

HRS

HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES, INC.

Management Consultants to Local Government

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

Town of Ayer, Massachusetts

CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY FOR NON-UNION POSITIONS

FINAL REPORT

March 2014

HRS CONSULTANT TEAM

Aleksandra E. Stapczynski

Project Manager and Principal Consultant

Carol M. Granfield

Senior Management Consultant

(Municipal Resources, Inc.)

Anthony Torrisi

Management Consultant

The project team conducted the following analytical activities:

- The consultants met with employee members and town officials at the onset of the study to determine the parameters of the project and expected outcomes of the study. Orientation sessions were provided. The Town provided HRS with necessary documents for Ayer; policies, previous studies, performance systems, job descriptions, current compensation plan and other related pertinent information.
- The project team immediately began an intensive process of interviewing a majority of employees in each position category. The consultants also interviewed supervisory and executive level officials as needed.
- The project team supplemented this input through the use of employee position analysis questionnaires. Virtually every employee took advantage of this opportunity to provide necessary input to the consultants regarding their positions, essential functions, and necessary qualifications.
- The project team collected compensation and other information from each of the comparable communities; these were used as the basis for this analysis and are provided as attachments to this report.
- The project team also reviewed initial findings and issues with the management of the Town as well as the Board of Selectmen and Personnel Board. Final draft report documents were submitted for review.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION.....4

II. PROJECT REPORT.....8

III. CLASSIFYING AND COMPENSATING POSITIONS.....10

IV. IMPLEMENTATION AND OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.....18

V. CONCLUSION.....21

Additional Documents Submitted:

Job Descriptions

Rating Manual and Ratings Conversion Scale

Position Analysis Questionnaire

HRS Performance System

ATTACHMENTS

PROPOSED TOWN COMPENSATION PLAN
PROPOSED TOWN CLASSIFICATION PLAN
COMPENSATION COMPARISONS CHART
COMPENSATION MARKET DATA

DISCLAIMER

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

TOWN OF AYER, MASSACHUSETTS CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY NON-UNION POSITIONS

I. Introduction

A. Scope of Services

The Town of Ayer, Massachusetts retained Human Resources Services, Inc. to conduct a comprehensive update of its classification and compensation plan for its non-union positions. This study was commissioned to re-examine the responsibilities, work performed, and market pay rates for each position included in the study. In general, the study involved updating job descriptions, classifying those positions according to a uniform classification system, surveying the market of comparable municipalities to determine rates of compensation offered, and developing and recommending an update to its classification and compensation plan.

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

The plan furnished in this report has been developed through an objective evaluation of position content and a systematic comparison of job value within the organization. Job descriptions have been revised in a standardized format to reflect more accurately actual job content and to enhance their usefulness as tools in

decisions involving pay, recruitment, promotion, and evaluations. The final job descriptions have been submitted to the Town in an electronic format for ease in future maintenance.

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

B. Study Process

This project included the following steps:

- *Organizational Meetings* with town officials to discuss the goals and objectives of the study.
- *Orientation Meetings* with town officials and the employees covered in the study to explain project activities, objectives, methodology. This meeting also gave employees an opportunity to meet HRS consultants and ask questions.
- A thorough *Job Analysis Process* which involved reviewing position duties and responsibilities (essential functions) utilizing position analysis questionnaires and on-site interviews.
- Preparation of updated *Job Descriptions* with review and comment from town officials.

- A thorough *Job Evaluation Process*. Position rating and ranking utilizing HRS' rating manual.
- Development of a *Classification Plan*. Position assignment to grades based on a system of objective evaluation.
- Thorough *Market Analysis* using comparable municipalities jointly selected by town officials and HRS.
- Establishment of *Compensation Schedule* using comparative wage data as a guide.
- Several *meetings* with the *Town Officials, Town Administrator, Personnel Board Chair, and other key Department Heads* to discuss pay policies and review draft work products (i.e. classification plan, salary schedule, comparative data, cost implementations and other related materials).
- Preparation of minimum estimated *Implementation Costs*.
- Provision of guidelines for updating and maintaining the plan.
- Final preparation of *Report* to the Town with explanation of recommendations and methodology.
- Final *Presentations* to Town Officials to explain findings, recommendations, and methodology.

The following has been prepared for the Town of Ayer:

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

II. Project Report

A. Details of the Methodology

In Ayer, the evaluation of job descriptions, position classification, and compensation levels was undertaken for non-union employees in town service. The employees were asked to complete position analysis questionnaires (PAQ) describing their duties, working conditions, physical requirements, supervision, required education, training, and experience, and tools, equipment, technology requirements of the job. Following an analysis of these completed PAQs, on-site interviews were held with the employees. Position descriptions were drafted throughout the duration of the study and forwarded to the Town for employee and supervisor review and comment. Final position descriptions incorporated pertinent information from questionnaires, interviews, and draft commentary.

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

At the same time, salary/wage data from communities comparable to Ayer was gathered and analyzed for as many positions as possible. The consultants also collected data for certain union positions for additional benchmark purposes only; but union positions were not classified on the classification plan. The consultant team worked in conjunction with the Town Administrator and the Personnel Board to determine a list of comparable communities to survey.

B. Selecting the Comparable Communities

The following communities were included in the comparative data analysis. The consultant team received a good response to the survey from the following communities.

Mass. Town/City	EQV/Per Capita (2012)	Population (2010)	Income Per Capita (2009)	Operating Budget (2010)	Average Tax Bill (2012)	Form of Government
Boxborough	\$202,928	4,996	\$50,181	\$20M	\$9,080	TA/Selectmen
Douglas	\$106,174	8,471	\$29,283	\$24M	\$3,664	TA/Selectmen
Fitchburg	\$57,636	40,318	\$16,148	\$116M	\$2,913	Mayor/Council
Groton	\$148,814	10,646	\$57,386	\$35M	\$6,681	TA/Selectmen
Harvard	\$170,797	6,520	\$50,237	\$22M	\$8,862	TA/Selectmen
Lancaster	\$104,543	8,055	\$25,821	\$17M	\$5,231	TA/Selectmen
Leominster	\$84,820	40,759	\$23,240	\$121M	\$3,640	Mayor/Council
Littleton	\$177,133	8,924	\$38,279	\$36M	\$5,960	TA/Selectmen
Lunenburg	\$121,006	10,086	\$31,258	\$28M	\$4,174	TM/Selectmen
Maynard	\$128,640	10,106	\$30,823	\$34M	\$5,751	TM/Selectmen
Pepperell	\$105,572	11,497	\$29,714	\$23M	\$4,001	TA/Selectmen
Shirley	\$84,600	7211	\$22,193	\$17M	\$3,969	CAO/Selectmen
West Boylston	\$115,415	7,669	\$26,831	\$23M	\$4,349	TA/Selectmen
Ayer	\$138,814	7,427	\$26,298	\$30M	\$3,558	TA/Selectmen

Note: The Towns of Ashland and Millis were added at the suggestion of the Town of Ayer and are included in the market data analysis.

III. Classifying and Compensating Positions

A. The Classification Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

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

BASIC KNOWLEDGE, TRAINING AND EDUCATION

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

PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS AND EFFORT

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

PHYSICAL SKILLS AND EFFORT

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

EXPERIENCE

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

INTERACTIONS WITH OTHERS/CUSTOMER SERVICE

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

CONFIDENTIALITY

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

OCCUPATIONAL RISKS

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

COMPLEXITY

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

SUPERVISION RECEIVED

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

SUPERVISION GIVEN

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

SUPERVISION SCOPE

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

JUDGMENT AND INITIATIVE

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

ACCOUNTABILITY

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

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

B. Market Survey and Developing the Compensation Plan

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

All of the comparative data is relatively recent information (*within the last year*) and detailed on the attached pages. For each position analyzed, data points were collected from the labor market. The data points indicate the amount of salary information for each position surveyed. In some instances: (1) the Town did not have a comparable position; or (2) the consultants determined that the position was not comparable to the position in Ayer. HRS used professional discretionary judgment when comparing positions to the comparable data. If there was less than two data points of salary information for a position, HRS placed more emphasis on the position rating when placing the position on the compensation/classification plan. While this market analysis and information provides the Town with benchmark salary data to set the parameters for compensation decisions, the client must also consider the “uniqueness” of certain positions in the organization as well as the Town’s ability to pay. The following is the analysis definitions for the data collected and presented in the attached charts.

- All comparative market data collected is information within the past year. If FY-13 data was not yet settled or determined, the most current salary information available from the community was included for this analysis.
- Certain salary/wage data collected has been pro-rated to hourly for comparative purposes only. Certain salary/wage data collected has been annualized for comparative purposes only.
- For each position analyzed, data points are collected from the labor market. The **Data Points** indicates the amount of salary information for each position surveyed. In other words, the number of municipalities that reported data for a particular position.
- In each cell, the top number indicates the minimum salary the community pays and the bottom number indicates the maximum salary the community pays.
- The **Average** is the sum of survey readings divided by the number of municipalities reporting. The **Average** shows the average minimum salary among the comparables over the average maximum salary/wage among the comparables.

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

C. Description of Compensation and Classification Plan

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

The proposed compensation and classification plan is presented on the attached pages. Pay ranges were set for groups of positions which the consultants determined should be paid equally. There are 17 grades on the compensation plan. The total increase from minimum to maximum within each grade is *approximately 28% percent* to allow substantial job growth; and 2.5% between each step. Overall, there is **10%** between grades to better match the municipal labor market for each group. Overall, the plan eliminates any job compression; for example supervisors making less base pay than their employees. Comparative data was considered to set the grade parameters, while the classification process controlled the internal assignment of positions to progressive compensation levels. Currently, the Town operates within a context of a traditional step system. The Town would like to be more flexible for performance achievements. In general the pay ranges on the new proposed salary schedule were developed utilizing the market data and the 75th percentile. The step system can also be tied to a new performance system. The schedule shows hourly, weekly, and annual rates for employees; and this plan should be included and/or translated in the Town’s current payroll system.

This is a base salary plan and does not include compensation for longevity, special pay, benefits, or other compensation. It is up to the Town to determine its ability to pay with regards to implementation of this proposed compensation plan. At a minimum, those employees falling below the grade range should be brought into the entry level of the grade ranges within two years. Doing this will result in an incremental total increase in compensation to this group as a whole. This study did not take into consideration performance, longevity, or special abilities/talents of employees. Therefore, Town officials may determine that it is necessary to make further adjustments when placing employees within the proposed pay ranges.

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

IV. Implementation and Other Recommendations

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

1. Initial Placements for Current Employees

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

For initial placement of incumbents within the plan, the Town should assign employees to be placed on the step closest to but just above their current wage to eliminate any cut in pay; employees should not be cut in their actual pay. The Town should also realize that this minimum approach may not recognize certain distinguishing factors among employees.

2. Salaries Below Pay Range (Green Circle)

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

3. Salaries Above Pay Range (Red Circle)

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

4. Classification vs. Market-Based Systems

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

5. Vacancies

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

6. Update and Maintain the Classification and Compensation Plan

The Town Administrator with the assistance of the Personnel Board should maintain and update the classification and compensation plan. This would include the following tasks:

- Conduct regular position reviews to assure positions have current functional job descriptions that are based on job content.
- Conduct job analysis of new positions to assure these positions are properly assigned to a grade.
- Review positions to ensure internal equity in relationship to other Town classifications.
- Conduct periodic salary surveys to ensure market competitiveness.

V. Conclusion

Overall, we found that most positions studied were near the maximum of their pay range. The new plan developed based on the 75th percentile of market will assist in providing pay ranges competitive to the municipal labor market, and allow appropriate job growth. Please note that this is a totally new classification plan; so the grade numbers on this new plan do not correspond to the grade numbers in the old plan. While an employee may feel they have been downgraded in grade number, the actual pay range may have been adjusted upward; it is important to point out this distinction. HRS attempted to consolidate some of the classifications and grades when necessary.

Our study results indicate that for the Town of Ayer to maintain a competitive edge, at a minimum compensation levels need to be brought up to the 75% percentile. Salary adjustments need to be made to these positions as soon as possible in order to avoid turn-over or poor morale.

Market surveys should be conducted every two (2) years. Also, this proposed compensation and classification plan should be viewed as only one step in the development of a total compensation and benefits program. This methodology will be of assistance in furnishing improved tools and guidance to management personnel. Ensuring that job descriptions, salary and classification plans are regularly reviewed and have valid methodologies will ultimately improve the management of compensation for all positions.

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

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

Please review the attached key documents to this report.

Summary of Comparative Market Data

Positions	Ayer FY13	Data Points	Average	Range	Median	75th Perc.	90th Perc.	% Diff. Avg.
Town Administrator	37.36	5	53.79	41.03	50.18	55.11	65.67	-31%
	48.74	9	56.24	45.72	55.29	58.67	65.63	-13%
Board of Selectmen Secretary	20.82	13	20.32	15.62	19.14	22.67	23.78	2%
	25.44	13	25.98	21.22	26.12	28.06	30.03	-2%
Payroll and Benefits Manager	New	5	19.91	16.06	19.67	22.21	22.82	
		5	23.71	21.14	22.61	24.03	26.74	
Town Accountant/Finance Manager	34.15	12	31.85	19.07	30.43	37.36	40.77	7%
	44.56	15	39.59	26.70	36.21	46.66	50.50	13%
Police Chief	37.36	6	46.93	37.30	43.31	54.47	59.61	-20%
	48.74	13	52.83	45.23	51.08	57.00	57.67	-8%
Police Lieutenant	29.74	5	32.60	28.03	31.03	36.31	36.74	-9%
	38.81	7	37.64	32.58	37.87	39.14	40.73	3%
Secretary to Police Chief	16.59	10	18.63	14.49	18.33	19.75	20.50	-11%
	20.28	10	22.97	20.33	22.91	23.92	24.82	-12%
Fire Chief	34.15	8	35.81	27.37	33.10	38.82	44.36	-5%
	44.56	13	44.39	33.30	42.73	50.89	53.88	0%
Secretary to Fire Chief	16.59	3	18.36	14.02	18.94	20.54	21.49	-10%
	20.28	3	23.44	19.18	24.11	25.57	26.45	-13%
DPW Superintendent		8	35.91	30.37	35.60	36.04	39.19	
	43.10	11	44.77	35.74	43.95	45.98	47.17	-4%
Assistant DPW Engineer		1	25.78	25.78	25.78	25.78	25.78	
		1	40.25	40.25	40.25	40.25	40.25	
DPW Office Manager		9	18.40	14.49	18.44	19.67	20.82	
	24.71	9	23.54	20.33	23.28	24.03	26.25	5%
Town Treasurer	24.55	4	27.07	23.16	25.62	28.53	31.75	-9%
	32.03	4	34.24	28.83	32.50	35.81	40.21	-6%
Assistant Town Treasurer	18.70	12	18.39	14.49	18.60	19.27	20.63	2%
	22.84	13	24.41	19.10	23.10	24.03	26.23	-6%
Tax Collector	24.55	4	22.41	14.49	23.22	24.64	27.09	10%
	32.03	4	29.40	20.38	30.33	32.86	35.08	9%
Town Treasurer/Collector	NA	11	29.93	22.23	29.02	32.27	36.48	
		11	38.35	28.83	35.91	41.45	47.17	
Town Clerk	24.55	9	26.44	17.88	26.43	28.95	33.38	-7%
	32.03	13	31.98	20.29	29.72	36.37	40.96	0%
Parks and Recreation Director	20.82	6	26.78	19.53	27.48	31.02	32.78	-22%
	25.44	6	33.69	25.21	34.89	38.03	40.66	-24%
IT Systems Administrator	31.92	7	30.57	25.48	27.37	32.81	37.54	4%
	41.66	7	38.16	33.30	39.24	41.62	43.05	9%
Facilities Maintenance Director	26.50	2	25.87	23.32	25.87	27.15	27.91	2%
	34.58	3	30.08	25.87	29.66	32.19	33.71	15%
Community/Economic Development Director	26.50	9	27.30	15.82	26.74	29.02	35.07	-3%
	34.58	9	34.21	21.64	34.96	36.56	40.88	1%
Assessing Administrator	29.74	11	28.43	19.07	27.37	31.46	35.82	5%
	38.81	12	36.63	26.70	35.45	38.86	45.04	6%

Comparative Market Data By Each Community

Positions	Ayer FY13	Ashland	Boxborough	Douglas	Fitchburg	Groton	Harvard	Lancaster	Leominster	Littleton	Lunenburg	Maynard	Millis	Pepperell	Shirley	West Boylston	Data Points	Average	Range	Median	75th Perc.	90th Perc.	% Diff. Avg.
Town Administrator	37.36 48.74	72.71 72.71		49.91 52.18						50.18 63.86	58.67	55.29	55.11 55.11	46.56	41.03 56.03		5 9	53.79 56.24	41.03 45.72	50.18 55.29	55.11 58.67	65.67 65.63	-31% -13%
Board of Selectmen Secretary	20.82 25.44	23.90 23.90	18.54 23.14	22.12 27.02	18.20 30.13	22.67 28.06		18.90 22.25	20.74 26.77	23.32 29.66	17.25 21.22		24.59 34.32	19.13 23.28	19.14 26.12	15.62 21.87	13 13	20.32 25.98	15.62 21.22	19.14 26.12	22.67 28.06	23.78 30.03	2% -2%
Payroll and Benefits Manager	New	16.06 21.14				23.22 28.55						18.39 22.21	19.67 24.03				5 5	19.91 23.71	16.06 21.14	19.67 22.61	22.21 24.03	22.82 26.74	
Town Accountant/Finance Manager	34.15 44.56	36.21 36.21	26.74 33.37	40.86 49.91	32.08 55.55	28.78 35.61	26.43 32.30	39.85	36.48 47.17	40.00 50.89	32.53	26.24 40.12	46.15 46.15	35.80	23.16 31.63	19.07 26.70	12 15	31.85 39.59	19.07 26.70	30.43 36.21	37.36 46.66	40.77 50.50	7% 13%
Police Chief	37.36 48.74	61.52 61.52	48.53	49.60		38.42 47.54	41.82 51.08	49.75	57.58	44.80 57.00		55.30	57.69 57.69	55.00	37.30 50.95	45.23	6 13	46.93 52.83	37.30 45.23	43.31 51.08	54.47 57.00	59.61 57.67	-20% -8%
Police Lieutenant	29.74 38.81	37.03 37.03		41.80		30.60 37.87							31.03 32.58	35.92	36.31 40.02	28.03 38.26	5 7	32.60 37.64	28.03 32.58	31.03 37.87	36.31 39.14	36.74 40.73	-9% 3%
Secretary to Police Chief	16.59 20.28	22.54 22.54				19.96 24.71		18.14 21.32		20.27 25.78	17.66 21.71	18.44 23.97	18.22 22.24	19.13 23.28	17.40 23.77	14.49 20.33	10 10	18.63 22.97	14.49 20.33	18.33 22.91	19.75 23.92	20.50 24.82	-11% -12%
Fire Chief	34.15 44.56	54.55 54.55	42.73	33.19 40.55		38.42 47.54	33.00 40.31		55.90	40.00 50.89	38.87	51.19	31.94 44.60	27.37 33.30	28.03 38.26	38.35	8 13	35.81 44.39	27.37 33.30	33.10 42.73	38.82 50.89	44.36 53.88	-5% 0%
Secretary to Fire Chief	16.59 20.28	14.02 19.18		22.13 27.03						18.94 24.11							3 3	18.36 23.44	14.02 19.18	20.54 24.11	21.49 25.57	21.49 26.45	-10% -13%
DPW Superintendent	43.10	45.52 45.52	37.52	35.69 43.60	35.90 62.15	35.52 43.95		30.37 35.74	36.48 47.17	33.90 43.14		41.70		45.67	33.91 46.29		8 11	35.91 44.77	30.37 35.74	35.60 43.95	36.04 45.98	39.19 47.17	-4%
Assistant DPW Engineer					25.78 40.25												1 1	25.78 40.25	25.78 40.25	25.78 40.25	25.78 40.25	25.78 40.25	
DPW Office Manager	24.71	23.01 23.01			17.08 28.13					20.27 25.78	17.66 21.71	18.44 23.97	19.67 24.03	19.13 23.28	15.82 21.64	14.49 20.33	9 9	18.40 23.54	14.49 20.33	18.44 23.28	19.67 24.03	20.82 26.25	5%
Town Treasurer	24.55 32.03		26.74 33.37					24.49 28.83		33.90 43.14					23.16 31.63		4 4	27.07 34.24	23.16 28.83	25.62 32.50	28.53 35.81	31.75 40.21	-9% -6%
Assistant Town Treasurer	18.70 22.84	15.37 21.56		17.33 21.17	25.78 45.25		23.10	16.23 19.10	20.74 26.77	18.94 24.11	18.76 23.05	18.44 23.97	19.67 24.03	19.13 23.28	15.82 21.64	14.49 20.33	12 13	18.39 24.41	14.49 19.10	18.60 23.10	19.27 24.03	20.63 26.23	2% -6%
Tax Collector	24.55 32.03		23.27 29.03							28.73 36.56					23.16 31.63	14.49 20.38	4 4	22.41 29.40	14.49 20.38	23.22 30.33	24.64 32.86	27.09 35.08	10% 9%
Town Treasurer/Collector	NA	37.57 37.57		28.87 35.27	32.08 55.55	29.02 35.91	26.43 32.30	24.49 28.83	36.48 47.17		28.93 35.58		32.47 45.33	30.63 37.27		22.23 31.12	11 11	29.93 38.35	22.23 28.83	29.02 35.91	32.27 41.45	36.48 47.17	
Town Clerk	24.55 32.03	36.37 36.37	23.27 29.03		28.95 50.10	31.50	26.43 32.30	24.49 27.25	36.48 42.07	28.73 36.56	20.29	29.45	stipend 5,561	24.43 29.72	25.48 26.08	17.88 25.02	9 13	26.44 31.98	17.88 20.29	26.43 29.72	28.95 36.37	33.38 40.96	-7% 0%
Parks and Recreation Director	20.82 25.44	25.83 25.83			19.53 32.18				29.14 37.60	33.90 43.14	31.65		20.66 25.21				6 6	26.78 33.69	19.53 25.21	27.48 34.89	31.02 38.03	32.78 40.66	-22% -24%
IT Systems Administrator	31.92 41.66	42.99 42.99	26.74 33.37		25.78 40.25	31.71 39.24				33.90 43.14			stipend 12,000	27.37 33.30	25.48 34.81		7 7	30.57 38.16	25.48 33.30	27.37 39.24	32.81 41.62	37.54 43.05	4% 9%
Facilities Maintenance Director	26.50 34.58			28.42 34.72						23.32 29.66	25.87						2 3	25.87 30.08	23.32 29.66	25.87 29.66	27.15 32.19	27.91 33.71	2% 15%
Community/Economic Development Director	26.50 34.58	34.96 34.96	26.74 33.37	35.53 43.40	25.78 40.25	29.02 35.91			26.01 33.57	28.73 36.56				23.14 28.18	15.82 21.64		9 9	27.30 34.21	15.82 21.64	26.74 34.96	29.02 36.56	35.07 40.88	-3% 1%
Assessing Administrator	29.74 38.81	35.82 35.82	26.74 33.37	28.42 34.72	25.78 45.25	29.02 35.91			36.73 47.17	33.90 43.14		35.07	26.76 37.44	27.37 33.29	23.16 31.63	19.07 26.70	11 12	28.43 36.63	19.07 26.70	27.37 35.45	31.46 38.86	35.82 45.04	5% 6%

TOWN OF AYER PROPOSED
NON-UNION CLASSIFICATION PLAN

POSITIONS
Grade 7
NONE
Grade 8
Administrative Assistant to Fire Chief Administrative Assistant to Police Chief Payroll and Benefits Manager Assistant Town Treasurer DPW Office Manager
Grade 9
Executive Assistant to TA/BOS Secretary
Grade 10
Parks and Recreation Director
Grade 11
Town Engineer Facilities Maintenance Director Town Clerk/Collector Town Treasurer
Grade 12
Economic and Community Development Director
Grade 13
Assessing Administrator Police Lieutenant Information Technology Director
Grade 14
Superintendent of Public Works Town Accountant/Finance Manager
Grade 15
Fire Chief
Grade 16
Chief of Police
Grade 17
Town Administrator

\$18.05 Starting Hourly Wage
52.20 Work Weeks Per Year

40 Hours Per Week
2.5 Percent between Steps

%	Proposed Compensation Plan - Town of AYER, MA											
	Grade	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10	
10	7	\$18.05	\$18.50	\$18.96	\$19.43	\$19.92	\$20.42	\$20.93	\$21.45	\$21.99	\$22.54	\$23.10
		\$722.00	\$740.00	\$758.40	\$777.20	\$796.80	\$816.80	\$837.20	\$858.00	\$879.60	\$901.60	\$924.00
		\$37,688.40	\$38,628.00	\$39,588.48	\$40,569.84	\$41,592.96	\$42,636.96	\$43,701.84	\$44,787.60	\$45,915.12	\$47,063.52	\$48,232.80
10	8	\$19.86	\$20.36	\$20.87	\$21.39	\$21.92	\$22.47	\$23.03	\$23.61	\$24.20	\$24.81	\$25.43
		\$794.40	\$814.40	\$834.80	\$855.60	\$876.80	\$898.80	\$921.20	\$944.40	\$968.00	\$992.40	\$1,017.20
		\$41,467.68	\$42,511.68	\$43,576.56	\$44,662.32	\$45,768.96	\$46,917.36	\$48,086.64	\$49,297.68	\$50,529.60	\$51,803.28	\$53,097.84
10	9	\$21.85	\$22.40	\$22.96	\$23.53	\$24.12	\$24.72	\$25.34	\$25.97	\$26.62	\$27.29	\$27.97
		\$874.00	\$896.00	\$918.40	\$941.20	\$964.80	\$988.80	\$1,013.60	\$1,038.80	\$1,064.80	\$1,091.60	\$1,118.80
		\$45,622.80	\$46,771.20	\$47,940.48	\$49,130.64	\$50,362.56	\$51,615.36	\$52,909.92	\$54,225.36	\$55,582.56	\$56,981.52	\$58,401.36
10	10	\$24.04	\$24.64	\$25.26	\$25.89	\$26.54	\$27.20	\$27.88	\$28.58	\$29.29	\$30.02	\$30.77
		\$961.60	\$985.60	\$1,010.40	\$1,035.60	\$1,061.60	\$1,088.00	\$1,115.20	\$1,143.20	\$1,171.60	\$1,200.80	\$1,230.80
		\$50,195.52	\$51,448.32	\$52,742.88	\$54,058.32	\$55,415.52	\$56,793.60	\$58,213.44	\$59,675.04	\$61,157.52	\$62,681.76	\$64,247.76
10	11	\$26.44	\$27.10	\$27.78	\$28.47	\$29.18	\$29.91	\$30.66	\$31.43	\$32.22	\$33.03	\$33.86
		\$1,057.60	\$1,084.00	\$1,111.20	\$1,138.80	\$1,167.20	\$1,196.40	\$1,226.40	\$1,257.20	\$1,288.80	\$1,321.20	\$1,354.40
		\$55,206.72	\$56,584.80	\$58,004.64	\$59,445.36	\$60,927.84	\$62,452.08	\$64,018.08	\$65,625.84	\$67,275.36	\$68,966.64	\$70,699.68
10	12	\$29.08	\$29.81	\$30.56	\$31.32	\$32.10	\$32.90	\$33.72	\$34.56	\$35.42	\$36.31	\$37.22
		\$1,163.20	\$1,192.40	\$1,222.40	\$1,252.80	\$1,284.00	\$1,316.00	\$1,348.80	\$1,382.40	\$1,416.80	\$1,452.40	\$1,488.80
		\$60,719.04	\$62,243.28	\$63,809.28	\$65,396.16	\$67,024.80	\$68,695.20	\$70,407.36	\$72,161.28	\$73,956.96	\$75,815.28	\$77,715.36
10	13	\$31.99	\$32.79	\$33.61	\$34.45	\$35.31	\$36.19	\$37.09	\$38.02	\$38.97	\$39.94	\$40.94
		\$1,279.60	\$1,311.60	\$1,344.40	\$1,378.00	\$1,412.40	\$1,447.60	\$1,483.60	\$1,520.80	\$1,558.80	\$1,597.60	\$1,637.60
		\$66,795.12	\$68,465.52	\$70,177.68	\$71,931.60	\$73,727.28	\$75,564.72	\$77,443.92	\$79,385.76	\$81,369.36	\$83,394.72	\$85,482.72
10	14	\$35.19	\$36.07	\$36.97	\$37.89	\$38.84	\$39.81	\$40.81	\$41.83	\$42.88	\$43.95	\$45.05
		\$1,407.60	\$1,442.80	\$1,478.80	\$1,515.60	\$1,553.60	\$1,592.40	\$1,632.40	\$1,673.20	\$1,715.20	\$1,758.00	\$1,802.00
		\$73,476.72	\$75,314.16	\$77,193.36	\$79,114.32	\$81,097.92	\$83,123.28	\$85,211.28	\$87,341.04	\$89,533.44	\$91,767.60	\$94,064.40
10	15	\$38.71	\$39.68	\$40.67	\$41.69	\$42.73	\$43.80	\$44.90	\$46.02	\$47.17	\$48.35	\$49.56
		\$1,548.40	\$1,587.20	\$1,626.80	\$1,667.60	\$1,709.20	\$1,752.00	\$1,796.00	\$1,840.80	\$1,886.80	\$1,934.00	\$1,982.40
		\$80,826.48	\$82,851.84	\$84,918.96	\$87,048.72	\$89,220.24	\$91,454.40	\$93,751.20	\$96,089.76	\$98,490.96	\$100,954.80	\$103,481.28
10	16	\$42.58	\$43.64	\$44.73	\$45.85	\$47.00	\$48.18	\$49.38	\$50.61	\$51.88	\$53.18	\$54.51
		\$1,703.20	\$1,745.60	\$1,789.20	\$1,834.00	\$1,880.00	\$1,927.20	\$1,975.20	\$2,024.40	\$2,075.20	\$2,127.20	\$2,180.40
		\$88,907.04	\$91,120.32	\$93,396.24	\$95,734.80	\$98,136.00	\$100,599.84	\$103,105.44	\$105,673.68	\$108,325.44	\$111,039.84	\$113,816.88
10	17	\$46.84	\$48.01	\$49.21	\$50.44	\$51.70	\$52.99	\$54.31	\$55.67	\$57.06	\$58.49	\$59.95
		\$1,873.60	\$1,920.40	\$1,968.40	\$2,017.60	\$2,068.00	\$2,119.60	\$2,172.40	\$2,226.80	\$2,282.40	\$2,339.60	\$2,398.00
		\$97,801.92	\$100,244.88	\$102,750.48	\$105,318.72	\$107,949.60	\$110,643.12	\$113,399.28	\$116,238.96	\$119,141.28	\$122,127.12	\$125,175.60

Compensation Comparisons

Ayer Positions	Current	Ayer		Data Points Max	Market @ 75th percentile		Proposed Pay		Proposed Pay Grade
	Pay Grade	Min	Max		Min	Max	Min	Max	
Secretary to Fire Chief	6	16.59	20.28	3	20.54	25.57	20.35	25.41	8
Secretary to Police Chief	6	16.59	20.28	10	19.75	23.92	20.35	25.41	8
Assistant Town Treasurer	7	18.70	22.84	13	19.27	24.03	20.35	25.41	8
Payroll and Benefits Manager	New			5	22.21	24.03	20.35	25.41	8
DPW Office Manager			24.71	9	19.67	24.03	20.35	25.41	8
Board of Selectmen Secretary	8	20.82	25.44	13	22.67	28.06	22.39	27.96	9
Parks and Recreation Director	8	20.82	25.44	6	31.02	38.03	24.63	30.76	10
Town Clerk/Collector	10	24.55	32.03	12	28.95	36.37	27.09	33.85	11
Town Treasurer	10	24.55	32.03	4	28.53	35.81	27.09	33.85	11
Facilities Maintenance Director	11	26.50	34.58	3	27.15	32.19	27.09	33.85	11
Assistant DPW Engineer	contract			1	25.78	40.25	27.09	33.85	11
Economic & Comm Development Director	11	26.50	34.58	9	29.02	36.56	29.80	37.21	12
Assessing Administrator	12	29.74	38.81	12	31.46	38.86	32.78	40.93	13
Police Lieutenant	12	29.74	38.81	7	36.31	39.14	32.78	40.93	13
Information Technology Director	13	31.92	41.66	7	32.81	41.62	32.78	40.93	13
DPW Superintendent	contract		43.10	11	36.04	45.98	36.06	45.04	14
Fire Chief	14	34.15	44.56	13	38.82	50.89	38.71	49.56	15
Town Accountant/Finance Manager	14	34.15	44.56	15	37.36	46.66	36.06	45.04	14
Police Chief	15	37.36	48.74	13	54.47	57.00	43.64	54.51	16
Town Administrator	15	37.36	48.74	9	55.11	58.67	46.84	59.95	17