended New Title
Planner II		455		Associate Planner
Public Health Nurse		455		
Administrative and Technical				
Sewer & Water Operator II	6	440	415 to 445	
Court Administrative Assistant		435	(30 points)	
Reference Librarian		420		
Youth Reference/Young Adult Librarian		420		
Engineering Tech II		415		
 				
Dispatcher	5	410	380 to 410	
Heavy Equipment Operator		410		
Sewer & Water Operator I		395		
Inspection Permit Clerk		395		
Assistant Mechanic		390		
Accountant		385		
Deputy City Clerk		385		
 				
Light Equipment Operator	4	375	345 to 375	
Confidential Police Administrative Assistant		370		
Secretary (Fire)		370		Conf. Fire Administrative Asst.
Deputy Court Administrative Assistant		370		
Sewer & Water Technician		370		
Administrative/Project Assistant		365		
Program and Outreach Coordinator		365		
Planner		355		Assistant Planner
Clerical and Support Staff				
Secretary (DPW)	3	335	310 to 340	Administrative Assistant
Secretary (Engineering)		335		Administrative Assistant
Municipal Court Clerk		325		
Account Clerk		315		Payroll Clerk
Administrative Clerk		315		
Assessor Clerk		315		
Maintenance Custodian		315		
 				
Secretary (Building)	2	305	275 to 305	
Library Assistant		300		
Secretary (Planning)		300		
Finance Clerk		290		
Secretary (Clerk)		290		
Lead Cashier		285		
Clerk Typist		275		
 				
Cashier/Clerk	1	270	240 to 270	
Library Administrative Aide		270		
Custodian		235		
Police Utility Clerk		235		

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 1

Position Title	Grade	JFA Total	Range	Recommended New Title
Library Shelver		185	To 235	
Clinic Staff Nurse				Not classified
Clerical Aide				Not classified
Eng Tech I				Not classified
Public Works Foreman				Not classified

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 2

Position Title	JFA Score	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile		Salary Ranges 70th Percentile		Franklin Actual Salary
			Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	
Executive and Management									
Director of Administration	810	14	\$ 87,718	\$ 121,295	\$89,539	\$122,333	\$ 91,309	\$ 123,267	\$ 116,736
Fire Chief	795		\$ 95,139	\$ 120,878	\$96,241	\$122,034			\$ 100,744
Police Chief	795		\$ 95,800	\$ 121,572	\$96,450	\$122,984			\$ 115,660
Assistant Fire Chief	770	13	\$ 85,085	\$ 108,839	\$85,238	\$109,033	\$ 84,938	\$ 114,667	\$ 95,947
City Engineer/DPW Director	755								\$ 107,060
Police Inspector	755								\$ 101,017
Battalion Chief	730	12	\$ 82,222	\$ 94,234	\$83,123	\$95,071	\$ 79,013	\$ 106,667	\$ 84,215
Captain of Police	730		\$ 81,054	\$ 100,758	\$82,687	\$101,440			\$ 92,979
Director of Finance and Treasurer	725		\$ 84,595	\$ 105,507	\$86,528	\$107,565			\$ 96,148
Director of Clerk Services	705	11					\$ 73,500	\$ 99,225	\$ 85,416
Director of Health and Human Services	680								\$ 80,635
Library Director	680		\$ 75,197	\$ 98,054	\$75,256	\$100,673			\$ 68,857
Supervisory and Advanced Technical									
Building Inspector	665	10	\$ 68,201	\$ 91,751	\$68,579	\$92,296	\$ 68,326	\$ 90,532	\$ 76,823
Sewer & Water Superintendent	665								\$ 67,639
Information Services Director	645		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			\$ -
Assistant City Engineer	650								\$ 88,181
Economic Development Director	630								\$ -
Planning Manager	630								\$ 77,576
Department of Public Works Superintendent	615		\$ 73,083	\$ 90,008	\$77,072	\$91,216			\$ 68,925
Emergency Services Communications Supervisor	585	9					\$ 63,559	\$ 84,216	\$ 62,249
Police Sergeant	570		\$ 75,926	\$ 83,049	\$76,375	\$84,017			\$ 77,795
Senior Planner	570		\$ 59,828	\$ 80,126	\$60,430	\$80,678			\$ 60,957
Public Health Nurse Supervisor	565								\$ -
Project Engineer	560								\$ -

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 2

Position Title	JFA Score	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile		Salary Ranges 70th Percentile		Franklin Actual Salary
			Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	
Electrical Inspector	550	8					\$ 59,125	\$ 78,341	\$ 66,742
Plumbing Inspector	550		\$ 61,279	\$ 74,885	\$62,284	\$75,071			\$ 66,742
First Assistant Building Inspector	545								\$ 65,474
Adult Services Librarian/Assistant Director	540		\$ 59,289	\$ 77,826	\$59,825	\$80,305			\$ 58,697
Human Resources Coordinator	520								\$ 62,488
Accounting Supervisor	505		\$ 60,307	\$ 76,737	\$60,944	\$78,627			\$ 57,228
Engineering Tech IV	505		\$ 52,505	\$ 73,634	\$53,885	\$73,896			\$ 64,053
Deputy Treasurer									
Deputy Treasurer	485	7					\$ 55,000	\$ 72,875	\$ 56,769
Assistant Superintendent of Public Works	480								\$ 57,991
Assistant Building Inspector	470		\$ 56,085	\$ 69,632	\$58,930	\$71,580			\$ 61,998
Building Maintenance Superintendent	460								\$ 56,254
Sanitarian	460								\$ 63,981
Engineering Tech III	455		\$ 55,752	\$ 72,223	\$56,312	\$72,296			\$ -
Library Circulation Supervisor	455								\$ 44,558
Mechanic I	455								\$ 59,265
Planner II	455		\$ 56,909	\$ 73,206	\$57,610	\$73,363			\$ 51,869
Public Health Nurse	455		\$ 59,677	\$ 71,423	\$59,996	\$72,345			\$ 58,547
Administrative and Technical									
Sewer & Water Operator II	440	6	\$ 46,370	\$ 60,131	\$47,819	\$60,615	\$ 50,270	\$ 65,351	\$ 60,467
Court Administrative Assistant	435		\$ 46,155	\$ 60,212	\$46,663	\$61,015			\$ 45,318
Reference Librarian	420		\$ 47,729	\$ 62,891	\$50,312	\$62,956			\$ 49,418
Youth Reference/Young Adult Librarian	420								\$ 42,380
Engineering Tech II	415		\$ 50,674	\$ 67,192	\$51,337	\$67,583			\$ 44,269
Dispatcher									
Dispatcher	410	5	\$ 41,012	\$ 53,332	\$41,712	\$53,530	\$ 46,763	\$ 60,791	\$ 46,550
Heavy Equipment Operator	410		\$ 43,705	\$ 58,205	\$46,516	\$58,350			\$ 56,773
Sewer & Water Operator I	395								\$ 56,773
Inspection Permit Clerk	395								\$ 46,319
Assistant Mechanic	390								\$ 54,609

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 2

Position Title	JFA Score	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile		Salary Ranges 70th Percentile		Franklin Actual Salary
			Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	
Accountant	385		\$ 41,809	\$ 59,905	\$41,889	\$61,441			\$ -
Deputy City Clerk	385								\$ 43,113
Light Equipment Operator	375	4	\$ 42,889	\$ 57,223	\$43,100	\$58,085	\$ 43,500	\$ 56,550	\$ 54,390
Confidential Police Administrative Assistant	370		\$ 41,049	\$ 56,107	\$46,663	\$61,015			\$ 51,118
Deputy Court Administrative Assistant	370								\$ 42,279
Secretary (Fire)	370								\$ 44,480
Sewer & Water Technician	370								\$ 54,029
Administrative/Project Assistant	365								\$ 47,689
Program and Outreach Coordinator	365								\$ 39,395
Planner	355								\$ -
Clerical and Support Staff									
Secretary (DPW)	335	3					\$ 38,713	\$ 50,327	\$ 44,480
Secretary (Engineering)	335								\$ 44,480
Municipal Court Clerk	325		\$ 38,492	\$ 48,043	\$38,663	\$48,566			\$ 42,286
Account Clerk	315		\$ 37,635	\$ 51,261	\$38,900	\$52,788			\$ 45,627
Administrative Clerk	315								\$ 45,627
Assessor Clerk	315								\$ 46,319
Maintenance Custodian	315		\$ 30,476	\$ 41,791	\$31,150	\$42,714			\$ -
Secretary (Building)	305	2					\$ 36,013	\$ 46,816	\$ 44,480
Library Assistant	300		\$ 31,655	\$ 43,407	\$33,812	\$44,216			\$ 35,880
Secretary (Planning)	300								\$ 44,480
Finance Clerk	290								\$ 32,552
Secretary (Clerk)	290								\$ 44,480
Lead Cashier	285		\$ 37,565	\$ 51,284	\$37,752	\$51,663			\$ 36,691
Clerk Typist	275		\$ 35,433	\$ 45,136	\$35,714	\$46,592			\$ 32,802
Cashier/Clerk	270	1	\$ 32,361	\$ 39,869	\$32,394	\$40,672	\$ 33,500	\$ 43,550	\$ 27,650
Library Administrative Aide	270								\$ 37,128
Custodian	235								\$ -

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 2

Position Title	JFA Score	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile		Salary Ranges 70th Percentile		Franklin Actual Salary
			Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	
Police Utility Clerk	235								\$ 33,134
Library Shelver	185								
Clinic Staff Nurse		N/I							
Clerical Aide		N/I							
Engineering Tech I		N/I							
Public Works Foreman		N/I							

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 3

50th Percentile

Clerical and Support Staff			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
1	\$31,000		\$40,300
2	\$33,325		\$43,323
3	\$35,824		\$46,572

60th Percentile

Clerical and Support Staff			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
1	\$32,000		\$41,600
2	\$34,400		\$44,720
3	\$36,980		\$48,074

Administrative and Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
4	\$40,000		\$52,000
5	\$43,000		\$55,900
6	\$46,225		\$60,093

Administrative and Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
4	\$41,500		\$53,950
5	\$44,613		\$57,996
6	\$47,958		\$62,346

Supervisory and Advanced Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
32.5% Range Spread			
7	\$50,000		\$66,250
8	\$53,750		\$71,219
9	\$57,781		\$76,560
10	\$62,115		\$82,302

Supervisory and Advanced Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
32.5% Range Spread			
7	\$53,000		\$70,225
8	\$56,975		\$75,492
9	\$61,248		\$81,154
10	\$65,842		\$87,240

Executive and Management			
7.5% between Ranges			
35% Range Spread			
11	\$67,500		\$91,125
12	\$72,563		\$97,959
13	\$78,005		\$105,306
14	\$83,855		\$113,204

Executive and Management			
7.5% between Ranges			
35% Range Spread			
11	\$70,000		\$94,500
12	\$75,250		\$101,588
13	\$80,894		\$109,207
14	\$86,961		\$117,397

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 3

65th Percentile

Clerical and Support Staff			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
1	\$32,500		\$42,250
2	\$34,938		\$45,419
3	\$37,558		\$48,825

70th Percentile

Clerical and Support Staff			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
1	\$33,500		\$43,550
2	\$36,013		\$46,816
3	\$38,713		\$50,327

Administrative and Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
4	\$42,500		\$55,250
5	\$45,688		\$59,394
6	\$49,114		\$63,848

Administrative and Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
30% Range Spread			
4	\$43,500		\$56,550
5	\$46,763		\$60,791
6	\$50,270		\$65,351

Supervisory and Advanced Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
32.5% Range Spread			
7	\$54,000		\$71,550
8	\$58,050		\$76,916
9	\$62,404		\$82,685
10	\$67,084		\$88,886

Supervisory and Advanced Technical			
7.5% between Ranges			
32.5% Range Spread			
7	\$55,000		\$72,875
8	\$59,125		\$78,341
9	\$63,559		\$84,216
10	\$68,326		\$90,532

Executive and Management			
7.5% between Ranges			
35% Range Spread			
11	\$72,000		\$97,200
12	\$77,400		\$104,490
13	\$83,205		\$112,327
14	\$89,445		\$120,751

Executive and Management			
7.5% between Ranges			
35% Range Spread			
11	\$73,500		\$99,225
12	\$79,013		\$106,667
13	\$84,938		\$114,667
14	\$91,309		\$123,267

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 3

City of Franklin Pay Plan 50th Percentile					
	Minimum Pay				Maximum Pay
	Increment 1	Increment 2	Increment 3	Open range*	
1	\$31,000	\$31,930	\$32,888		\$40,300
2	\$33,325	\$34,325	\$35,354		\$43,323
3	\$35,824	\$36,899	\$38,006		\$46,572
4	\$40,000	\$41,200	\$42,436		\$52,000
5	\$43,000	\$44,290	\$45,619		\$55,900
6	\$46,225	\$47,612	\$49,040		\$60,093
7	\$50,000	\$51,500	\$53,045		\$66,250
8	\$53,750	\$55,363	\$57,023		\$71,219
9	\$57,781	\$59,515	\$61,300		\$76,560
10	\$62,115	\$63,978	\$65,898		\$82,302
11	\$67,500				\$91,125
12	\$72,563				\$97,959
13	\$78,005				\$105,306
14	\$83,855				\$113,204

***Exempt Positions in any Grade covered by Open Range pay plan.**

City of Franklin Pay Plan 60th Percentile					
	Minimum Pay				Maximum Pay
	Increment 1	Increment 2	Increment 3	Open range*	
1	\$32,000	\$32,960	\$33,949		\$41,600
2	\$34,400	\$35,432	\$36,495		\$44,720
3	\$36,980	\$38,089	\$39,232		\$48,074
4	\$41,500	\$42,745	\$44,027		\$53,950
5	\$44,613	\$45,951	\$47,329		\$57,996
6	\$47,958	\$49,397	\$50,879		\$62,346
7	\$53,000	\$54,590	\$56,228		\$70,225
8	\$56,975	\$58,684	\$60,445		\$75,492
9	\$61,248	\$63,086	\$64,978		\$81,154
10	\$65,842	\$67,817	\$69,851		\$87,240
11	\$70,000				\$94,500
12	\$75,250				\$101,588
13	\$80,894				\$109,207
14	\$86,961				\$117,397

***Exempt Positions in any Grade covered by Open Range pay plan.**

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 3

City of Franklin Pay Plan 65th Percentile					
	Minimum Pay				Maximum Pay
	Increment 1	Increment 2	Increment 3	Open range*	
1	\$32,500	\$33,475	\$34,479		\$42,250
2	\$34,938	\$35,986	\$37,065		\$45,419
3	\$37,558	\$38,685	\$39,845		\$48,825
4	\$42,500	\$43,775	\$45,088		\$55,250
5	\$45,688	\$47,058	\$48,470		\$59,394
6	\$49,114	\$50,587	\$52,105		\$63,848
7	\$54,000	\$55,620	\$57,289		\$71,550
8	\$58,050	\$59,792	\$61,585		\$76,916
9	\$62,404	\$64,276	\$66,204		\$82,685
10	\$67,084	\$69,097	\$71,169		\$88,886
11	\$72,000				\$97,200
12	\$77,400				\$104,490
13	\$83,205				\$112,327
14	\$89,445				\$120,751

***Exempt Positions in any Grade covered by Open Range pay plan.**

City of Franklin Pay Plan 70th Percentile					
	Minimum Pay				Maximum Pay
	Increment 1	Increment 2	Increment 3	Open range*	
1	\$33,500	\$34,505	\$35,540		\$43,550
2	\$36,013	\$37,093	\$38,206		\$46,816
3	\$38,713	\$39,875	\$41,071		\$50,327
4	\$43,500	\$44,805	\$46,149		\$56,550
5	\$46,763	\$48,165	\$49,610		\$60,791
6	\$50,270	\$51,778	\$53,331		\$65,351
7	\$55,000	\$56,650	\$58,350		\$72,875
8	\$59,125	\$60,899	\$62,726		\$78,341
9	\$63,559	\$65,466	\$67,430		\$84,216
10	\$68,326	\$70,376	\$72,487		\$90,532
11	\$73,500				\$99,225
12	\$79,013				\$106,667
13	\$84,938				\$114,667
14	\$91,309				\$123,267

***Exempt Positions in any Grade covered by Open Range pay plan.**

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 4

Position Title	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 50th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 60th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile	
		Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Executive and Management									
Director of Administration	14	\$ 84,670	\$ 114,349	\$ 85,897	\$ 120,256	\$ 87,718	\$ 121,295	\$ 89,539	\$ 122,333
Fire Chief		\$ 93,309	\$ 118,664	\$ 94,037	\$ 119,722	\$ 95,139	\$ 120,878	\$ 96,241	\$ 122,034
Police Chief		\$ 93,995	\$ 116,777	\$ 94,478	\$ 120,184	\$ 95,800	\$ 121,572	\$ 96,450	\$ 122,984
Assistant Fire Chief	13	\$ 82,006	\$ 108,472	\$ 84,933	\$ 108,645	\$ 85,085	\$ 108,839	\$ 85,238	\$ 109,033
City Engineer/DPW Director									
Police Inspector									
Battalion Chief	12	\$ 76,098	\$ 93,312	\$ 81,321	\$ 93,397	\$ 82,222	\$ 94,234	\$ 83,123	\$ 95,071
Captain of Police		\$ 78,987	\$ 99,181	\$ 79,420	\$ 100,076	\$ 81,054	\$ 100,758	\$ 82,687	\$ 101,440
Director of Finance and Treasurer		\$ 81,321	\$ 100,076	\$ 82,662	\$ 103,448	\$ 84,595	\$ 105,507	\$ 86,528	\$ 107,565
Director of Clerk Services	11								
Director of Health and Human Services									
Library Director		\$ 73,882	\$ 96,678	\$ 74,910	\$ 96,731	\$ 75,197	\$ 98,054	\$ 75,256	\$ 100,673
Supervisory and Advanced Technical									
Building Inspector	10	\$ 65,265	\$ 87,418	\$ 67,332	\$ 90,589	\$ 68,201	\$ 91,751	\$ 68,579	\$ 92,296
Sewer & Water Superintendent									
Information Services Director		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant City Engineer									
Economic Development Director									
Planning Manager									
Department of Public Works Superintendent		\$ 66,687	\$ 87,471	\$ 69,094	\$ 88,799	\$ 73,083	\$ 90,008	\$ 77,072	\$ 91,216
Emergency Services Comm. Supervisor	9								
Police Sergeant		\$ 72,162	\$ 82,537	\$ 75,880	\$ 82,810	\$ 75,926	\$ 83,049	\$ 76,375	\$ 84,017
Senior Planner		\$ 58,022	\$ 78,470	\$ 59,226	\$ 79,574	\$ 59,828	\$ 80,126	\$ 60,430	\$ 80,678
Public Health Nurse Supervisor									
Project Engineer									

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 4

Position Title	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 50th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 60th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile	
		Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Electrical Inspector	8								
Plumbing Inspector		\$ 56,805	\$ 73,528	\$ 59,788	\$ 74,433	\$ 61,279	\$ 74,885	\$ 62,284	\$ 75,071
First Assistant Building Inspector									
Adult Services Librarian/Assistant Director		\$ 58,510	\$ 75,873	\$ 58,919	\$ 76,443	\$ 59,289	\$ 77,826	\$ 59,825	\$ 80,305
Human Resources Coordinator									
Accounting Supervisor		\$ 57,129	\$ 75,119	\$ 59,644	\$ 76,706	\$ 60,307	\$ 76,737	\$ 60,944	\$ 78,627
Engineering Tech IV		\$ 52,305	\$ 73,239	\$ 52,438	\$ 73,502	\$ 52,505	\$ 73,634	\$ 53,885	\$ 73,896
Deputy Treasurer	7								
Assistant Superintendent of Public Works									
Assistant Building Inspector		\$ 52,000	\$ 68,640	\$ 54,130	\$ 68,654	\$ 56,085	\$ 69,632	\$ 58,930	\$ 71,580
Building Maintenance Superintendent									
Sanitarian									
Engineering Tech III		\$ 54,482	\$ 72,163	\$ 56,312	\$ 72,296	\$ 56,737	\$ 72,398	\$ 57,162	\$ 72,500
Library Circulation Supervisor									
Mechanic I									
Planner II		\$ 54,418	\$ 70,853	\$ 56,208	\$ 73,048	\$ 56,909	\$ 73,206	\$ 57,610	\$ 73,363
Public Health Nurse		\$ 58,718	\$ 68,658	\$ 59,357	\$ 70,501	\$ 59,677	\$ 71,423	\$ 59,996	\$ 72,345
Administrative and Technical									
Sewer & Water Operator II	6	\$ 45,396	\$ 58,958	\$ 47,819	\$ 60,615	\$ 49,931	\$ 60,950	\$ 52,042	\$ 61,284
Court Administrative Assistant		\$ 44,071	\$ 59,381	\$ 46,387	\$ 60,304	\$ 47,078	\$ 62,081	\$ 47,769	\$ 63,858
Reference Librarian		\$ 45,282	\$ 55,673	\$ 46,207	\$ 61,421	\$ 47,729	\$ 62,891	\$ 50,312	\$ 62,956
Youth Reference/Young Adult Librarian									
Engineering Tech II		\$ 46,363	\$ 64,449	\$ 49,546	\$ 66,487	\$ 50,674	\$ 67,192	\$ 51,337	\$ 67,583
Dispatcher	5	\$ 39,495	\$ 52,116	\$ 40,311	\$ 53,135	\$ 41,012	\$ 53,332	\$ 41,712	\$ 53,530
Heavy Equipment Operator		\$ 42,214	\$ 57,065	\$ 43,416	\$ 57,827	\$ 43,705	\$ 58,205	\$ 46,516	\$ 58,350
Sewer & Water Operator I									
Inspection Permit Clerk									
Assistant Mechanic									

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 4

Position Title	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 50th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 60th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile	
		Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Accountant		\$ 41,592	\$ 57,325	\$ 41,729	\$ 58,369	\$ 41,809	\$ 59,905	\$ 41,889	\$ 61,441
Deputy City Clerk									
Light Equipment Operator	4	\$ 40,373	\$ 54,446	\$ 42,678	\$ 56,361	\$ 42,889	\$ 57,223	\$ 43,100	\$ 58,085
Confidential Police Administrative Assistant		\$ 37,231	\$ 50,106	\$ 39,148	\$ 52,953	\$ 41,049	\$ 56,107	\$ 41,752	\$ 57,393
Deputy Court Administrative Assistant									
Secretary (Fire)									
Sewer & Water Technician									
Administrative/Project Assistant									
Program and Outreach Coordinator									
Planner									
Clerical and Support Staff									
Secretary (DPW)	3								
Secretary (Engineering)									
Municipal Court Clerk		\$ 37,212	\$ 47,213	\$ 38,331	\$ 47,891	\$ 38,492	\$ 48,043	\$ 38,663	\$ 48,566
Account Clerk		\$ 36,070	\$ 50,063	\$ 36,816	\$ 50,410	\$ 37,635	\$ 51,261	\$ 38,900	\$ 52,788
Administrative Clerk									
Assessor Clerk									
Maintenance Custodian		\$ 28,288	\$ 38,823	\$ 29,769	\$ 40,828	\$ 30,476	\$ 41,791	\$ 31,150	\$ 42,714
Secretary (Building)	2								
Library Assistant		\$ 30,138	\$ 41,328	\$ 31,150	\$ 42,714	\$ 31,655	\$ 43,407	\$ 33,812	\$ 44,216
Secretary (Planning)									
Finance Clerk									
Secretary (Clerk)									
Lead Cashier		\$ 37,003	\$ 50,149	\$ 37,377	\$ 50,906	\$ 37,565	\$ 51,284	\$ 37,752	\$ 51,663
Clerk Typist		\$ 33,938	\$ 43,638	\$ 35,152	\$ 43,680	\$ 35,433	\$ 45,136	\$ 35,714	\$ 46,592
Cashier/Clerk	1	\$ 32,261	\$ 37,461	\$ 32,327	\$ 39,067	\$ 32,361	\$ 39,869	\$ 32,394	\$ 40,672
Library Administrative Aide									

**CITY OF FRANKLIN
CLASSIFICATION PLAN**

Table 4

Position Title	Pay Range	Salary Survey Data 50th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 60th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 65th Percentile		Salary Survey Data 70th Percentile	
		Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Custodian									
Police Utility Clerk									

APPENDIX A

EMPLOYEE JOB ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE (JAQ)

City of Franklin, Wisconsin

IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

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

INSTRUCTIONS

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

Job Description: Please review your job description. Are there any major changes (additions and/or deletions) that need to be made? Yes No If yes, please explain:

If you do not have a job description, please respond to the following questions regarding the primary function and job tasks associated with your position:

Summarize the major purpose or primary function of your job in three or four sentences.

Job Tasks: Please list your job duties. Try to place your duties in their order of importance, and group "like" tasks together (e.g. "clerical duties including word processing, opening mail, filing, etc." or e.g. "front desk responsibilities including greeting visitors, answering telephones and routing calls, etc.").

Job Duty

1.

2.

3.

- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.

Feel free to add more numbers/duties if necessary.



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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

.....

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

- Position requires that my daily work load and activities are assigned to me by my supervisor.
 Position requires that I plan my own daily work load and work independently according to established procedures or standards.

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

How much planning do you do for others in the department?

Scheduling: Yes No Assigning of Duties/Jobs: Yes No

.....

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

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

.....

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

If yes:

- Position is responsible for assigning work to an employee or employees, without acting in a supervisory role.
- Position is responsible for the supervision of one full time or several part time employees.
- Position is responsible for the supervision of two to five full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- Position is responsible for the supervision of six to 15 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 16 to 29 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.
- Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of 30 to 50 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.

Position is responsible for direct and/or indirect supervision of more than 51 full time (or full time equivalent) employees.

.....

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

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

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

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

.....

9. Use of Technology: Please check the level of technology needed for you to perform your job:

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

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

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

Type your name and the date below, then save this form as a Word document with your last name and job title in the file name and email it to your supervisor with a copy to Dana Zahn at dzahn@franklinwi.gov. 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 Dana Zahn in Human Resources dzahn@franklinwi.gov. 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 Dana Zahn in Human Resources at dzahn@franklinwi.gov. If using a printed copy of this form, sign and date it before forwarding.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE OR TYPED NAME

DATE

APPENDIX B

City of Franklin, Wisconsin
Criteria used to Determine Survey Comparables

1. 2012 Population: ~ Maximum 15 points

35,520

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.33	26,707	35,520	35,520	47,242	15
1.67	21,269	26,706	47,243	59,318	10
2.00	17,760	21,268	59,319	71,040	5
All Others					0

2. Municipal Property Tax Levy (Thousands): ~ Maximum 15 points

\$20,509

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.33	\$15,420	\$20,509	\$20,509	\$27,277	15
1.67	\$12,281	\$15,419	\$27,278	\$34,250	10
2.00	\$10,255	\$12,280	\$34,251	\$41,018	5
2.33	\$8,802	\$10,254	\$41,019	\$47,786	3
All Others					0

3. Equalized Value (Millions): ~ Maximum 15 points

\$3,414

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.33	\$2,567	\$3,414	\$3,414	\$4,541	15
1.67	\$2,044	\$2,566	\$4,542	\$5,701	10
2.00	\$1,707	\$2,043	\$5,702	\$6,828	5
2.33	\$1,465	\$1,706	\$6,829	\$7,955	3
All Others					0

4. Basic Spending (per capita): ~ Maximum 15 points

\$554

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.33	\$417	\$554	\$554	\$737	15
1.67	\$332	\$416	\$738	\$925	10
2.00	\$277	\$331	\$926	\$1,108	5
2.33	\$238	\$276	\$1,109	\$1,291	3
All Others					0

5. Municipal Property Tax Rate: ~ Maximum 15 points

\$6.19

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.33	\$4.65	\$6.19	\$6.19	\$8.23	15
1.67	\$3.71	\$4.64	\$8.24	\$10.34	10
2.00	\$3.10	\$3.70	\$10.35	\$12.38	5
2.33	\$2.66	\$3.09	\$12.39	\$14.42	3
All Others					0

City of Franklin, Wisconsin
Criteria used to Determine Survey Comparables

6. Proximity in Miles to Franklin ~ Maximum 15 Points

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Points</u>
0 to 15 miles	15
16 to 40 miles	10
41 to 75 miles	5
76 to 110 miles	3
111 miles +	0

7. General Obligation Debt (per capita): ~ Maximum 5 points

\$610					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.33	\$459	\$610	\$610	\$811	5
1.67	\$365	\$458	\$812	\$1,019	4
2.00	\$305	\$364	\$1,020	\$1,220	3
2.33	\$262	\$304	\$1,221	\$1,421	2
All Others					0

8. Shared Revenues (Thousands): ~ Maximum 5 points

\$856					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.33	\$644	\$856	\$856	\$1,138	5
1.67	\$513	\$643	\$1,139	\$1,430	4
2.00	\$428	\$512	\$1,431	\$1,712	3
2.33	\$367	\$427	\$1,713	\$1,994	2
All Others					0

Geographic region: South of Green Bay to State line (West and South)

Data Source: MunicipalFacts 14 (Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance)

**2012 population (screen: 20,000 to 75,000 population)

**Municipal Property Tax Levy (2013/14)

**Equalized Value (2013) per million \$

**Basic Spending Per Capita (2012) General Government; Streets; Law Enforcement; Fire-Ambulance

**General Obligation Debt (2012) per capita

**Municipal Property Tax Rates (2013/14)

**State Shared Revenues (2012) per thousands \$

Mileage: MapQuest

City of Franklin, Wisconsin
Criteria used to Determine Survey Comparables

Municipality	Pop.	Max. Points	Prop. Tax Levy (Ths.)	Max. Points	EA Value (Millions)	Max. Points	Spending Per Capita	Max. Points	Prop. Tax Rate	Max. Points	Proximity Miles	Max. Points	Gen. Oblig. Debt	Max. Points	Shared Revs. (Ths.)	Max. Points	Total Points
Franklin	35,520	15	\$20,509	15	\$3,414	15	\$554	15	\$6.19	15	0	15	\$610	5	\$856	5	100
New Berlin	39,770	15	\$24,436	15	\$4,524	15	\$547	15	\$5.40	15	10	15	\$1,179	3	\$648	5	98
Greenfield	36,740	15	\$22,185	15	\$2,741	15	\$591	15	\$8.12	15	5	15	\$968	4	\$1,502	3	97
Oak Creek	34,530	15	\$19,202	15	\$2,922	15	\$745	10	\$6.72	15	7	15	\$675	5	\$6,195	0	90
Menomonee Falls	35,680	15	\$22,199	15	\$4,245	15	\$558	15	\$5.54	15	22	10	\$2,846	0	\$476	3	88
Mequon	23,225	10	\$19,612	15	\$3,950	15	\$549	15	\$4.98	15	26	10	\$1,275	2	\$341	2	84
Mt. Pleasant	26,220	10	\$16,917	15	\$2,315	10	\$626	15	\$7.51	15	22	10	\$1,672	0	\$322	0	75
Wauwatosa	46,320	15	\$37,950	5	\$4,933	10	\$793	10	\$8.18	15	11	15	\$1,299	2	\$1,785	2	74
Sun Prairie	29,840	15	\$19,068	15	\$2,369	10	\$473	15	\$8.42	10	75	5	\$1,652	0	\$1,343	4	74
Caledonia	24,731	10	\$13,232	10	\$1,922	5	\$495	15	\$6.93	15	11	15	\$1,444	0	\$598	4	74
Fitchburg	25,246	10	\$18,274	15	\$2,504	10	\$510	15	\$7.87	15	87	3	\$1,733	0	\$924	5	73
West Bend	31,380	15	\$19,250	15	\$2,378	10	\$575	15	\$8.61	10	41	5	\$2,254	0	\$1,847	2	72
Brookfield	37,870	15	\$35,835	5	\$5,998	5	\$731	15	\$6.04	15	16	10	\$1,287	2	\$973	5	72
Fond du Lac	43,100	15	\$21,501	15	\$2,566	10	\$615	15	\$8.48	10	69	5	\$1,789	0	\$6,136	0	70
Muskego	24,217	10	\$12,096	5	\$2,535	10	\$389	10	\$4.91	15	6	15	\$1,399	2	\$428	3	70
Sheboygan	49,110	10	\$21,877	15	\$2,448	10	\$563	15	\$9.26	10	68	5	\$927	4	\$11,770	0	69
Janesville	63,480	5	\$30,455	10	\$3,793	15	\$487	15	\$8.28	10	62	5	\$1,169	3	\$5,126	0	63
Oshkosh	66,325	5	\$32,029	10	\$3,759	15	\$522	15	\$9.28	10	91	3	\$2,078	0	\$10,808	0	58
Manitowoc	33,750	15	\$14,470	10	\$1,869	5	\$630	15	\$8.24	10	93	3	\$2,036	0	\$5,725	0	58
West Allis	60,300	5	\$39,167	5	\$3,701	15	\$738	10	\$10.84	5	9	15	\$1,300	2	\$8,856	0	57
Stevens Point	27,129	15	\$14,103	10	\$1,523	3	\$606	15	\$9.47	10	157	0	\$1,142	3	\$3,799	0	56
Neenah	25,723	10	\$15,745	15	\$1,663	3	\$613	15	\$9.27	10	102	3	\$1,824	0	\$2,119	0	56
Waukesha	71,020	5	\$53,099	0	\$5,390	10	\$587	15	\$10.19	10	15	15	\$1,638	0	\$3,547	0	55
DePere	23,944	10	\$10,844	5	\$1,758	5	\$438	15	\$6.56	15	118	0	\$1,332	2	\$1,611	3	55
South Milwaukee	21,103	5	\$10,537	5	\$1,133	0	\$597	15	\$9.76	10	9	15	\$1,188	3	\$3,169	0	53
Greendale	12,808	0	\$9,247	3	\$1,251	0	\$627	15	\$7.84	15	4	15	\$1,240	2	\$468	3	53
Beloit	36,850	15	\$14,182	10	\$1,377	0	\$686	15	\$12.18	5	67	5	\$1,505	0	\$16,833	0	50
La Crosse	51,590	10	\$34,684	5	\$3,103	15	\$694	15	\$12.11	5	212	0	\$1,724	0	\$11,555	0	50
Hales Corners	7,683	0	\$5,045	0	\$635	0	\$576	15	\$7.97	15	4	15	\$981	4	\$240	0	49
Appleton	72,810	0	\$37,984	5	\$4,651	10	\$540	15	\$8.48	10	111	0	\$457	5	\$10,929	0	45
Cudahy	18,247	5	\$8,060	0	\$1,177	0	\$609	15	\$8.30	10	11	15	\$2,307	0	\$3,664	0	45
Watertown	23,891	10	\$10,834	5	\$1,257	0	\$416	10	\$9.47	10	50	5	\$1,737	0	\$2,980	0	40
St. Francis	9,452	0	\$5,725	0	\$572	0	\$751	10	\$10.01	10	10	15	\$0	0	\$2,140	0	35
West Milwaukee	4,200	0	\$3,682	0	\$358	0	\$1,209	3	\$12.96	3	9	15	\$2,420	0	\$965	5	26

Communities noted in YELLOW were supplied by Franklin as comparable communities used prior to this study.

**City of Franklin, Wisconsin
Criteria used to Determine Survey Comparables**

Municipality	Pop.	Max. Points	Prop. Tax Levy (Ths.)	Max. Points	EA Value (Millions)	Max. Points	Spending Per Capita	Max. Points	Prop. Tax Rate	Max. Points	Proximity Miles	Max. Points	Gen. Oblig. Debt	Max. Points	Shared Revs. (Ths.)	Max. Points	Total Points
Franklin	35,520	15	\$20,509	15	\$3,414	15	\$554	15	\$6.19	15	0	15	\$610	5	\$856	5	100
New Berlin	39,770	15	\$24,436	15	\$4,524	15	\$547	15	\$5.40	15	10	15	\$1,179	3	\$648	5	98
Greenfield	36,740	15	\$22,185	15	\$2,741	15	\$591	15	\$8.12	15	5	15	\$968	4	\$1,502	3	97
Oak Creek	34,530	15	\$19,202	15	\$2,922	15	\$745	10	\$6.72	15	7	15	\$675	5	\$6,195	0	90
Menomonee Falls	35,680	15	\$22,199	15	\$4,245	15	\$558	15	\$5.54	15	22	10	\$2,846	0	\$476	3	88
Mequon	23,225	10	\$19,612	15	\$3,950	15	\$549	15	\$4.98	15	26	10	\$1,275	2	\$341	2	84
Mt. Pleasant	26,220	10	\$16,917	15	\$2,315	10	\$626	15	\$7.51	15	22	10	\$1,672	0	\$322	0	75
Wauwatosa	46,320	15	\$37,950	5	\$4,933	10	\$793	10	\$8.18	15	11	15	\$1,299	2	\$1,785	2	74
Sun Prairie	29,840	15	\$19,068	15	\$2,369	10	\$473	15	\$8.42	10	75	5	\$1,652	0	\$1,343	4	74
Caledonia	24,731	10	\$13,232	10	\$1,922	5	\$495	15	\$6.93	15	11	15	\$1,444	0	\$598	4	74
Fitchburg	25,248	10	\$18,274	15	\$2,504	10	\$510	15	\$7.87	15	87	3	\$1,733	0	\$924	5	73
West Bend	31,380	15	\$19,250	15	\$2,378	10	\$575	15	\$8.61	10	41	5	\$2,254	0	\$1,847	2	72
Brookfield	37,870	15	\$35,835	5	\$5,998	5	\$731	15	\$6.04	15	16	10	\$1,287	2	\$973	5	72
Fond du Lac	43,100	15	\$21,501	15	\$2,566	10	\$615	15	\$8.48	10	69	5	\$1,789	0	\$6,136	0	70
Muskego	24,217	10	\$12,096	5	\$2,535	10	\$389	10	\$4.91	15	6	15	\$1,399	2	\$428	3	70

Communities noted in YELLOW were supplied by Franklin as comparable communities used prior to this study.