## TENTATIVE AGENDA

## SPECIAL PERSONNEL WORK GROUP

9:00 a.m. Call to Order

## Discussion of Minutes

Discussion of Proposed Goals and Objectives
Explanation of Materials prepared by LFB
Agenda for Next Meeting


## LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU

August 12, 1999

## MEMORANDUM

## TO: $\quad$ Special Personnel Committee of the Service Committee

FROM: Diane Bolender, Director, Legislative Service Bureau $\mathscr{A B}$
RE: Background Information and First Meeting Date

At its November 1998 meeting, the Legislative Council approved the establishment of a special personnel committee to review job classifications and salary structures for legislative employees. The committee is required to report its findings during the 1999 interim. The first meeting of the special committee has been set for Tuesday, August 31, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 1 of the State Capitol.

Attached is a short memorandum containing background information regarding the General Assembly's personnel system. If the Legislative Service Bureau can be of further assistance in gathering other information for members of the special committee, please don't hesitate to contact Rich Johnson or me.

In order that the August 31 meeting can be productive, I ask that each of you think about the personnel issues that you would like to have discussed by the committee. Please provide Rich Johnson or me with your list by August 23, and we will then forward you a complete list of the issues. These issues could be placed on the agenda for that meeting or for a subsequent meeting.

If you are unable to attend the meeting on August 31, please let me know. If you would like a substitute to attend in your place, I would appreciate knowing that as well. Thank you in advance for your cooperation in assisting with the work of this important personnel committee.


LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU
LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE DIRECTOR DEPUTY DIRECTOR JOHN C. POLLAK COMMITTEE SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR

LESLIE E. W. HICKEY IOWA CODE EDITOR

KATHLEEN K. BATES ADMINISTRATIVE CODE EDITOR JULIE E. LIVERS
STATE CAPITOL

RICHARD L. JOHNSON DES MOINES, IOWA 50319 (515) 281-3566

FAX (515) 281-8027

August 13, 1999

## MEMORANDUM

## TO: Special Personnel Committee of the Service Committee

FROM: Diane Bolender, Director, Legislative Service Bureau
RE: Background Information Regarding the Iowa General Assembly's Personnel System

Introduction. At its November 1998 meeting, the Legislative Council approved the establishment of a special personnel committee to review job classifications and salary structures for legislative employees. The Council directed that the committee's membership consist of representatives from the central nonpartisan staff agencies, representatives from the Senate and House staffs, caucus staff directors, and assistants to leaders, as well as four legislators, one from each caucus. The committee is required to report its findings during the 1999 interim.

Membership. The special Personnel Committee consists of the following members:
Central Nonpartisan Staff Agencies
Diane Bolender, Director, LSB
Dennis Prouty, Director, LFB
Sandy Scharf, Director, CSB
Bill Angrick, Citizens' Aide
Senate
Senator Mary Kramer
Senator Patricia Harper
Mike Marshall, Secretary of the Senate
Chris Hull, Director, Majority Caucus Staff
Debbie O'Leary, Director, Minority Caucus Staff
Administrative Assistant to the President of the Senate
Administrative Assistant to the Majority Leader
Jo Ann Hanover, Administrative Assistant to the Minority Leader

House of Representatives
Representative Libby Jacobs
Representative John Connors
Liz Isaacson, Chief Clerk of the House
Warren Fye, Director, Majority Caucus Staff
Paulee Lipsman, Director, Minority Caucus Staff
Susan Severino, Administrative Assistant to the Speaker of the House
Jeff Mitchell, Administrative Assistant to the Majority Leader
Mark Brandsgard, Administrative Assistant to the Minority Leader
Personnel Administration. For the purposes of making personnel policy and executing that policy the Iowa General Assembly is generally considered to consist of the following 10 personnel entities:

1. Senate central administrative staff.
2. Senate majority caucus staff.
3. Senate minority caucus staff.
4. House central administrative staff.
5. House majority caucus staff.
6. House minority cacus staff.
7. Legislative Service Bureau.
8. Legislative Fiscal Bureau
9. Legislative Computer Support Bureau.
10. Citizens' Aide/Ombudsman.

The three Senate staffs are supervised respectively by the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate majority leaders, and the Senate minority leaders. All are subject to the jurisdiction of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee chaired by the Senate Majority Leader.

The three House staffs are supervised respectively by the Chief Clerk of the House, the House majority leaders, and the House minority leaders. All are subject to the jurisdiction of the House Administration and Rules Committee chaired by one of the House majority leaders.

The four central nonpartisan staff agencies are supervised by the Service Committee of the Legislative Council.

Senate Rules and Administration Committee Membership and Charge. The Senate Rules and Administration Committee, consisting of eleven senators, including the Majority and Minority Leaders and the President and President Pro Tempore, is responsible for establishing policies for the operation of the Secretary of the Senate, leadership, and caucus staffs. The Rules and Administration Committee approves the personnel classification system for Senate employees (staff positions and salary grades). The Committee also approves or establishes protocol for the approval of the promotion of staff members, and the granting of merit step increases, educational leave, and parental and family leave for staff members, and approves certain other personnel and organizational actions of the Senate staffs.

House Administration and Rules Committee Membership and Charge. The House Administration and Rules Committee, consisting of 14 representatives, including the Speaker and Speaker Pro Tempore, Majority and Minority Leaders and Assistant Majority and Minority Leaders, is responsible for establishing policies for the operation of the Chief Clerk, leadership, and caucus
staffs. The Administration and Rules Committee approves the personnel classification system for House employees (staff positions and salary grades). The Committee also approves or establishes protocol for the approval of the promotion of staff members, and the granting of merit step increases, educational leave, and parental and family leave for staff members, and approves certain other personnel and organizational actions of the House staffs.

Service Committee Membership and Charge - Similar Policy Coverage Extended to Senate and House Employees. The Service Committee, consisting of six members, is responsible for recommending policies for the operation of the four central nonpartisan staff agencies. The Service Committee in 1989 completed its development of comprehensive personnel guidelines which were adopted by the Legislative Council. The Personnel Guidelines for the Central Legislative Staff Agencies technically govern only the employment of staff members of the central agencies. However, since the Service Committee membership has included the legislative leaders, the policies approved for the employees of the central nonpartisan staff agencies have often been extended, as appropriate, by the respective houses to cover their own employees.

The Service Committee recommends the personnel classification system for central nonpartisan staff employees (staff positions and salary grades), selection of directors of the four central agencies, the directors' salaries, the hiring of any staff member above the entry level, the promotion of any staff member, and the granting of any additional merit steps for outstanding service. An agency director must present any changes in organizational structure of the agency to the Service Committee. The Service Committee must be notified of, but does not act upon, certain other personnel and organizational actions of the directors such as the granting of merit step increases for staff members, granting of educational leave, and the granting of parental and family leave. Staff promotions for employees of the central nonpartisan staff agencies are proposed only at the June and December meetings of the Service Committee.

Comparable Worth and Staff Uniformity. Former Speaker Del Stromer was a member of the Service Committee for many years and under his leadership some uniformity in pay and personnel practices for all legislative employees, regardless of the employing agency, was implemented. In 1986, pursuant to 1985 legislation requiring that the jobs within state government be evaluated for comparable worth, the Legislative Council employed Arthur Young \& Company, to perform the analysis for the legislative branch. Arthur Young \& Company was the same consulting firm that had evaluated jobs in both the executive and judicial branches of lowa state government. The consulting firm reviewed all of the jobs in the General Assembly and evaluated them in terms of the same 13 factors on which the executive branch and judicial branch employees had been evaluated. The report of Arthur Young \& Company was then reviewed by a Comparable Worth Staff Committee which included representatives from each of the four nonpartisan agencies and from the Iowa Code Office, the Chief Clerk of the House, the Assistant Secretary of the Senate, a representative of the Senate partisan staff and a representative of the House partisan staff. The Committee developed a proposed job classification system that was submitted to the Service Committee. The proposal was recommended to the Legislative Council and to the appropriate Senate and House committees and adopted. Under the proposal adopted by the Legislative Council, positions of similar responsibilities regardless of the specific employing legislative agency were placed in similar job series. For the analyst series, the positions corresponded to the pay grades in the executive branch for the job series for public service executives. Attached is the Summary of the Report of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee from 1986.

Staff Personnel Committee. The comparable worth plan has remained in place since its adoption. In 1991 and 1992 discussions took place among the various staffs concluding that promotions were not applied within each legislative agency using uniform criteria and that the personnel classification system needed to be updated. The Service Committee authorized a staff committee, with members representing the same positions as the Comparable Worth Staff Committee and with the addition of caucus staff directors and other administrative assistants to the leaders, to meet during the early part of the 1992 interim to develop recommendations. The Staff Committee developed a proposal to define criteria for promotion, to provide credit for previous job experience and for the possession of advanced degrees, and to revise the personnel classification system. The proposal was recommended by the Service Committee and was adopted by the Legislative Council. It was then submitted to the appropriate Senate and House committees so that the personnel classification system changes were adopted for the entire legislative branch. Attached is the Implementation Plan for the Proposed Position Classification System which was implemented in 1992.

1997 Revision of Personnel Guidelines. In November 1997, the Legislative Council adopted the following significant changes to the Personnel Guidelines for Central Legislative Staff Agencies relating to employee status and salary:

1. Guidelines Subject to Change and Status of Employees. Provisions were added to the Guidelines to state that the Guidelines are informational in nature only and do not in any way alter the employment relationship or create contractual employment rights, to state that all employees of the central legislative staff agencies are employees at will, and to require that each employee receive and acknowledge receipt of a copy of the Guidelines.
2. Salary Increases. Merit increase eligibility dates are required to be set on an employee's anniversary date or on a standard date. An employee is limited to only two step increases in pay during any twelve-month period.

## LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE PAY PLANS \& BENEFITS

## Legislative Pay Matrix

- Historically the Legislative pay matrix has duplicated the Executive Branch professional staff non-covered pay plan, the 000 pay plan.
- Historically the Legislative benefits have duplicated the Executive Branch professional staff benefits, which in turn have been based upon the AFSCME settlement.
- The 000 pay plan does not have steps. The Legislative pay matrix replicated the minimums and maximums of the 000 pay plan and six steps were created within that range.
- The Legislative pay matrix for FY 2000 was adjusted upwards by the AFSCME bargained $3 \%$ cost of living adjustment and no longer uses the 000 minimum and maximums.


## 000 Pay Plan v. 014 Pay Plan FY 2000

- The 014 Executive branch pay plan is for AFSCME covered employees on a minimum/maximum plan, no steps. For FY 2000 the Executive Branch plans to make the 000 pay plan the same as the 014 pay plan.
- The maximums for the 000 pay plan are generally $1.6 \%$ lower than the 014 pay plan. The 000 pay plan minimums are lower at the bottom and top grades but higher in the middle grades. See Attachment 1 for the differences by grade.
- The Executive Branch has made the 000 pay plan minimums match the 014 pay plan minimums. The Executive Branch intends to match the 000 pay plan maximums with the 014 pay plan maximums upon completion of a new performance based appraisal system. Governor Vilsack wrote the following to all Legislators on July 27 regarding this situation:

IDOP, working with DRF and individual departments, was to provide for a performancebased system(s) of approximately equivalent earning opportunities to non-contract employees. This was intended to address some current problems with inequities between contract-covered employees and non-contract employees in similar positions, as well as concerns about employee recruitment and retention.

- The Department of Personnel (IDOP) hopes to implement the performance based system during FY 2000. At that time the 000 pay plan maximums will be adjusted to mirror the 014 pay plan.


## 000 Pay Plan FY 2001 \& FY 2002

- The Executive Branch intends to increase the maximum of the new 000 pay plan over the next two years beyond the cost of living adjustments negotiated by AFSCME.
- Mollie Anderson, IDOP Director, outlined the plan in a July 20 letter:

The Governor is very supportive of the need to address recruitment and retention problems, and relieve the other compensation issues that result from having pay ranges that are too short. He wants to accomplish this, however, in conjunction with a new performance management system that recognizes the outstanding contributions and productivity of our workforce. Work is already underway on this new system. Following the implementation of the new performance management system, it is also the Governor's intent to add 5\% to the maximum of the noncontract pay ranges on 12-22-00 and another 5\% on 7-1-01 so that employees who make positive contributions to the state's mission and add value for our customers can take advantage of that increased salary growth potential.

## Executive Branch AFSCME FY 2001 Step Increases

- The AFSCME system pay plans for FY 2000 have been restructured. They were based on the previous fiscal year 1999 six step range, divided into seven equal steps, with the addition of one more step, for a eight step range. Three percent was added to the restructured plan to create the actual FY 2000 scale for each pay grade.
- If the employee has been at step 6 of the pay grade for twelve months or more on July 1 , 1999, they; move to step 7 of FY 2000 matrix on July 1, 1999, receive the $2.6 \%$ increase July 1, 2000, and are eligible to move to step 8 on December 22, 2000.


## Benefits

- AFSCME Executive Branch bargained for deferred compensation employer match at \$1 for $\$ 2$ up to $\$ 300$ per year - effective April 1, 2001.
- AFSCME Judicial Branch bargained for deferred compensation employer match at $\$ 1$ for $\$ 2$ up to $\$ 180$ per year - effective August 1, 2000.
- IDOP has not decided if deferred compensation match will be extended to non-covered employees.

014 Pay Plan v. O. dy Plan FY 2000

| Grade | Plan | Minimum | Maximum | Plan | Minimum | Maximum | Dif Min | Dif Max | \% Min | \% Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 014 | \$610.58 | \$766.32 | 000 | \$588.34 | \$755.61 | (22.25) | (10.71) | -3.8\% | -1.4\% |
| 11 | 014 | \$641.07 | \$804.22 | 000 | \$618.00 | \$792.69 | (23.07) | (11.54) | -3.7\% | -1.5\% |
| 12 | 014 | \$666.62 | \$843.78 | 000 | \$649.31 | \$828.12 | (17.30) | (15.66) | -2.7\% | -1.9\% |
| 13 | 014 | \$701.22 | \$882.50 | 000 | \$680.62 | \$868.50 | (20.60) | (14.01) | -3.0\% | -1.6\% |
| 14 | 014 | \$730.06 | \$924.53 | 000 | \$716.88 | \$908.46 | (13.18) | (16.07) | -1.8\% | -1.8\% |
| 15 | 014 | \$760.55 | \$971.50 | 000 | \$755.61 | \$955.84 | (4.94) | (15.66) | -0.7\% | -1.6\% |
| 16 | 014 | \$793.51 | \$1,015.99 | 000 | \$792.69 | \$998.69 | (0.82) | (17.30) | -0.1\% | -1.7\% |
| 17 | 014 | \$826.47 | \$1,067.08 | 000 | \$828.12 | \$1,048.13 | 1.65 | (18.95) | 0.2\% | -1.8\% |
| 18 | 014 | \$861.90 | \$1,116.52 | 000 | \$868.50 | \$1,100.04 | 6.59 | (16.48) | 0.8\% | -1.5\% |
| 19 | 014 | \$901.46 | \$1,168.43 | 000 | \$908.87 | \$1,149.48 | 7.42 | (18.95) | 0.8\% | -1.6\% |
| 20 | 014 | \$944.30 | \$1,226.11 | 000 | \$955.84 | \$1,207.16 | 11.54 | (18.95) | 1.2\% | -1.6\% |
| 21 | 014 | \$986.33 | \$1,283.79 | 000 | \$998.69 | \$1,263.19 | 12.36 | (20.60) | 1.2\% | -1.6\% |
| 22 | 014 | \$1,029.18 | \$1,346.42 | 000 | \$1,048.13 | \$1,324.17 | 18.95 | (22.25) | 1.8\% | -1.7\% |
| 23 | 014 | \$1,076.14 | \$1,410.69 | 000 | \$1,100.04 | \$1,389.26 | 23.90 | (21.42) | 2.2\% | -1.5\% |
| 24 | 014 | \$1,134.65 | \$1,478.26 | 000 | \$1,149.48 | \$1,455.18 | 14.83 | (23.07) | 1.3\% | -1.6\% |
| 25 | 014 | \$1,171.73 | \$1,548.30 | 000 | \$1,207.16 | \$1,525.22 | 35.43 | (23.07) | 2.9\% | -1.5\% |
| 26 | 014 | \$1,214.58 | \$1,627.40 | 000 | \$1,263.19 | \$1,600.21 | 48.62 | (27.19) | 3.8\% | -1.7\% |
| 27 | 014 | \$1,269.78 | \$1,699.09 | 000 | \$1,324.17 | \$1,673.54 | 54.38 | (25.54) | 4.1\% | -1.5\% |
| 28 | 014 | \$1,329.94 | \$1,785.61 | 000 | \$1,389.26 | \$1,756.77 | 59.33 | (28.84) | 4.3\% | -1.6\% |
| 29 | 014 | \$1,392.56 | \$1,869.66 | 000 | \$1,455.18 | \$1,839.17 | 62.62 | (30.49) | 4.3\% | -1.7\% |
| 30 | 014 | \$1,432.94 | \$1,958.65 | 000 | \$1,525.22 | \$1,927.34 | 92.29 | (31.31) | 6.1\% | -1.6\% |
| 31 | 014 | \$1,506.27 | \$2,053.41 | 000 | \$1,600.21 | \$2,019.62 | 93.94 | (33.78) | 5.9\% | -1.7\% |
| 32 | 014 | \$1,580.43 | \$2,153.11 | 000 | \$1,673.54 | \$2,118.50 | 93.11 | (34:61) | 5.6\% | -1.6\% |
| 33 | 014 | \$1,661.18 | \$2,255.29 | 000 | \$1,756.77 | \$2,218.21 | 95.58 | (37.08) | 5.4\% | -1.7\% |
| 34 | 014 | \$1,744.41 | \$2,364.88 | 000 | \$1,839.17 | \$2,326.15 | 94.76 | (38.73) | 5.2\% | -1.7\% |
| 35 | 014 | \$1,830.10 | \$2,480.24 | 000 | \$1,927.34 | \$2,439.04 | 97.23 | (41.20) | 5.0\% | -1.7\% |
| 36 | 014 | \$1,922.39 | \$2,596.42 | 000 | \$2,019.62 | \$2,555.22 | 97.23 | (41.20) | 4.8\% | -1.6\% |
| 37 | 014 | \$2,153.11 | \$2,722.50 | 000 | \$2,118.50 | \$2,679.65 | (34.61) | (42.85) | -1.6\% | -1.6\% |
| 38 | 014 | \$2,255.29 | \$2,852.69 | 000 | \$2,218.21 | \$2,804.90 | (37.08) | (47.79) | -1.7\% | -1.7\% |
| 39 | 014 | \$2,364.88 | \$2,991.12 | 000 | \$2,326.15 | \$2,942.50 | (38.73) | (48.62) | -1.7\% | -1.7\% |
| 40 | 014 | \$2,480.24 | \$3,135.32 | 000 | \$2,439.04 | \$3,083.41 | (41.20) | (51.91) | -1.7\% | -1.7\% |
| 41 | 014 | \$2,596.42 | \$3,282.82 | 000 | \$2,555.22 | \$3,230.08 | (41.20) | (52.74) | -1.6\% | -1.6\% |
| 42 | 014 | \$2,722.50 | \$3,441.02 | 000 | \$2,679.65 | \$3,384.99 | (42.85) | (56.03) | -1.6\% | -1.7\% |
| 43 | 014 | \$2,852.69 | \$3,605.82 | 000 | \$2,804.90 | \$3,620.66 | (47.79) | 14.83 | -1.7\% | 0.4\% |
| 44 | 014 | \$2,991.12 | \$3,777.22 | 000 | \$2,942.50 | \$3,801.11 | (48.62) | 23.90 | -1.7\% | 0.6\% |
| 45 | 014 | \$3,135.32 | \$3,961.79 | 000 | \$3,083.41 | \$3,992.28 | (51.91) | 30.49 | -1.7\% | 0.8\% |
| 46 | 014 | \$3,321.54 | \$4,195.81 | 000 | \$3,230.08 | \$4,179.33 | (91.46) | (16.48) | -2.8\% | -0.4\% |
| 47 | 014 | \$3,515.18 | \$4,440.54 | 000 | \$3,384.99 | \$4,384.50 | (130.19) | (56.03) | -3.8\% | -1.3\% |
| 48 | 014 | \$3,683.28 | \$4,654.78 | 000 | \$3,620.66 | \$4,578.14 | (62.62) | (76.63) | -1.7\% | -1.7\% |
| 49 | 014 | \$3,857.14 | \$4,877.26 | 000 | \$3,801.11 | \$4,806.39 | (56.03) | (70.86) | -1.5\% | -1.5\% |
| 50 | 014 | \$4,047.49 | \$5,110.45 | 000 | \$3,992.28 | \$5,046.18 | (55.21) | (64.27) | -1.4\% | -1.3\% |

## Legislative Personnel System Goals and Objectives

1. Recruitment of qualified candidates.
a. Offer a competitive starting salary.
b. Allow flexibility in setting the starting salary based on education or experience, or market pressures.
c. Offer a competitive benefit package.
d. Offer the potential for a competitive increase in salary based on performance and seniority..
e. Offer promotional opportunities and advancement based on performance and duties to be assumed.
f. Offer adequate training.
2. Retention of competent employees.
a. Offer a competitive increase in salary based on performance and seniority, or market pressures.
b. Allow flexibility in setting the salary increases based on performance or continuing education, or market pressures.
c. Offer a competitive benefit package.
d. Offer promotional opportunities and advancement based on performance and duties to be assumed.
e. Offer adequate training and retraining.
3. Avoidance of inequities and raiding among legislative agencies.
a. Offer salaries and benefits commensurate to the offerings of all other comparable legislative agencies.
b. Avoid salary compression, especially among supervisors and their subordinates.
c. Avoid compensation and benefit differences between current and new employees.
4. Control of personnel costs.
a. Avoid offering salaries and benefits out of line with the market or with commensurate offerings by comparable legislative agencies.
b. Maintain efficient personnel deployment, supervision, and training policies.
c. Control administrative costs associated with pay matrices and employee benefits.
5. Job satisfaction.
a. Offer a safe and efficient work environment.
b. Offer challenging and productive work in which the employees can take satisfaction.
6. Decision-making Process.

Establish a decision-making process for periodic review of compensation and benefit issues, especially to determine whether legislative branch policies and procedures should reflect or diverge from executive and judicial branch compensation and benefit policies and procedures.

## Summary of Full Time Legislative Employees (4th pay period FY 2000)

| Agency | \# Emp. | Yrs | Age | Salary | Max. | \% Max. | Term. | \% Term. | Avg. Grade |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Senate - Central | 9 | 9 | 45 | 49,111 | 2 | $22.2 \%$ | 5 | $55.6 \%$ | 29 |
| Senate - Republican | 13 | 4 | 35 | 52,040 | 2 | $15.4 \%$ | 11 | $84.6 \%$ | 32 |
| Senate - Democrat | 10 | 6 | 40 | 49,383 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 11 | $110.0 \%$ | 32 |
| House - Central | 12 | 14 | 50 | 39,763 | 6 | $50.0 \%$ | 6 | $50.0 \%$ | 24 |
| House - Republican | 16 | 6 | 35 | 48,474 | 4 | $25.0 \%$ | 3 | $18.8 \%$ | 31 |
| House - Democrat | 9 | 12 | 41 | 49,157 | 4 | $44.4 \%$ | 3 | $33.3 \%$ | 30 |
| LSB | 58 | 11 | 45 | 44,472 | 18 | $31.0 \%$ | 22 | $3.9 \%$ | 28 |
| LFB | 27 | 10 | 41 | 56,206 | 10 | $37.0 \%$ | 13 | $48.1 \%$ | 33 |
| CSB | 14 | 6 | 40 | 49,996 | 2 | $14.3 \%$ | 5 | $35.7 \%$ | 31 |
| CAO | 13 | 9 | 43 | 47,309 | 2 | $15.4 \%$ | 11 | $84.6 \%$ | 29 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Total | 183 | 9 | 42 | 48,987 | 50 | $27.3 \%$ | 90 | $49.2 \%$ | 30 |



Senate-Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Senate - Republican Total Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Senate - Democrat Total Senate - Central Senate - Central Senate - Central Senate - Central Senate - Central

Class
SENIOR RESEARCH ANALYST SECRETARY TO CAUCUS RESEARCH ANALYST II RESEARCH ANALYST II RESEARCH ANALYST II RESEARCH ANALYST II RESEARCH ANALYST CONFIDENTIAL SECRETARY TO LEADE CAUCUS STAFF DIRECTOR ADMIN ASSIST TO LEADER III ADMIN ASSIST TO LEADER III

SENIOR RESEARCH ANALYST SENIOR RESEARCH ANALYST SENIOR RESEARCH ANALYST SENIOR CAUCUS SECRETARY SENIOR ADMIN ASSIST. TO LEADER SECRETARY TO CAUCUS RESEARCH ASSISTANT RESEARCH ASSISTANT RESEARCH ANALYST II RESEARCH ANALYST II ADMIN ASSIST TO LEADER

SENIOR JOURNAL EDITOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE INDEXER 2 FINANCE OFFICERI

## Senate - Central Total

LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU TEXT PROCESSOR 2 LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU TEXT PROCESSOR 1 LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU TEXT PROCESSOR 1 LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU TEXT PROCESSOR 1 LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU SENIOR TEXT PROCESSOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU SENIOR DOCUMENT PROCESSOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU LIO OFFICER LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU LIO OFFICER LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU LEGAL COUNSEL 2 LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU LEGAL COUNSEL 2

| Name | FTE | FY | Period | \# | Emp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUZANNE M JOHNSON | 1.00 | 1998 | 26 | 01 | 22-Aug-86 |
| JON MILLER GASKELL, II | 1.00 | 1997 | 22 | 01 | 26-Jan-96 |
| MICHAEL V SAVALA | 1.00 | 1999 | 25 | 01 | 31-Aug-95 |
| MARK J BRAUN | 1.00 | 1999 | 08 | 01 | 07-Apr-95 |
| KRISTIN D RIPPERGER | 1.00 | 1999 | 07 | 01 | 17-Oct-94 |
| CURTIS W STAMP | 1.00 | 1996 | 04 | 01 | 07-Aug-89 |
| JOHN H. POEPSEL | 1.00 | 1997 | 17 | 01 | 05-Aug-96 |
| VICTORIA L DAVIS | 1.00 | 1997 | 13 | 01 | 08-Jan-88 |
| TERRY A. NELSON | 1.00 | 1998 | 09 | 01 | 13-Jan-97 |
| STEPHANIE R LAUDNER | 1.00 | 1998 | 05 | 01 | 14-Sep-90 |
| KAREN L SLIFKA | 1.00 | 1998 | 13 | 01 | 13-Jan-97 |
|  | 11.00 |  |  |  |  |
| WILLIAM B HAIGH | 1.00 | 1998 | 03 | 01 | 02-Dec-85 |
| RANDALL L BAUER | 1.00 | 1999 | 14 | 01 | 31-Mar-87 |
| JOHN C CACCIATORE | 1.00 | 1999 | 03 | 01 | 10-Jan-91 |
| MARY L BUSTAD | 1.00 | 1996 | 15 | 01 | 03-Jan-83 |
| GREGORY S NICHOLS | 1.00 | 1999 | 14 | 01 | 22-Dec-80 |
| JEAN M COOPER | 1.00 | 1999 | 10 | 01 | 16-Jul-98 |
| ROBYN A MILLS | 1.00 | 1998 | 23 | 01 | 13-Nov-96 |
| L DAY BARNES | 1.00 | 1997 | 14 | 01 | 08-Oct-93 |
| RONALD M. PARKER | 1.00 | 1999 | 11 | 01 | 14-Nov-95 |
| LINDA R SANTI | 1.00 | 1999 | 13 | 01 | 09-Dec-91 |
| MARY ANN PEER | 1.00 | 1997 | 14 | 01 | 14-Jan-91 |
|  | 11.00 |  |  |  |  |
| CAROLE J KELLY | 1.00 | 1998 | 14 | 01 | 29-Oct-67 |
| MARY'PATRICIA GUNDERSON | 1.00 | 1999 | 14 | 01 | 02-Jan-97 |
| JOHN F DWYER | 1.00 | 1997 | 14 | 01 | 13-Oct-86 |
| CARYLL WLEBUR | 1.00 | 1999 | 14 | 01 | 01-Jan-70 |
| NANCY GIBSON | 1.00 | 1996 | 15 | 01 | 02-Dec-85 |
|  | 5.00 |  |  |  |  |
| KIMBERLY A MCKNIGHT | 1.00 | 1996 | 26 | 01 | 15-Feb-93 |
| PAMELA J KAUFFMAN | 1.00 | 1996 | 15 | 01 | 23-Sep-94 |
| JEANETTE M ALT | 1.00 | 1997 | 04 | 01 | 03-Jun-96 |
| ANDREA L ZASTROW | 1.00 | 1998 | 05 | 01 | 18-Mar-96 |
| JODY B LAWNSDAIL | 1.00 | 1999 | 07 | 01 | 11-Nov-88 |
| JOYCE S LATHRUM | 1.00 | 1999 | 22 | 01 | 24-Oct-96 |
| LUCINDA J PARKER | 1.00 | 1999 | 03 | 01 | 05-Sep-89 |
| GARY L THOMPSON | 1.00 | 1998 | 10 | 01 | 08-Jan-90 |
| MICHAEL A KUEHN | 1.00 | 1998 | 10 | 01 | 22-Oct-90 |
| MARY M CARR | 0.50 | 1997 | 10 | 01 | 09-Oct-89 |
| $)$ |  |  |  |  |  |


| Dept. | Class | Name | FTE | FY | Period | \# | Emp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | LEGAL COUNSEL 2 | JULIE A SMITH | 1.00 | 1997 | 05 | 01 | 07-Dec-89 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | LEGAL COUNSEL | KREGG A HALSTEAD | 1.00 | 1997 | 07 | 01 | 25-Oct-95 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | IOWA CODE EDITOR | LOANNE M DODGE | 1.00 | 1999 | 25 | 01 | 14-Jan-80 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | INDEXER 1 | JANET E HAWKINS | 1.00 | 1998 | 03 | 01 | 04-Dec-91 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | DOCUMENT PROCESSOR SUPERVISO | SHELLI G TOBIS | 1.00 | 1999 | 06 | 01 | 12-Dec-94 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | DOCUMENT PROCESSOR 1 | JENNIFER L CLARK | 1.00 | 1996 | 10 | 01 | 09-Nov-92 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | DEPUTY IOWA CODE EDITOR | JANET L WILSON | 0.50 | 1998 | 14 | 01 | 01-Dec-83 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | CONFIDENTIAL SECRETARY | DONNA GREENWOOD | 1.00 | 1996 | 26 | 01 | 16-Dec-72 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | ASSISTANT INDEXER | FAITH B SHERMAN | 1.00 | 1998 | 07 | 01 | 20-Mar-95 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | ASSISTANT EDITOR 1 | JUDITH W KAUT | 1.00 | 1996 | 14 | 01 | 31-May-94 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | ASSISTANT EDITOR 1 | CATHY S KELLY | 1.00 | 1998 | 13 | 01 | 27-Mar-95 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | ADMINISTRATIVE CODE EDITOR | PHYLLIS V BARRY | 1.00 | 1996 | 19 | 01 | 01-Oct-64 |
| LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU | Total |  | 21.00 |  |  |  |  |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | SENIOR LEGISLATIVE ANALYST | ROBERT R SNYDER | 1.00 | 1997 | 09 | 01 | 19-Nov-84 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | SENIOR LEGISLATIVE ANALYST | JONATHAN M NEIDERBACH | 1.00 | 1997 | 05 | 01 | 21-Dec-81 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | SENIOR LEGISLATIVE ANALYST | JON A STUDER | 1.00 | 1999 | 06 | 01 | 05-Sep-89 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST II | JONATHON A MULLER | 1.00 | 1998 | 06 | 01 | 05-Oct-92 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST I | MARGARET BUCKTON | 1.00 | 1999 | 10 | 01 | 07-Nov-94 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST I | LEROY A MC GARITY | 1.00 | 1996 | 04 | 01 | 01-Aug-90 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST I | LEAH D CHURCHMAN | 1.00 | 1996 | 26 | 01 | 20-Sep-93 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST I | DARLENE H. KRUSE | 1.00 | 1999 | 05 | 01 | 09-Oct-97 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST I | ANGELA M FREY | 1.00 | 1998 | 16 | 01 | 07-Nov-94 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST | DIANE S. TEGTMEYER | 1.00 | 1997 | 15 | 01 | 21-Oct-96 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST | CAROLYN P. INDIA BLACK | 1.00 | 1999 | 05 | 01 | 28-Oct-97 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | LEGISLATIVE ANALYST | BRETT C. CROUSE | 1.00 | 1999 | 11 | 01 | 06-Nov-98 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | COMPUTER SYSTEMS ANALYST II | DAVID L HINMAN | 1.00 | 1997 | 07 | 01 | 16-Nov-92 |
| LEGISLATIVE FISCAL BUREAU | Total |  | 13.00 |  |  |  |  |
| LEG. COMPUTER SUPPORT BU | EXECUTIVE SECRETARY | SHERRY J FREDERICK | 1.00 | 1999 | 16 | 01 | 05-Feb-88 |
| LEG. COMPUTER SUPPORT BU | DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR II | KATHRYN M EVANS | 1.00 | 1999 | 06 | 01 | 24-Jun-85 |
| LEG. COMPUTER SUPPORT BU | DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR I | ROGER MURTFELD | 1.00 | 1997 | 25 | 01 | 23-Jul-90 |
| LEG. COMPUTER SUPPORT BU | DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR I | EDWN J DAMMAN | 1.00 | 1996 | 06 | 01 | 03-Apr-89 |
| LEG. COMPUTER SUPPORT BU | COMPUTER SYSTEMS ANALYST I | MICHAEL W BISHOP | 1.00 | 1998 | 21 | 01 . | 13-Jan-97 |
| LEG. COMPUTER SUPPORT BUR | REAU Total |  | 5.00 |  |  |  |  |
| House - Republican | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | SUSAN C BRUCKSHAW | 1.00 | 1999 | 23 | 01 | 07-Jan-80 |
| House - Republican | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | KIMBERLY D STATLER | 1.00 | 1998 | 04 | 01 | 07-Aug-95 |
| House - Republican | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | A JOHN DAVIS | 1.00 | 1998 | 05 | 01 | 04-Jan-93 |
| House - Republican Total |  |  | 3.00 |  |  |  |  |
| House - Democrat | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | MARY E O FLECKENSTEIN | 1.00 | 1996 | 14 | 01 | 15-Dec-80 |
| House - Democrat | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | JAMES M ADDY | 1.00 | 1998 | 03 | 01 | 11-Jul-94 |
| House - Democrat | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | INGRID L JOHNSON | 1.00 | 1997 | 05 | 01 | 11-Jan-93 |

Full Time Legislative Employees Terminated Since July 1995

| Dept. | Class | Name | FTE | FY | Period | \# | Emp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| House - Democrat Total |  |  | 3.00 |  |  |  |  |
| House - Central | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | VIVIAN M ANDERS | 1.00 | 1997 | 13 | 01 | 31-Mar-78 |
| House - Central | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | TRICIA S BERG | 1.00 | 1998 | 05 | 01 | 20-Nov-95 |
| House - Central | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | SUSAN K JENNINGS | 1.00 | 1999 | 26 | 01 | 08-Jan-96 |
| House - Central | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | KATY M ROUTH | 1.00 | 1996 | 12 | 01 | 16-Dec-94 |
| House - Central | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | JEFFREY A BEAN | 1.00 | 1997 | 26 | 01 | 16-Dec-96 |
| House - Central | LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES-FULL TIME | DAVID LSTANLEY | 1.00 | 1996 | 27 | 01 | 17-Oct-94 |
| House - Central Total |  |  | 6.00 |  |  |  |  |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | SENIOR DEPUTY-CITIZENS AIDE | DUNCAN C FOWLER | 1.00 | 1998 | 05 | 01 | 10-Jun-94 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | CITIZENS AIDE SECRETARY | MARIANNE MCVEY | 1.00 | 1998 | 22 | 01 | 02-Feb-98 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | CITIZENS AIDE SECRETARY | DIANE C SCHINKEL | 1.00 | 1996 | 27 | 01 | 19-May-95 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ASSISTANT III CITIZENS AIDE | MICHAEL J FERJAK | 1.00 | 1999 | 03 | 01 | 11-Dec-87 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ASSISTANT III CITIZENS AIDE | CONNIE L BENCKE | 1.00 | 1999 | 19 | 01 | 22-Aug-90 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ASSISTANT II CITIZENS AIDE | STEVEN L EXLEY | 1.00 | 1997 | 08 | 01 | 16-Sep-91 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ASSISTANT I CITIZENS AIDE | CRAIG A ARTERBURN | 1.00 | 1996 | 10 | 01 | 19-Aug-88 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ASSISTANT CITIZENS AIDE | MARY J FLYNN | 1.00 | 1999 | 18 | 01 | 30-Nov-98 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ASSISTANT CITIZENS AIDE | JERRY L MOORE | 1.00 | 1999 | 08 | 01 | 03-Jan-97 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ASSISTANT CITIZENS AIDE | GREGORY L ROSEBERRY | 1.00 | 1999 | 08 | 01 | 02-Feb-98 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY | PATRICIA NETT | 1.00 | 1996 | 10 | 01 | 17-Jan-72 |
| CITIZENS' AIDE, OFFICE OF | Total |  | 11.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total |  |  | 89.00 |  |  |  |  |
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## 1999 SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

- ALLIED Group, A Nationwide Insurance Company
- American Republic Insurance Co.
- AmerUs Holding Company
- BP Amoco Plc
- Brenton Bank
- Briggs Corporation
- Broadlawns Medical Center
- Central lowa Health System
- Children \& Families of lowa
- City of West Des Moines

Color Converting Industries
Colorfx DeVries Communications, Inc.

- Communications Data Services, Inc.
- Continental Western Ins. Co.
- Des Moines Area Community College
- Des Moines Water Works
- EMC Insurance Companies
- Farmland Insurance, A Nationwide Insurance Company
- FBL Financial Group, Inc.
- Federal Home Loan Bank
- General Casualty Insurance Cos.
- Grinnell Mutual Reinsurance Company
- GuideOne Insurance
- Homesteaders Life Co.
- Hy-Vee, Inc.
- IMT Insurance Company Mutual

Information Technology Group

- Interstate Assurance Company
- lowa Department of Personnel
- John Deere Credit
- John Deere Des Moines Works
- Kirke Van Orsdel, Inc.
- Mary Greeley Medical Center Maytag Corporation
- Mercy Hospital Medical Center
- Meredith Corporation
- Microware Systems Corp.
- MidAmerican Energy
- National Pork Producers Council (NPPC)
- National Travelers Life Company NCMIC Group Inc.
- Norwest Card Services
- Norwest Financial
- Norwest Mortgage, Inc.
- Perishable Distributors of lowa Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.
- Polk County Human Resources
- Sears Regional Credit Card Operations Center
- The Des Moines Register
- The Members Group
- The Principal Financial Group
- Wellmark Blue Cross Blue Shield
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## 1999 Des Moines Area Benchmark Job Compensation Survey

## PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

## Participant Size

The total number of employees reported by participants ranges from 28 to 100,000 . The total number of employees who work in the Des Moines and surrounding area ranges from 27 to 8,000.

The average number of employees in a participating organization is 7,376; while the average number in an organization's Des Moines operation is 1,223 .

The average number of full-time employees in a participating organization is 6,531 ; while the average number of full-time employees in an organization's Des Moines area operation is 1,019 .

Following is a graph illustrating the number of employees in participating organizations working in the Des Moines or surrounding area:

Participant Size in the Des Moines Area


Number of Employees

## PARTICIPANT INFORMATION (Continued)

## Participant Type

Seventy-five percent ( $75 \%$ ) or 39 of the participants have headquarters located in the Des Moines or surrounding area. Nineteen percent (19\%) or 10 participants reported a Des Moines branch operation. Three participants or $6 \%$ reported both a headquarters and branch operation in Des Moines.

## Industry Distribution

Following is a breakdown of industry classifications reported by participating organizations. Industry classifications included in "Other" were: Energy, Retail, Business Services, Communications, TPA, High Tech-Software Development, Media Newspaper and Technoloby/Computers.


Insurance
35\%

## PARTICIPANT INFORMATION (Continued)

## Annual Turnover

The average annual turnover rate reported by participants is:

|  | Average |  | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-Exempt | $18.4 \%$ |  | $18.5 \%$ |
| Exempt | $10.5 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $0.0-68 \%$ |
| Combined |  | $0.0-31 \%$ |  |
|  | $12.8 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $4.4-21 \%$ |

**Turnover reported by Companies that could not separate turnover between non-exempt and exempt employees..

## Work Environment

Casual attire is allowed by 50 or $96 \%$ of participants at some time. Two companies did not respond.
Participants reported business or casual attire as follows:

|  | Percent of Participants |
| :--- | ---: |
| Business Casual - All Normal Business Days | $38 \%$ |
| Business Casual - Monday thru Thursday; Casual - Friday | $10 \%$ |
| Business Casual - Fridays and/or Special Occasions | $15 \%$ |
| Casual - All Normal Business Days | $13 \%$ |
| Casual - Fridays and/or Special Occasions | $8 \%$ |
| Other** | $12 \%$ |
| No Response | $4 \%$ |

**Other includes Casual only on Fridays or Special Occasions, Business Casual on Fridays in Summer , Business Casual or Casual variations by department or by position.

## PAY STRUCTURES

## Formal Pay Structures

## Non-Exempt

Ninety percent ( $90 \%$ ) or 47 participants reported having formal pay structures for non-exempt employees. Of the 47 participants with formal pay structures, 35 or $74 \%$ reported structure adjustments in 1999. Average structure adjustments reported by companies with formal pay structures are:

| Non-Exempt | Average Structure | Adjustments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| $\frac{\text { (Actual) }}{3.6 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { (Actual) }}{2.6 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { (Anticipated) }}{2.6 \%}$ |

Twenty-five (25) of the participants with formal pay structures or 53\% reported making structure adjustments in January and four (4) or $9 \%$ reported structure adjustments in July. Other participants implement structure adjustments in various months throughout the year or did not report.

## Lowest Reported Non-Exempt Pay Ranges



## PAY STRUCTURES (Continued)

## Formal Pay Structures (Continued)

## Exempt

Eighty-eight percent (88\%) or 46 participants reported having formal pay structures for Exempt employees. Of the 46 companies with formal pay structures, 33 or $72 \%$ reported structure adjustments in 1999. Average structure adjustments reported by companies with formal pay structures are:

| Exempt Average Structure |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustments |  |  |
| 1998 1999 2000 <br> $\frac{\text { (Actual) }}{3.5 \%}$ $\frac{\text { (Actual) }}{2.6 \%}$ $\frac{\text { (Anticipated) }}{2.7 \%}$ |  |  |

Twenty-seven (27) of the participants with formal pay structures or $59 \%$ reported making structure adjustments in January and four (4) or $9 \%$ reported structure adjustments in July. As with Non-exempt structures, other participants implement structure adjustments in various months throughout the year or did not report.

## Lowest Reported Exempt Pay Ranges



## Hours of Work

Participants reported the following number of work hours in a standard work week:

| Number of Hours | Percent of Participants |
| :--- | :---: |
| 40 | $82.7 \%$ |
| 39 | $1.9 \%$ |
| 38.75 | $9.6 \%$ |
| 37.5 | $1.9 \%$ |
| 35 | $3.9 \%$ |

- Des Moines Area Benchmark Job Compensation Survey


## PAY PRACTICES

## Non-Exempt Pay Increase Policies

The following table provides 1999 and projected 1999 pay increases for participants who reported increases. Please note that the Average Increase to all Non-Exempts is not the sum of the Average Performance-Based Increase and the Average Across-the-Board Increase since not all organizations award both types of increases.

|  | 1999 | $\underline{2000}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average Performance-Based Increase | $4.3 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| Average Across-the-Board Increase | $2.7 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Average Increase to all Non-Exempts | $4.1 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |

## Exempt Pay Increase Policies

The following table provides 1999 and projected 1999 pay increases for participants who reported increases. Please note that the Average Increase to all Exempts is not the sum of the Average Performance-Based Increase and the Average Across-the-Board Increase since not all organizations award both types of increases.

|  | 1999 | $\underline{2000}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average Performance-Based Increase | $4.4 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| Average Across-the-Board Increase | $2.7 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| Average Increase to all Non-Exempts | $4.3 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |

## Work Shifts



Shift Differentials

No Response
6\%

Data processing is assigned to second or third shifts in $53 \%$ of the participants reporting additional shifts. Other groups assigned to additional shifts include manufacturing, medical care, public safety, retail, collections, mail, warehouse and custodians.

## PAY PRACTICES (Continued)

## Incentive/Bonus Arrangements - excludes Information Technology jobs

Non-Exempt

Skill-Based Pay or Pay for Knowledge Individual Annual Incentive
Team or Organization Annual Incentive Project Bonus
Spot Bonus
Retention Bonus
Sign-On Bonus
Referral Bonus
Moving Allowance
Bonus for Completion of Internal Training
Bonus for Completion of External Training
Stock Options

Yes
11\%
13\%
23\%
21\%
40\%
13\%
29\%
50\%
27\%
13\%
13\%
4\%

| No | Considering |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $8 \%$ |
| $79 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $67 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| $75 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $50 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| $81 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| $67 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $44 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| $73 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $81 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| $83 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $92 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Exempt
Skill-Based Pay or Pay for Knowledge

| No | Considering |
| :---: | :---: |
| $84 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $60 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $61 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $63 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $52 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| $65 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| $46 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| $40 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $86 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $83 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $77 \%$ | $6 \%$ |

## PAY PRACTICES (Continued)

## Non-Traditional Job Designs - excludes Information Technology jobs

| Non-Exempt |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No | Considering |
| Flexible Work Hours | 73\% | 25\% | 2\% |
| Earned Time Off | 15\% | 79\% | 6\% |
| Compressed Work Week | 31\% | 67\% | 2\% |
| Telecommuting | 27\% | 65\% | 8\% |
| Job Sharing | 25\% | 63\% | 12\% |
| Team Concepts rather than Department Organization | 27\% | 69\% | 4\% |
| Exempt |  |  |  |
|  | Yes | № | Considering |
| Flexible Work Hours | 73\% | 25\% | 2\% |
| Earned Time Off | 23\% | 73\% | 4\% |
| Compressed Work Week | 31\% | 65\% | 4\% |
| Telecommuting | 40\% | 52\% | 8\% |
| Job Sharing | 27\% | 63\% | 10\% |
| Team Concepts rather than Department Organization | 31\% | 67\% | 2\% |

Dis Moines Area Benchmark Job Compensation Survey

When using this Survey to evaluate your current compensation levels against prevailing competitive levels, it is critical for you to:

- Match your jobs to survey jobs based on job content, rather than title.
- Recognize that your incumbents) need not perform all of the functions described in the survey job in order to have a valid job match. However, you may decide not to match a job if one or several of the major responsibilities included in the survey description are not a part of your organization's job.
- One rule of thumb - consider your job a good match if it represents $80 \%$ of the survey description.

This Survey has not been designed to cover every possible job. The selected jobs are intended to be benchmarks, so please treat them accordingly.

The Appendix, Glossary of Terms, provides definitions for terms use on the Summary Table and Job Profiles.

## Job Index

The Job Index provides a list of survey jobs in survey code order. New and revised jobs are noted.

## Summary Table

The Summary Table is presented in survey code order and reports data for all survey participants. This Summary Table displays averages for pay ranges and actual average pay data for the survey jobs. Data is presented in hourly and annual rates. The hourly rates on the Summary Table are identical to the rates reported on the Job Profiles. The annual rates are based on a 40-hour workweek for comparison purposes.

## Job Profiles

The Job Profiles are presented in survey code order. The Profiles provide the job description and statistical data for each of the 83 survey jobs.

The mean and weighted mean are displayed where the number of cases is at least three. The $25^{\text {th }}, 50^{\text {th }}$ (median) and $75^{\text {th }}$ percentiles are displayed only if the number of cases is 4 or more; the $10^{\text {th }}$ and $90^{\text {th }}$ percentiles are displayed only if the number of cases is 10 or more.

## PLEASE NOTE: SURVEY DATA IS EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1999.

Job information input is not included for Norwest Financial. Job information for $1 T$ jobs is not included for low Department of Personnel. Data is presented in hourly rates for both nonexempt and exempt jobs for comparison purposes only. This presentation format does not reflect the FLSA status of a particular job.

|  |  |  |  | Actual Pay |  |  | Variable | Mean Pay Range |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Survey Title | Survey Code | Employees In Job | Orgs Reporting | Low | Mean | High | Pay <br> Mean | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| General Clerk 1-Entry | 1000 | 676 | 24 | \$12,231 | \$17,882 | \$28,760 | \$568 | \$15,756 | \$19,387 | \$22,932 |
| General Clerk 11-Intermediate | 1005 | 1043 | 28 | \$12,605 | \$20,559 | \$40,850 | \$829 | \$17,223 | \$21,218 | \$24,876 |
| General Clerk III-Senior | 1010 | 1044 | 16 | \$15,600 | \$23,486 | \$33,509 | \$872 | \$20,795 | \$25,168 | \$30,065 |
| Mail Clerk | 1015 | 211 | 35 | \$13,104 | \$18,087 | \$32,344 | \$1,691 | \$15,474 | \$18,945 | \$22,165 |
| Receptionist | 1020 | 105 | 20 | \$14,040 | \$20,028 | \$39,520 | \$1,010 | \$17,614 | \$21,753 | \$25,612 |
| Switchboard Operator | 1025 | 82 | 22 | \$15,974 | \$19,980 | \$26,728 | \$2,189 | \$17,051 | \$20,870 | \$24,677 |
| Clerical Supervisor | 1030 | 202 | 34 | \$14,500 | \$33,619 | \$59,238 | \$2,231 | \$29,595 | \$37,569 | \$45,894 |
| Entry Customer Service Rep | 1035 | 814 | 17 | \$12,870 | \$21,009 | \$33,300 | \$1,125 | \$18,832 | \$23,476 | \$28,169 |
| Intermediate Customer Service Rep | 1040 | 395 | 25 | \$18,700 | \$24,467 | \$39,416 | \$1,247 | \$21,342 | \$26,569 | \$31,490 |
| Senior Customer Service Rep | 1045 | 432 | 22 | \$18,741 | \$26,305 | \$39,800 | \$1,644 | \$23,589 | \$28,831 | \$33,966 |
| Collector 1 | 1100 | 243 | 7 | \$17,992 | \$20,867 | \$30,288 | \$1,075 | \$18,993 | \$23,380 | \$27,901 |
| Collector II | 1105 | 246 | 10 | \$18,720 | \$24,191 | \$30,618 | - | \$19,607 | \$24,706 | \$28,177 |
| Secretary I | 1200 | 764 | 25 | \$15,434 | \$24,030 | \$29,598 | \$922 | \$19,090 | \$23,449 | \$27,932 |
| Secretary II | 1205 | 943 | 38 | \$15,600 | \$27,930 | \$43,451 | \$2,306 | \$21,140 | \$26,216 | \$30,762 |
| Executive Secretary | 1210 | 266 | 47 | \$22,826 | \$33,812 | \$55,008 | \$2,048 | \$25,378 | \$31,590 | \$37,479 |
| Word Processor I | 1215 | 26 | 8 | \$19,159 | \$21,592 | \$24,981 | \$819 | \$18,567 | \$22,239 | \$26,582 |
| Word Processor II | 1220 | 342 | 17 | \$11,029 | \$25,114 | \$42,245 | \$1,045 | \$20,737 | \$25,607 | \$30,495 |
| Human Resource Specialist | 1300 | 48 | 29 | \$24,981 | \$35,162 | \$49,026 | \$1,983 | \$29,424 | \$36,732 | \$43,534 |
| Training Specialist | 1305 | 61 | 15 | \$20,280 | \$37,852 | \$57,600 | \$2,787 | \$37,446 | \$46,454 | \$57,588 |
| Accounting Clerk 1-Entry | 1400 | 126 | 26 | \$14,206 | \$20,976 | \$30,347 | \$889 | \$17,965 | \$22,270 | \$26,152 |
| Accounting Clerk II - Intermediate | 1405 | 246 | 36 | \$14,195 | \$22,677 | \$35,880 | \$1,211 | \$19,914 | \$24,380 | \$28,996 |
| Accounting Clerk III - Senior | 1410 | 132 | 31 | \$19,822 | \$26,798 | \$40,768 | \$1,365 | \$21,909 | \$27,152 | \$32,074 |
| Accountant | 1420 | 119 | 31 | \$23,774 | \$33,249 | \$62,130 | \$1,229 | \$28,215 | \$34,899 | \$41,966 |
| Senior Accountant | 1425 | 104 | 27 | \$27,924 | \$47,081 | \$30,002 | \$2,673 | \$36,587 | \$46,043 | \$56,466 |
| Data Entry Operator | 1500 | 55 | 14 | \$15,392 | \$19,028 | \$24,523 | \$1,199 | \$16,803 | \$20,555 | \$24,107 |
| Appl Systems Analyst/Prog-Entry | 1505 | 291 | 31 | \$27,840 | \$38,925 | \$54,288 | \$1,525 | \$30,997 | \$38,579 | \$46,173 |
| Appl Systems Analyst/Prog-Interm | 1510 | 550 | 28 | \$22,880 | \$46,604 | \$83,200 | \$2,020 | \$36,319 | \$46,184 | \$55,800 |
| Appl Systems Analyst/Prog-Senior | 1515 | 494 | 31 | \$22,880 | \$54,239 | \$74,733 | \$3,437 | \$41,675 | \$53,136 | \$64,410 |
| Appl Systems AnalystProg-Staff Spec | 1516 | 78 | 13 | \$41,000 | \$58,488 | \$79,144 | \$5,748 | \$49,695 | \$60,173 | \$71,706 |
| Appl Systems Analyst/Prog-Lead | 1517 | 255 | 19 | \$41,994 | \$65,624 | \$81,600 | \$5,297 | \$51,030 | \$62,450 | \$74,004 |
| Computer Operator - Associate | 1520 | 48 | 15 | \$19,843 | \$26,421 | \$35,693 | \$2,416 | \$22,056 | \$27,020 | \$32,166 |
| Computer Operator - Intermediate | 1525 | 84 | 24 | \$21,507 | \$28,350 | \$37,877 | \$2,001 | \$23,468 | \$29,402 | \$35,482 |
| Computer Operator - Senior | 1526 | 43 | 18 | \$24,128 | \$33,054 | \$49,670 | \$2,499 | \$26,326 | \$32,191 | \$38,417 |
| Network Support Technician-Associate | 1530 | 61 | 12 | \$28,371 | \$39,002 | \$60,000 | \$1,447 | \$34,725 | \$42,890 | \$51,177 |
| Network Support Technician-Interm | 1531 | 119 | 22 | \$21,840 | \$46,344 | \$65,998 | \$2,693 | \$33,825 | \$41,969 | \$51,335 |
| Network Support Technician-Senior | 1532 | 84 | 22 | \$30,867 | \$54,036 | \$77,572 | \$4,561 | \$42,528 | \$53,176 | \$63,508 |
| Network Support Technician-Staff Spec | 1533 | 34 | 11 | \$47,856 | \$66,116 | \$81,307 | \$7,347 | \$47,118 | \$58,600 | \$69,428 |
| PC Maintenance Tech - Associate | 1535 | 33 | 11 | \$26,832 | \$31,359 | \$44,096 | \$1,791 | \$29,153 | \$35,600 | \$42,323 |
| PC Maintenance Tech - Intermediate | 1536 | 37 | 8 | \$28,872 | \$35,969 | \$51,459 | \$1,770 | \$32,984 | \$40,403 | \$47,330 |
| PC Maintenance Tech - Senior | 1537 | 51 | 12 | \$26,998 | \$40,703 | \$54,413 | \$2,671 | \$36,986 | \$45,729 | \$53,977 |



SUMMARY TABLE - ANNUAL I RATES


# 1999 CENTRAL STATES SALARY SURVEY Central States Compensation Association (CSCA) 

The Central States Salary Survey is a joint project of the participating states. The Survey began in 1984 as an effort by ten states to reduce individual state survey activities and to collect highly accurate comparative salary information. In addition to the annual survey, states participate in an annual conference held for the purpose of reviewing and promoting the survey and sharing compensation experience and information among members. Participation in the CSCA has grown nearly every year to the current membership of 25 states. Member states are:

| Arizona | Michigan | Oklahoma |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Arkansas | Minnesota | Oregon |
| Colorado | Missouri | South Dakota |
| Idaho | Montana | Texas |
| Illinois | Nebraska | Utah |
| Indiana | Nevada | Washington |
| lowa | New Mexico | Wisconsin |
| Kansas | North Dakota | Wyoming |
| Louisiana |  |  |

The 1999 survey report and data file contains responses from all 25 states.

## PROCEDURES

The survey contains substantially the same benchmarks each year. Changes are made baoed on occupational changes and state requests. Survey data is gathered electronically either through e-mail attachments or computer disk. Various states have conducted the survey over the years as computer and staff capabilities and schedules allow. The benchmark classes and base data disks are distributed in July with a requested return in early to mid August. Each member state receives a complete data file with all of the response data. They also receive a hard-copy of the report.

## ENSURING ACCURACY

One of the primary goals of the CSCA is to ensure accuracy in the report. Accuracy is a focal point not only in the data itself but also in matches to the benchmark jobs. All states are expected to verify their benchmark job matches each year. In addition, the CSCA has initiated a process to review one or two of the benchmark groupings each year.

In 1999, the State of lowa reviewed, revised, and re-wrote the descriptions for classes in the ' 8000 ' series. All previous data was excluded from the ' 8000 ' series to ensure that each respondent re-matched the benchmarks accurately.

## REPORT INFORMATION

Each page of the report represents one benchmark class. The information includes:

- The capsule description of the benchmark job
- List of Data Responses from each state
- Number

CSCA benchmark code number

- Match Title

Each state's title for their job match

- \# Incumbents
- Minimum, Midpoint, \& Maximum

Each state's salary range (annual salary)

- Average

Each state's actual average annual salary

- State ID

2 letter abbreviation

- Match Level (Degree of Match)
' H ' if match stronger than the benchmark
' $A$ ' if match appears average to the benchmark
' L ' if match is weaker than the benchmark
- Class Level
ie. $1 / 3$ for 1 of 3 levels, etc.
- Totals \& Averages (annual salaries)
- Total \# of incumbents
- Simple Average Minimum, Midpoint, Maximum, and Average
- Weighted Average (Weighted by \# incumbents)
- Median Average
- Bar Chart displaying each state's average along with overall Averages \& Median

The 1999 Central States Salary Survey was conducted and compiled by:

North Dakota Central Personnel Division<br>State Capitol<br>600 East Boulevard Ave<br>Bismarck, NC "8505-0120<br>(701) 328-329i

The following pages are the instruction letter sent to survey participants in July.

NORTH DAKOTA
CENTRAL PERSONNEL DIVISION

## A Division of the Office of Management \& Budget

600 E. Bonlevard - 14th Floor
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0120

## MEMORANDUM

## TO: CENTRAL STATES COMPENSATION ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

FROM: Ken Purdy, Compensation Manager
SUBJ: 1999 SURVEY INFORMATION \& INSTRUCTIONS
DATE: July 22, 1999

Enclosed is the 1999 Central States Salary Survey. This package includes:

- A Benchmark Class Description Booklet
- A Diskette with the following files:
- A text file of the benchmark class descriptions
- 2 data files of your state's 1998 match data (one in Lotus *.wk1 format; the other in Excel ".xis format) Please feel free to use either file, whichever is more convenient.

Again, we are asking that all participants review their matches very carefully. In 1997, one member state received a union challenge that revealed several inaccurate matches. The quality of job matches is critical to the Central States survey success!

The CSCA has begun a process to review and update the benchmark descriptions by selecting one series each year. In 1997, the 5xox series was updated; in 1998, the $4 \times 0 \times$ series was updated. This year, the $8 \times 0 \times$ series was done. To further promote accurate matches, the Survey Committee decided to delete the data from the revised series each year. That means your data file contains no previous data for the $8 \times 0 \times$ series. We are asking that you CAREFULLY re-match the benchmarks to ensure continued survey quality.

In addition to this mailing; this letter, the benchmark descriptions, \& data files are being e-mailed to those states for which I have e-mail addresses. Please return the survey by diskette using a tracked delivery process or by attaching to an e-mail. My e-mail address is 'kpurdy@state.nd.us'. ALWAYS KEEP A BACKUP COPY!

- Arizona - Arkansas - Colorado - Idaho - Illinois - Indiana - lowa - Kansas - Louisiana - Michigan - Minnesota - Missouri - Montana -- Nebraska - New Mexico - Nevada - North Dakota - Oklahoma - Oregon - South Dakota - Texas - Utah - Washington - Wisconsin - Wyoming -


## INSTRUCTIONS

As usual, the survey file is self-explanatory and fairly straightforward to complete. Following is a sample of the survey file and a few instructions to make the survey more precise and easier to compile:


1. Survey classes with no match - Enter 'NCC' in the Match Title Cell (Col. B); leave all other cells blank.
2. DO NOT ENTER 0 OR PUT A BLANK SPACE IN Columns $C$ through J.
3. DO NOT DELETE ANY LINES OR COLUMNS IN THE WORKSHEET.
4. Match Level (Col. I) - Code ' $H$ ' if your job is stronger than the benchmark Code ' $A$ ' if your job appears average to the benchmark Code ' $L$ ' if your job is weaker than the benchmark
5. Class Level - Code the Level of the class \& \# of levels in the series (i.e. $1 / 3[1$ of 3 ] or $2 / 4$ (2 of 4], etc.)
6. Report all salaries as Annual Amounts. The CSCA has adopted annual salaries in the report format. If reporting annual salaries presents a significant problem, call us to work out a solution.

We are asking that surveys be retumed by August 13 so we can have time to compile the printed copy for the conference. Data received after August 13 may not be included in the printed report.

As last year, there will be a PRIZE for the state representative with the first accurate response. This is not a joke or 'gag gift' - it will be a nice prize (just ask Jeannie from NE).

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 701-328-4739 (kpurdy@state.nd.us) or Virginia Rivinius at 701-328-3374 (vriviniu@state.nd.us).

## 2140 EXECUTIVE BUDGET ANALYST II

Under general supervision professionally reviews and analyzes agency budgets and requests for changes. Typically requires a bachelor's degree in business administration and five years of progressively responsible budgeting experience. Second of two lt assigned the most complex and politically sensitive agency budgets. Help develop the biennial state budget. Reviews, analyzes . recommends action on spending levels and agency budgets and requests for changes. Reviews pending legislation and testifies at legislative committee hearings. Prepares fiscal impact statements.



[^1]- Arizona - Arkansas - Colorado - Idaho - Illinois - Indiana - Iowa - Kansas - Louisiana - Michigan - Minnesota - Missouri - Montana -- Nebraska - New Mexico - Nevada - North Dakota - Oklahoma - Oregon - South Dakota - Texas - Utah - Washington - Wisconsin - Wyoming -


## 2145 AUDITOR II

Under general supervision performs professional auditing and examination of governmental organizations, financial institutions, or other private organizations. Typically requires a bachelors degree in accounting and one year of experience. Second of four levels. The work of an Auditor I is less complex, while higher level Auditors have either supervisory or project responsibility. Conducts complex audits or parts of a complete audit. Participates in pre-audit and post-audit conferences with client officials and administrative personnel. Assists in the implementation of audit recommendations. Performs preliminary research and analysis. Tests and analyzes existing accounting systems and fiscal controls to identify problems. Prepares audit reports. Confers with client officials and verbally presents findings and recommendations. Performs audits to determine legality and accuracy of fund receipts, expenditures and control methods. Interviews clients and key employees regarding procedures.



## © 1999 Central States Salary Survey Central States Compensation Association

- Arizona - Arkansas - Colorado - Idaho - Illinois - Indiana - Iowa - Kansas - Louisiana - Michigan - Minnesota - Missouri - Montana -- Nebraska - New Mexico - Nevada - North Dakota - Oklahoma - Oregon - South Dakota - Texas - Utah - Washington - Wisconsin - Wyoming -


## FRINGE BENEFITS SURVEY



|  | 150 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F⿳\% |  | UniclăsisifieddPositions | Glassified eluficlassified |  |  |
| Arizona | \$27,582 |  |  | N/A | \$27,582 |
| Arkansas | \$27,913 | \$48,386 | \$29,042 | N/A | \$29,042 |
| Colorado | \$37,032 | N/A | N/A | Included | \$37,030 |
| Idaho | \$32,115 |  |  |  | \$32,115 |
| Illinois | \$36,755 | N/A | N/A | \$32,440 | \$34,598 |
| Indiana | NR |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | \$35,230 | \$50,015 | \$36,831 | N/A |  |
| Kansas | \$28,542 | \$49,436 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Louisiana | \$25,813 | \$27,940 | \$26,531 | Included in Unclassified | \$26,531 |
| Michigan | NR |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | \$37,876 | \$42,031 | \$28,670 | N/A | \$38,670 |
| Missouri | \$26,388 | ; |  |  | \$26,388 |
| Montana | \$28,186 | \$37,287 | \$27,846 | Not available | \$27,846 |
| Nebraska |  |  | \$29,057 |  | \$29,057 |
| Nevada | \$34,791 | \$51,496 | \$35,966 | N/A | N/A |
| New Mexico | \$28,134 | \$54,585 | \$29,416 | N/A | \$29,416 |
| North Dakota | \$28,932 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Oklahoma | \$26,193 | 35570 | \$28,647 | \$33,611 | \$30,584 |
| Oregon | \$31,764 | \$50,100 | \$35,040 | NA | \$35,040 |
| South Dakota | \$25,555 | \$47,534 | \$28,543 | N/A | N/A |
| Texas | NR |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | \$33,283 | Not tracked separately | \$33,283 | Not on our payroll | \$33,283 |
| Washington | \$34,344 | \$49,104 | \$41,724 | N/A | \$41,724 |
| Wisconsin | \$34,300 | \$52,700 | \$36,000 | \$47,900 | \$39,500 |
| Wyoming | \$27,600 |  |  |  | \$27,600 |
| NR - No Response |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (7) | 235\% |  |  |  |

## 21



| Table | frimutig | creases | K5ayk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Ey ${ }^{1} 1996$ |  |  |  | ExK992 | EVK1991 | 5Y4990 |
|  | (estimăte) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 5.50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | 2.80\% | 2.80\% | 5.20\% | 2.80\% | 4.80\% | 2.80\% | 1.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.00\% | 2.50\% | 2.00\% |
| Colorado | 3.40\% | 4.02\% | 1.99\% | 2.13\% | 1.81\% | 2.45\% | 3.22\% | 2.51\% | 4.22\% | 2.16\% | 0.00\% |
| Idaho | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.20\% | 2.00\% | 0.67\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Illinois | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | Lump sum | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 5.00\% | 4.50\% | 0.00\% | 4.50\% | 3.50\% |
|  |  |  | bonus \$565 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 2.50\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 2.00\% | \$650/yr | 4\%-7.5\% | 0\%-5\% | 5.00\% |
| Kansas | 1.00\% | 1.50\% | 1.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.50\% | 0.50\% | 1.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.50\% | 3.00\% |
| Louisiana | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.50\% |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | N/A | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 3.25\% | 0.00\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% |
| Missouri | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 2.00\% | 2.00\% | 3\% +\$200 | 1\% +\$400 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.20\% |
| Montana | 3.00\% | 2.00\% | 2.00\% | 3.90\% | 2.90\% | 1.50\% | 0.00\% | 7.40\% | 5.20\% | 2.50\% | 0.00\% |
| Nebraska | 4.50\% | 3.50\% | 2.75\% | 2.75\% | 3.50\% | 4.00\% | \$500/ yr. | \$300/yr | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 4.00\% |
| Nevada | 0.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 5.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.00\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% |
| New Mexico | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 3\% (avg) | 1.20\% | 0.00\% | 1.50\% | varied |
| North Dakota | \$420/ yr. | \$420/ yr | \$360/ yr. | \$360/yr. | 2.00\% | 2.00\% | 3.00\% | \$720/ yr. | \$480/yr | 4.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oklahoma | 2.00\% | 4.00\% | 0.00\% | \$1200/ yr. | 0.00\% | \$800/yr. | 0.00\% | 2.50-5.00\% | \$420/ yr. | \$1000/ yr | \$400/ yr. |
| Oregon | 2.00\% | 2.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 4.50\% |
| South Dakota | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 2.50\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 4.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% |
| Texas |  | 0.00\% | \$100/month | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Utah | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.67\% | 3.90\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.00\% | 2.75\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.00\% |
| Washington | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.60\% | 6.00\% | 2.50\% |
| Wisconsin | 2.00\% | 3.50\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 2.00\% | 1.00\% | 2.50\% | 1.50\% | 4.25\% | 1.27\% | 4.25\% |
| Wyoming | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | varied | varied | \$100-1000 | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CEntral |  | 526.63\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Tabiterataaymurase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 5, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \% |  | Ext995 | EXI994 | E)S1993 | Ex 1992 |  | W5Y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fixat |  |  |  |
| Arizona | 2.00\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 0.00\% | 2.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | None | None | None | None | 0-5.5\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% |
| Colorado | N/A | 2.20\% | 2.20\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Idaho | 3.00\% | 5.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.00\% | 5.00\% | 4.20\% | 0.00\% | 1.50\% | 4.00\% | 4.50\% | 5.00\% |
| Illinois | 5.00\% | 5.00\% | 0.00\% | 5.10\% | 4.60\% | 4.60\% | 5.00\% | 4.20\% | 0.00\% | 5.30\% | 4.80\% |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% |
| Kansas | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% |
| Louisiana | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | N/A | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% |
| Missouri | 1-2 (steps 3.6\%) | 1-2 steps(3.3\%) | 1-2 steps (3.5\%) | 1-2 steps (3.7\%) | 1 step (2\%) | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 1 step (2\%) | 1 step(2\%) |
| Montana | 3.00\% | 2.00\% | 2.00\% | 3.90\% | 2.90\% | 1.50\% | 0.00\% | 7.40\% | 5.20\% | 2.50\% | 0.00\% |
| Nebraska |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nevada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Mexico | 1.5\%-6.00\% | 2.75\% to 6.5\% | 1.5\% to 4.5\% | 2.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| North Dakota | 0.50\% | N/A | 1\%-2\% | 1.5\% - 2\% | 1.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oklahoma | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oregon | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 5.00\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 3.00\% | 3.50\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.50\% |
| South Dakota | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas |  | Varies by | individual | agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | 2.75\% | 2.75\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.75\% | 2.75\% | 2.75\% | 2.75\% | 2.75\% | 1.60\% | 0.00\% |
| Washington | 1-2 steps (2.5\%-5\%) | 5.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | N/A | Information | not | available |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wyoming | Varies by Agency | N/A | \$250 Bonus | 2.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gentran |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SAnnual Maximumamountot fighestarade |
| Arizona | \$10,980 | \$115,373 |
| Arkansas | \$11,012 | \$70,082 |
| Colorado | \$10,716 | \$120,756 |
| Idaho | \$12,002 | \$134,160 |
| Illinois | \$16,356 | \$159,636 |
| Indiana |  |  |
| lowa | \$15,870 | \$180,232 |
| Kansas | \$11,315 | \$79,913 |
| Louisiana | \$10,716 | \$140,508 |
| Michigan |  |  |
| Minnesota | \$15,451 | \$162,400 |
| Missouri | \$13,332 | \$91,908 |
| Montana | \$12,262 | \$109,243 |
| Nebraska | \$10,712 | \$208,080 |
| Nevada | \$13,885 | \$123,276 |
| New Mexico | \$10,712 | \$122,152 |
| North Dakota | \$10,716 | \$106,800 |
| Oklahoma | \$12,483 | \$97,944 |
| Oregon | \$13,668 | \$121,992 |
| South Dakota | \$12,293 | \$64,418 |
| Texas |  |  |
| Utah | \$11,630 | \$175,152 |
| Washington | \$14,976 | \$147,528 |
| Wisconsin | \$11,747 | \$163,586 |
| Wyoming | \$10,920 | \$82,380 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Central States
Compensation Structure - General Plan


| Tăbles50 \%et in era |  | 3, |  |  | 1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Holiday | 3 STCKL wave |  | , \%exak |  |
| \% | Fincuide |  |  |  | Hzku |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | Yes | No | No | Yes, $1.5 \times$ hours worked | Straight time pay or straight time compensatory time |
| Arkansas | No | No | No | Yes, $1.5 \times$ hours worked | None or $1 \times$ time off |
| Colorado | Yes* | Yes* | Yes* | Yes | None or some time off-employer choice |
| Idaho | Yes | No | Yes | Yes, $1.5 \times$ hours worked | None or $1 \times$ time off |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | Yes | FLSA 240 hrs | None or straight time |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | 120 hours maximum | Straight time union employees only |
| Kansas | No | No | No | Yes, $1.5 \times$ hours worked | None |
| Louisiana | No | No | No |  | $1 \times$ time off or cash |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Maximum of 150 hours | None or $1 \times$ time off or cash--employer choice |
| Missouri | No | No | No |  | None or $1 \times$ time off or cash--employer choice |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes, at $1.5 \times$ hours worked | None or $1 \times$ time off |
| Nebraska | Yes | No | No | Yes | None |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Most classified employees receive 1.5 cash or comp. time off |
| New Mexico | Yes | No | No | $11 / 2$ time off or cash | Varies by state agency |
| North Dakota | No | No | No | Allowed | None or Up to $11 / 2$ time off or cash |
| Oklahoma | No | No | No | Yes, $1.5 \times$ hours worked | None or $1 \times$ time off |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | None |
| South Dakota | No | No | No | No | None |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | No | No | No | Yes, $1.5 \times$ hours worked | $1 \times$ time off or (cash for hours in excess of 80) |
| Washington | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Discretionary except holiday work at $11 / 2 \times$ pay |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | None to $11 / 2 \times$ time off or cash-- employer choice |
| Wyoming | No | No | No |  | None |
| *Essential Services Employees. |  |  |  |  |  |









## FRINGE BENEFITS SURVEY
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|  | Vaccrual Rates |  |  |  | F5\% |  | 2xet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5 x \% | Ortox ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 95tox 9 years |  |  | 恟以aximumbays | ckarijovver Almount |
| Arizona | $1-2 \mathrm{yrs}=12$ | $3-6 \mathrm{yrs}=15$ | $7-14$ yrs $=18$ | $15+\mathrm{yrs}=21$ | 21 | 21 | 240 hrs max/yr | Agency head discretion |
| Arkansas | 12 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 30 |
| Colorado | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 2 yrs . worth of vacation |
| Idaho | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 21 |  | 2 yrs . worth of vacation |
| Illinois | 10 | 15 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 2 yrs . worth of vacation |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | 10 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 25 | Double annual entitlement |
| Kansas | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 21 | Varies | $1.5 \times$ annual accumulation |
| Louisiana | $0-3 y r s=12 / 3-5 y r s=15$ | $5-10=18$ | 10-15=21 | 24 | 24 | 24 | Unlimited | Unlimited |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 13 | 16.3 | 22.8 | 24.4 | 26 | 27.6 | 29.25 (30 + yrs) | 260-275 hrs. max. |
| Missouri | 15 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 21 | $2 \times$ annual | $2 \times$ annual |
| Montana | 15 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 24 |  | $2 \times$ total amt. eligible to earn |
| Nebraska | 12 | 12-18 | 19-23 | 24-25 | 25 | 25 |  | 35 days |
| Nevada | 15 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 30 | 30 days |
| New Mexico | 10-12 | 12-15 | 15-18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 240 Hours Max. | 30 days |
| North Dakota | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 24 |  | 30 days |
| Oklahoma* | 10-15 | 15-18 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 25 | 60 | 30-60 |
| Oregon | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 24 | $250 \mathrm{Hrs}, 350 \mathrm{Mgmt}$ | To accumulation maximum |
| South Dakota | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 30-40 days | 30-40 days |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | 13 | 16.3 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 40 days |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | 10 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 25 |  | Agency head discretion |
| Wyoming | 12 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 24 |  | 30-48 days |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Ave |  | 2915170 |  |  | 2322257 |  |  |  |
| Higher rates used in average if multiple rates reported. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Lesser rates for employees initially hired after July 1, 1997. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 416 STCk Leav |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SSICk. | 等Average | Accufmulartion |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Upon Reslgatato |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | 12 | N/A | Untimited | No | $25-50 \%$ payout; with minimum 500 hours | No | No | No |
| Arkansas | 12 | N/A | 120 | No | amount varies for each: $50,60,70,80$ days accrued | No | No | No |
| Colorado | 10 | 6.6 | 7/1/88 bal. | No | 25\% | No | No | 25\% |
|  |  |  | + 45 days |  |  |  |  |  |
| Idaho | 12 | 6.5 | Unlimited | No | Used for insurance premiums limit | No | No | No |
| Illinols | 12 | 8.1 | Unlimited | Yes, $1 / 2$ if eamed between 1/1/84 \& 12/31/97 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  | No | 30 day maximum |
| lowa | 18 | 9 | Unlimited | No | 100\% (up to max. of \$2000) | No | No | No |
| Kansas | 12 | 9 | Unlimited | No | Up to 60 days | No | No | No |
| Loulsiana | 12 to 24 | N/A | Unlimited | No | No | No | No | No |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 13 | 8 | Unlimited | $\begin{gathered} 40 \% \text { of } 900 \text { hrs. }+12.5 \% \text { over } \\ 900(20 \text { y.0.s. min.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \text { of } 900 \text { hrs. }+12.5 \% \text { over } \\ & 900 \end{aligned}$ | $40 \%$ of 900 hrs. $+12.5 \%$ over 900 | No | $40 \%$ of $900 \mathrm{hrs} .+12.5 \%$ over 900 hrs . |
| Missourl | 15 | N/A | Unlimited | No | No | No | No | No |
| Montana | 12 | N/A | Unlimited | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| Nebraska | 12 to 18 | 9.7 | Unlimited | No | 25\% (50 day max.) | No | No | 25\% (50 day max.) |
| Nevada | 15 | 11.4 | Unlimited | Yes, based on years of service | Yes, based on years of service | Yes, based on years of service | No | Yes |
| New Mexico | 12 | N/A | Unlimited | No | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \text { For hours }>600(400 \mathrm{Hr} \text {. } \\ & \text { Max) } \end{aligned}$ | No | No | No |
| North Dakota | 12 | 7.5 | Unlimited | $10 \%$ of balance w/ 10 yrs continuous service | $10 \%$ of balance w/ 10 yrs continuous service | 10\% of balance w/ 10 yrs continuous service | $10 \%$ of balance w/ 10 yrs continuous service | $10 \%$ of balance w/ 10 yrs continuous service |
| Oklahoma | 15 | 10 | Unlimited | No | Creditable for Retirement | No | No | No |
| Oregon | 12 | N/A | Unlimited | No | $1 / 2$ accumulated balance is converted for pension final avg. salary calculation | No | No | No |
| South Dakota | 14 | 6.3 | Unlimited | 25\% (60 day maximum) | 25\% (60 day maximum) sick leave at the time of retirement | 25\% (60 day maximum) | No | 25\% (60 day maximum) |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  | No | 50\% (336 hour maximum) |
| Utah | 13 | N/A | Unlimited | No | 0.25 | No | No | No |
| Washington | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | 16.25 |  | Unlimited | No | Creditable toward health insurance | Creditable toward health insurance | No | Creditable toward health insurance |
| Wyoming | 12 | N/A | Unlimited | 50\% (60 day maximum) | 50\% (60 day maximum) | 50\% (60 day maximum) | 50\% (60 day maximum) | 50\% (60 day maximum) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Higher rates used in average if multiple rates reported. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Tăblay 2 Amounte | Typeota | days ${ }^{\text {dill }}$ | owedpersa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1780 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \％Mérornalue | Columburs |  | 9\％DayiAfterexay |  |  |  |
|  | 5Hblday | 突Majo |  |  |  | 遥宕Day |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | 10 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |  |
| Arkansas | 12 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 1，4， 17 |
| Colorado | 10 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |  |
| Idaho | 10 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |  |
| Illinols | 12.5 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 8 |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | 11 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | 2 |
| Kansas | 10 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | 10 |
| Loulslana | 8 to 11 | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 2，7 |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 11 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 10 |
| Missouri | 12 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | 8，13 |
| Montana | 10.5 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |  |
| Nebraska | 12 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 18 |
| Nevada | 11 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 21 |
| New Mexico | 10.5 | Yes | 4 hrs ． | No | Yes | Yes | Yeś | Yes | No | Yes | 2 hrs ． | 10 |
| North Dakota | 10.5 | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | 15 |
| Oklahoma | 10 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |
| Oregon | 9 to 10 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | 23 |
| South Dakota | 10 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | 19 |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | 11 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | 20 |
| Washington | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | 12.5 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | 1，10，22 |
| Wyoming | 9 | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Higher rates used in average if multiple rates reported． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The five major holidays are observed by all member states：New Year＇s Day，Independence Day，Labor Day，Thanksgiving，and Christmas． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Holidays：1）Christmas Eve 2）Christmas－ 1 extra day 3）Confederate Memorial Day 4）Employee＇s Birthday 5）Jefferson＇s Birthday 6）Lee－Jackson－King Day 7）Mardi Gras Day |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8）Lincoln＇s B－day 9）New Year＇s Day－ 1 extra day 10）Personal or Optional Day 11）Primary Election Day 12）Robert E．Lee＇s B－day 13）Harry Truman＇s B－day 14）West Virginia Day |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15）1／2 Day－Christmas Eve 16）1／2 Day－New Year＇s Eve 17）Lee－King Day 18）Arbor Day 19）Native American Day 20）Pioneer Day 21）Nevada Day 22）New Year＇s Eve |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23）Governor＇s Day |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Tablequequitio |  |  |  | 60\% |  | 30\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Famindicemat |  | \% \% | 2P081ed/Shäreat |  |
|  |  | \% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Cagaucatomi.Wlipay |  |  |  |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes,agy head discretion | Yes, | N/A | FMLA, donational annual leave, parental leave, |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | agy head disc. |  | medical LWOP, LWOP, Administrative Leave |
| Arkansas | Yes | Yes |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Disaster, Svc Volunteer; FMLA, Catastrophic |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  | No | Disaster, Funeral |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | No | Yes, agcy discretion | Yes, agency discretion | Yes, agency discretion | NA | FMLA, Berevement (sick leave used) |
| Illinols | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Maternity-Paternity(10 days) |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes, Vacation | Donated Leave for catastrophic illness, FMLA, LWOP, Compensatory |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Election, Jury Duty, Voting, Disaster, Emergency |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Funeral |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Funeral (2 days) |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Bereave.,court, voting, emergency, donate blood, election judge,transition,union, |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | related work, elder care, parenthood, disability |
| Missourl | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Funeral |
| Montana | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Maternity, parental, disaster \& emergency, FMLA |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes,agy head disc. | Yes, Vacation | Voting, election board, family leave, injury, funeral, adoption |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Administrative, voting, volunteer fire fighting, EMT, police reserve |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes, Vacation | administrative, voting, unpaid FMLA |
| North Dakota | Yes | Yes | No | State Unpaid FMLA | Various agy programs | Various agy programs | Yes | Leave Sharing Program |
| Oklahoma | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Professional (3 days), family leave |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Vacation Leave |  |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  | Yes | Personal leave=40 hrs per year of sick leave that can be used for specified reasons |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |  | Yes | Funeral, Family Leave |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Varies |  |  | (Already indicated at left) |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | No | No | Varies by agency | No | Yes | Administrative leave |


| Tablej14. Heamunsura | ancosk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Enjbloy |  | , \% | Employ |  |  | Embrosjodcost |  |  | Enproyd Cos |  |  |
|  |  |  | 7raskusw |  | Emproyce |  | \%taxich | Emproyes exata | H1Fccorem |  | Effipoyeoonly | Coyen ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5 |
| F |  | Fiche |  |  |  |  |  |  | (ixarponuti |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona* | No | \$359.86 | - | \$359.86 | \$162.00 | - | \$162.00 | \$153.54 | - | \$75.00 | \$40.14 | - | \$5.00 |
| Arkansas | Yes | \$261.00 | \$261.00 | \$261.00 | \$261.00 | \$261.00 | \$261.00 | \$279.00 | \$180.00 | \$188.00 | \$91.60 | \$52.00 | \$55.00 |
| Colorado | Partially | \$167.90 |  | \$167.90 | \$131.76 |  | \$131.76 | Varies |  |  | Varies |  |  |
| Idaho |  | \$283.33 |  | \$283.33 | \$283.33 |  | \$283.33 | \$43.00 |  | \$155.89 | \$7.00 | \$23.00 | \$44.63 |
| Illinols | Yes | \$456.60 |  | \$310.69 | \$250.60 |  | \$157.71 | \$160.40 |  | \$101.74 | \$15.40 |  | \$15.40 |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iowa | Min Prem | \$398.70 | \$324.00 | \$326.22 | \$245.91 | \$213.37 | \$191.00 | \$170.48 | \$168.64 | \$139.78 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Kansas** | Yes | \$295.98 | \$295.98 | \$295.98 | \$195.21 | \$195.21 | \$195.21 | individual + | 65\% of | dep. cost | ** | * | * |
| Louisiana |  | \$223.62 |  | \$223.62 | \$113.36 |  | \$113.36 | \$223.62 |  | \$223.62 | \$113.36 |  | \$113.36 |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | Partially |  |  | \$462.82 |  |  | \$181.62 |  |  | \$27.24 |  |  | \$0.00 |
| Missouri |  | \$163.00 |  |  | \$163.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montana | Partially | \$230.64 | NA | \$248.66 | \$235.00 |  | \$236.68 | \$93.36 |  | \$95.59 | \$0.00 |  | \$11.36 |
| Nebraska | Partially |  | \$444.23 | \$383.79 |  | \$125.14 | \$105.78 |  | \$118.09 | \$102.02 |  | \$33.26 | \$28.12 |
| Nevada | Yes |  | \$264.51 | \$264.51 |  | \$264.51 | \$264.51 |  | \$211.95 |  |  | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| New Mexico | Yes | \$260.26 |  | \$210.51 | \$96.09 | , | \$77.09 | \$173.51 |  | \$140.36 | \$64.07 |  | \$51.39 |
| North Dakota |  | \$401.67 |  |  | \$162.48 |  |  | \$0.00 |  |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Oklahoma** |  | \$343.65 |  | \$343.65 | \$170.88 |  | \$170.88 | \$172.78 |  | \$23.99 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |
| Oregon | No | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| South Dakota | Yes |  |  |  | \$247.69 |  |  | \$218.39 | \$209.66 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | Partially | \$558.97 | \$489.62 | \$489.62 | \$203.06 | \$177.86 | \$177.86 | \$105.43 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$38.31 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin |  |  |  | \$557.04 |  |  | \$223.64 |  |  | \$0.00 |  |  | \$0.00 |
| Wyoming | Yes | \$190.00 |  |  | \$190.00 |  |  | \$199.04 |  |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 520, \$183.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Arizona - Not a separate PPO plan/Traditional has a PPO component. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Kansas - \% of plan cost based on Employee Income - 2.6\%, 6.0\%, 9.3\%. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\cdots$ Oklahoma - As of July 1, 1999, Oklahoma benefit allowance totals \$224.69 or \$262.19 for employee only, plus $1 / 2$ of dependent health \& dental premium. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Hablex 15 Healabiasi | Tancex (cotinued) | 170 | 238(s) | Whyuckumuk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Max |  |
|  |  | 縣Numberof | Nämber ${ }^{\text {Waf }}$ |  |
| Wemene |  | 2等Employees | Employees |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | 4,065 | N/A | 47,514 | NA |
| Arkansas | N/A |  |  |  |
| Colorado | N/A |  |  |  |
| Idaho | 16,872 |  | 1,126 | \$61,192,000 Employer Cost (Annual) |
| Illinois | N/A |  |  |  |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | 26,000 | 1,500 | 5,103 | \$112,660,352.00 |
| Kansas | 22,267 | 609 | 11,355 | \$172,000,000.00* (Total Combined) |
| Louisiana | N/A |  | . |  |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | N/A |  | 46,327 | \$208,126,424* (Total Combined) |
| Missouri | N/A | 1,222 | 35,743 | \$18,500,000.00 |
| Montana | 8,048 | 0 | 2,183 | \$22,566,947.00 |
| Nebraska | N/A | 9,809 | 4,222 | \$43,712,623.00 |
| Nevada | N/A |  |  |  |
| New Mexico | 15,730 Trad and | PPO combined | 4,254 | \$61,464,267.00 |
| North Dakota | 12,606 |  |  | N/A |
| Oklahoma | 19,220 |  | 18,031 | N/A |
| Oregon | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| South Dakota | 6,068 | 5,955 |  | \$13,655,170.00 |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | 946 | 16,151 | 889 | \$69,273,400 (Claims only) |
| Washington | N/A |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | N/A |  | 12,300 | \$67,700,000 (Most enrolled in HMO) |
| Wyoming | 12,737 |  |  | \$39,022,832.00 |
| *Active and Retirees combined |  |  |  |  |

1999 Central States Fringe Benefits Survey

|  |  | 1） |  |  |  | Fextich |  |  | \％${ }^{\text {ck }}$ | － |  |  | －8， |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Major Modrat ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Majbr M |  | MajokMeat |  | Annum |  |  |  | Hosbral | \％ |
|  |  |  |  | Fismexick | Colnizuraterst |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AIown ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
|  |  | 瑗然Employker | Emproyed | Employ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 等 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \％8，Eximify |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ｜PPRHMO］ |  |  | ［PPOHMOX |  |  |  |  | SPP\％／3M0 ${ }^{\text {S }}$ |  |  |  |
| Arizona | \＄150．00 | \＄300．00 | \＄150N／A | \＄300N／A | 80．00\％ | 90\％N／A | \＄2，000，000．00 | \＄2，000，000／N／A | \＄750．00 | \＄1，500．00 | \＄750／N／A | \＄1，500／N／A | 80．00\％ | 90\％N／A |
| Arkansas | \＄300．00 | \＄600．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | 80．00\％ |  | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄2，000．00 | \＄4，000．00 | \＄1，000．00 | \＄2，000．00 | 80．00\％ | 80\％／100\％ |
| Colorado | N／A |  | N／A |  | N／A |  | N／A |  | N／A |  |  |  | N／A |  |
| Idaho | \＄300．00 | \＄900．00 |  |  | 80．00\％ |  | \＄1，000，000．00 |  | \＄2，000．00 | \＄6，000．00 |  |  | 80．00\％ |  |
| Illinols | \＄150／250／300 | \＄300／400／450 | None | None | 80／20 |  | None | None | \＄800．00 | \＄2．000．00 | None | None | 90．00\％ | 100．00\％ |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄500．00 | \＄500．00 | 80．00\％ | 90／10 | None | None | \＄600．00 | \＄800．00 | \＄1，000．00 | \＄1，000．00 | 80．00\％ | 90／100 |
| Kansas | \＄200．00 | \＄400．00 | \＄0．00 |  | 80．00\％ | 20．00\％ | \＄2，000，000．00 | N／A | \＄500．00 | \＄1，000．00 |  |  | 80．00\％ | 100．00\％ |
| Loulslana | \＄300．00 | \＄900．00 | \＄300．00 | \＄900．00 | 90．00\％ | 100．00\％ | \＄1，000，000．00 | None | \＄500．00 | \＄1，500．00 | None | None | 80．00\％ | 90．00\％ |
| Michlgan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | N／A | N／A | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | N／A | 100．00\％ | \＄2，000，000．00 | None | \＄3，000．00 | \＄6．000．00 | None | None | 100．00\％ | 100．00\％ |
| Missouri | \＄300．00 | \＄900．00 |  |  | 80．00\％ |  | \＄1．000，000．00 |  | \＄7．500．00 | \＄15，000．00 | \＄2，550．00 | \＄5．400．00 | 80．00\％ |  |
| Montana | \＄200．00 | \＄600．00 |  |  | 75．00\％ |  | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄950．00 | \＄2，100．00 | \＄1，000．00 | \＄2，000．00 | 75．00\％ | \＄200．00 |
| Nebraska |  |  | \＄200．00 | \＄400．00 |  | 85．00\％ |  | \＄1，000，000．00 |  |  | \＄1，000．00 | \＄2，000．00 |  | 85．00\％ |
| Nevada |  |  | \＄350．00 | \＄700．00 |  | 80．00\％ |  | \＄2，000，000．00 |  |  |  |  | 80．00\％ | 90．00\％ |
| New Mexico＊ | \＄250．00 | \＄750．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | 75－85\％ | 75－85\％ | None | None | \＄2，000．00 | per person | \＄0．00 | per person | 75－85\％ | －90．00\％ |
| North Dakota | \＄200．00 | \＄600．00 | \＄200．00 | \＄600．00 | 80．00\％ | 85．00\％ | \＄2，000，000．00 | \＄2，000，000．00 | \＄1，250．00 | \＄2，500．00 | \＄750．00 | \＄1，500．00 | 80．00\％ | 85．00\％ |
| Oklahoma | \＄300．00 | \＄900．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | 80．00\％ | 0．00\％ | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄2，300．00 | \＄9，200．00 | \＄1，000．00 | \＄2，000．00 | 80．00\％ |  |
| Oregon | New plan，spec | cifics not yet available |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Dakota | \＄500．00 | \＄1，250．00 | None | None | 75．00\％ | 75．00\％ | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄2，000．00 | per person | \＄1，500．00 | per person | 75．00\％ | 100\％less copay |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | 90／10 | 90／10 | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄1．500．00 | \＄2，000．00 | \＄1．000．00 | \＄2，500．00 | 80．00\％ | 90／100 |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin＊＊ | \＄100．00＊ | \＄200．00 | \＄0．00 | \＄0．00 | 80／20 | N／A | N／A | \＄1，000，000．00 | \＄500．00 | \＄1，000．00 | N／A | N／A | 100．00\％ | 100．00\％ |
| Wyoming | \＄350．00 | \＄700．00 |  |  | 80．00\％ |  | \＄2，000，000．00 |  | \＄2，600．00 | \＄5，200．00 |  |  | 80．00\％ |  |
| －New Mexico－Employee pays $\$ 100$ maximum and insurance pays $100 \%$ for the rest of the cost． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| －Wisconsin has two（2）traditional fee－for－service plans．Responses are for Standard Plan II which has the larger enrollment． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | Fice |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Monlysing lecovorago |  |  | Wirn Family Coverage |
| Arizona | 100.00\% | 80.00\% | 50.00\% | \$13.00 | \$35.00 | \$8.22 | \$34.44 |
| Arkansas | \$20, 2 x yr. copay | None | None | No dental coverage | No dental coverage | No dental coverage | No dental coverage |
| Colorado | 100.00\% | 80-100\% | 50.00\% | \$15.41 | \$55.71 | \$0.00 | \$15.41 |
| Idaho | yes | yes | yes | \$11.99 | \$11.99 | \$3.25 | \$38.70 |
| Illinois | 100.00\% | 100\% after \$50 deduct. | \$1,364 max, after deduct. | \$11.35 | \$26.38 | \$7.50 | \$12.50-\$15.00 |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iowa | 100.00\% | 80.00\% | 50\% 750 annual max. | \$15.56 | \$15.56 | \$0.00 | \$25.96 |
| Kansas | 100.00\% | 50.00\% | No | \$13.17 | \$18.89 | Varies: $2.6 \%, 6.0 \%, 9.3 \%$ | Employee contribution |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | depending on income | +65\% dependent |
| Louisiana | None | None | None | No dental coverage | No dental coverage | No dental coverage | No dental coverage |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 100.00\% | 80.00\% | 80.00\% | \$22.30 | \$43.85 | \$0.00 | \$21.55 |
| Missouri | 100.00\% | Varies | Varies | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$11.00 | \$40.57 |
| Montana | 100.00\% | 80.00\% | No | \$18.60 | \$18.60 | \$0.00 | \$18.00 |
| Nebraska | 100.00\% | 80.00\% | 50.00\% | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$14.25 | \$44.70 |
| Nevada | 100.00\% | 50\%-80\% | None | Included in med. cost |  |  |  |
| New Mexico | 100\%/Cigna | 80.00\% | 50.00\% | \$14.43 | \$41.70 | \$9.62 | \$27.79 |
|  | United Dental | No Percentage | Reduced Co-Pay | \$7.23 | \$21.81 | \$4.81 | \$14.53 |
| North Dakota | \$10 office visit | 50\% - 80\% | 50.00\% | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$18.87 | \$59.84 |
|  | deductible-100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 100.00\% | 60\%-85\% | 60\%/\$1500 max | In benefit allowance | 39.72 in benefit allowance | \$19.78 | \$79.44 |
| Oregon | New plan, specifics not yet available. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Dakota | 100.00\% | 1st \$100 at 100\%, then 60\% |  | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$13.64 | \$38.98 |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 50\%/\$1500 max. | \$35.27 | \$65.26 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | Varies | by | HMO. | \$10.00 avg | \$21.50 avg | Varies | by plan. |
| Wyoming | 100.00\% | 50.00\% | None | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$6.62 | \$15.56 |
|  | Preventative dental is included, optional expanded available. |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  | 532\% |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F\% \% |  |  |  | disuranceqooverage | Finsuranice Coveragevo |
|  |  | Whatickeverage |  | K \% | KwherDopendents |
| Arizona | \$10,000 | $3 \times$ salary | \$0.314 | No | No |
| Arkansas | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | No | No |
| Colorado | \$12,000 | \$12,000 | \$0.18 | No | No |
| Idaho | $1 \times$ salary |  | \$0.08- \$4.88 | \$3,000 | No |
| Illinois | $1 \times$ salary | $4 \times$ salary (emp opt) | \$0.41 | No | No |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | \$10,000 | Employee pd. \$40,000 | \$0.30 | No | No |
| Kansas | $1.5 \times$ salary |  | \$0.30 | No | No |
| Louisiana | $1.5 \times$ salary | \$40,000 | \$0.46 | No | No |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | $1 \times$ salary |  | $\therefore \quad$ varies | No | No |
| Missouri | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | \$0.29 | No | No |
| Montana | \$12,000 | \$200,000 | \$0.23 | No | No |
| Nebraska | \$10,000 |  | \$0.20 | No | No |
| Nevada | \$40,000 |  | \$0.40 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| New Mexico | \$40,000 | or up to \$280,000* | \$0.18-\$0.225 | \$10,000 | \$5,000 |
|  | *Up to \$280,000 based | d on employee's pay rate: | Optional; Includes Basic L | fe and AD\&D coverage |  |
| North Dakota | \$1,300 | up to \$200,000 | \$0.215 | No | No |
| Oklahoma | \$20,000 | $5 \times$ salary to \$300,000 | 0.25 on 1st \$40,000 | No | No |
|  |  |  | age rated above \$40,000 |  |  |
| Oregon | \$5,000 | \$260,000 | N/A | No | No |
| South Dakota | \$25,000 | opt. $5 \times$ sal. to a | Included in H I premium | No | No |
|  |  | max of \$350,000 |  |  |  |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | \$18,000 |  | 0.17 | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | $2 \times$ salary | 5 X salary | \$0.07- \$0.48 | No | No |
| Wyoming | \$50,000 |  | \$0.22 | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 21Accldental Dath | and Dismemberment and Long | Toum Disablitycoyerage 2 \% |  |  | H20 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fozay |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 13\% |
|  |  | 5\% |  | W\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | \$10,000.00 | 66.67\% | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Arkansas | No | No | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Colorado | Yes, \$12,000 | Yes, 60\% | No |  | Yes |  |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iowa | \$10,000 | 60\% (\$2000/max per mo) | Yes | N/A | N/A |  |
| Kansas | No | 66.66\% | No |  | No |  |
| Louisiana | No | No | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | No | No | Yes | Varies | Yes | Varies |
| Missouri | No | Max 60\% salary | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Montana | No | No | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Nebraska | No | No | \$5,200 Coverage | \$.10 per month | \$5,000 max per mo. | Varies by age and 6 options |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes-60\% (\$7,500) | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| New Mexico | \$40,000* | 60\% salary(up to \$5000/mo) | No |  | No |  |
| North Dakota | \$1,300 | 25\% of salary | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Oklahoma | \$20,000 | Yes | N/A | $\mathrm{ee}=\$ 4.04$ | N/A |  |
| Oregon | No | No | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| South Dakota | \$25,000 | 50\% of highest any 3 yrs | Yes | N/A | N/A |  |
|  | purchase added insurance | before disability |  |  |  |  |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | No | Yes | \$250,000 maximum | \$.95 per \$25,000 coverage(S) | N/A | NA |
|  |  |  |  | \$1.28 per \$25,000 coverage(F) |  |  |
| Washington |  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | Included with Life Ins. | Included with Life Ins. |  |  |  |  |
| Wyoming | Included with Life Ins. | No | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| * New Mexico - An additional \$10,000 available if employee was wearing a seatbelt. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (S): Single , (F): Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Whay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sBehefif |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Arizona | N/A |  |
| Arkansas | N/A |  |
| Colorado | N/A | Provided by Public Employee Retirement Association up to 2 years. |
| Idaho | N/A |  |
| Illinois | N/A |  |
| Indiana |  |  |
| lowa | N/A |  |
| Kansas | 3yrs, \$164,250 max. 5yrs, $\$ 273,750$ max. Lifetime, Unlimited | 100\% Daily benefit, LTC facility, Assisted Living Facility 50\% Daily benefit, Home or Community Care |
| Louisiana | N/A |  |
| Michigan |  |  |
| Minnesota | N/A |  |
| Missouri | N/A |  |
| Montana |  | 100\% daily benefit - LTC facility; 60\% daily benefit - assisted living facility; 50\% home care |
| Nebraska | 3yrs, \$36,000 max. 6yrs, $\$ 72,000$ max. Unlimited, Unlimited | Plan 1: LTC facility \& professional home care <br> Plan 2: LTC facility \& professional home care with nonforfeiture provision <br> Plan 3: LTC facility \& professional home care with total home care <br> Plan 4: LTC facility \& professional home care with total home care nonforfeiture provision |
| Nevada | Maximum Daily Benefits $\$ 50-\$ 140$ per day 3yr. max. payable | Home Care \& Nursing Home Care Plan Total Home Care \& Nursing Home Care Plan |
| New Mexico | N/A |  |
| North Dakota | N/A |  |
| Oklahoma | N/A |  |
| Oregon | \$40-\$140 per day | Implementation in 2000. |
| South Dakota | N/A |  |
| Texas |  |  |
| Utah | N/A |  |
| Washington | N/A |  |
| Wisconsin | Currently, three state-approved private | insurers. No state contribution-state just monitors plans. |
| Wyoming | N/A |  |
|  |  |  |
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|  |  | Wexaskick | Kizy |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5ixas |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  | W |  | Wisw |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | x |  | Annually, FY98(\$10.71*yrs of service | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
|  |  |  | added to annual benefit amount) |  |  |
| Arkansas | x |  | Annually, FY99-3\% | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Colorado | $x$ |  | N/A | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Idaho | x |  | Periodically | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Illinois | x |  | Annually | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | x |  | Yes, FY99-1.33\% (1 time pymt each yr) | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Kansas | x |  | Periodically, FY98-3.00\% | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Louisiana | x |  | N/A | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Michigan |  |  | ! |  |  |
| Minnesota | x |  | Periodically | Yes, State Cont. varies |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$100-\$200 per fiscal year |  |
| Missouri | x |  | Yes, 2 Plans:Capped retirees 1.246\% | Yes, State Cont. \$25/mth,match |  |
|  |  |  | Noncapped - $4.00 \%$ min. and 5\% max. |  |  |
| Montana | x |  | Yes, FY98-1.50\% | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Nebraska |  | x | N/A | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Nevada | x |  | Periodically | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| New Mexico* | x |  | Yes, 3\% after 1yr, if 65* | Yes, No State Cont. | Law Enforcement only |
| North Dakota | x |  | N/A | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Oklahoma | x |  | Ad Hoc | \$25/mth, match plan is 401(a) |  |
|  |  |  | with 10+yrs no more than $25 \%$ |  |  |
| Oregon | x | x | Yes, 2.00\% annual | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| South Dakota | x |  | Yes, 3.1\% | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | X |  | Yes, FY99-1.6\% | Yes, No State Cont. | Yes |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | x |  | N/A | Yes, No State Cont. | No |
| Wyoming | x |  | Yes, FY99-2.5\% | Yes, No State Cont. |  |
| *New Mexico - 3\% after | o years retirem | ent, if not age 65 or not | due to disability. |  |  |


|  |  |  |  | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Flexibiespendmgy |  |  |
| FW\% |  | 約HEaitheafe |  |  |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | Yes | On site facility-not paid |
| Arkansas | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Colorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Illinois | N/A | Yes | Yes | No |
| Indiana |  |  |  |  |
| lowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Louisiana | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| North Dakota | N/A | Yes | Yes | No |
| Oklahoma | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Oregon | N/A | N/A | Yes | No |
| South Dakota | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Texas |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Washington | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Wyoming | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | Yes | Yes | Health screenings, weight control, smoking cessation, health classes stress mgmt., nutrition, library: books, video, audio, newsletter. |
|  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | Yes | No | Included in medical plan, screening, physicals, wellness publications. |
| Colorado | Yes | No |  |
| Idaho | Yes | Yes |  |
| Illinois | Yes | No |  |
| Indiana |  |  |  |
| lowa | Yes | Yes | Information provided to employees. |
| Kansas | Yes | Yes | Health Risk Appraisal, Employee Assistance Program, Self Care, Blood Pressure, Exercise Equipment |
|  |  |  |  |
| Louisiana | Yes | Yes | Healfh Screenings, Newsletter |
| Michigan |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | Yes | Yes | Newsletters, Health Screenings, Discussion Groups, Health Seminars |
| Missouri | Yes | Yes | CPR Classes, Health First Classes/Nutrition \& Weight Loss, Blood Pressure Checks, Speakers (health related topics), Flu Shots, Health Fair, First Aid, Stress Mgmt., Fitness Center |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Montana | Yes | Yes | Health Screenings, Group competitions, Food and Fitness |
| Nebraska | Yes | Yes | Blood Pressure, Chemistry Profile, Fitness Walks, Safety\& Relationship programs: Free or discounted price |
|  |  |  |  |
| Nevada | Yes | Yes | PPO Plan-flu shots,health risk appraisal,blood chemistry panel, blood pressure, prostrate screening analysis. |
|  |  |  |  |
| New Mexico | Yes | No | Varies by Agency:additional 30 minutes at lunch, 3 x a week for exercise |
| North Dakota | Yes | No |  |
| Oklahoma | Yes | Yes | Qtrly newsletter, Health Fairs, Health \& Wellness Training for Wellness Coordinators, WebPage, Health risk appraisals |
|  |  |  |  |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| South Dakota | No | Yes | Health screenings, Healthwise classes, Flu shots. <br> Prenatal Program, Video Lending Library, Fitness Center Discounts, Wellness Seminar Series |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Texas |  |  |  |
| Utah | Some | Yes | Health screenings, rebates, health seminars, add'I 30 minutes at lunch 3 times a week for exercise, flu shots |
|  |  |  |  |
| Washington | N/A | N/A | Hoalth fairs. |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes |  |
| Wyomir | Yes | Yes |  |


| Tabientiemme | baneus Baie | fits\％ |  | 空新䜌 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | exatim |  | grackiciein |  |  | KUniforms | 3ioolsis\％ | Severaice |
|  | WWorky ${ }^{\text {deek }}$ |  |  | nlowed |  |  | \％ |  | drovided | ＊S Sataty | 55 may |
|  |  |  | 5kychimay |  |  |  |  |  |  | Egupment | 5is． |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31Proxided |  |
| Arizona | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．310 | \＄28．00 | varies | N／A |  | Yes | No |
| Arkansas | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．28 | Actual | Actual | No charge | Yes | Yes | No |
| Colorado | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．28 | \＄26．00 | Actual | Prevailing | Some | Mixed | No |
| Idaho | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．31 | \＄20．00 | Actual | \＄25．00 | Yes | Yes | No |
| Illinois＊ | 37.5 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．30 | \＄22．50 | \＄50－70 | N／A | Yes | Yes | Yes＊ |
| Indiana | 37.5 or 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．28 | \＄24．00 | \＄65．00 | N／A | N／A | N／A | N／A |
| lowa | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．21 | \＄18．75 | \＄40．00 | No charge | Some | Yes | No |
| Kansas | 40 | No | Varies | Yes | \＄0．32 | \＄28．00 | \＄54．00 | \＄9．24 | Some | Yes | No |
| Louisiana | 40 | No | Yes | Yes | \＄0．28 | \＄26．00 | \＄55．00 | No charge | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．31 | \＄31．00 | Actual | Varies | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Missouri | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．295 | Actual | Actual | No charge | Yes | Yes | No |
| Montana | 40 | Some | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．28 | \＄23．00 | \＄36．40 | No charge | Some | Some | No |
| Nebraska | 40 | Troopers | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．31 | \＄34．00 | \＄48．00 | \＄30．00 | Yes | Mixed | No |
| Nevada | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．31 | \＄26．00 | \＄43．00 | No charge | Yes | Mixed | No |
| New Mexico | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．25 | \＄22．50 | \＄65－95 | No charge | Some | Some | No |
| North Dakota | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．25 | \＄20．00 | \＄39＋tax | No charge | Some | Some | Yes |
| Oklahoma | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．31 | \＄25．00 | \＄40．00 | No charge | Some | Yes | No |
| Oregon＊＊ | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．30 | \＄30．00 | \＄50．00 | ＊\＄55．00 | Some | Some | No |
|  |  |  |  |  | own veh．$\$ 0.275$ | Out \＄32．00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Dakota | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．29 | \＄23．00 | \＄35．00 |  | Some | Some | No |
| Texas | 40 | No | Varies | Yes | \＄0．28 | \＄25．00 | \＄55．00 | Higher Ed．，varies | Varies | Yes | No |
| Utah | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．31 | \＄34．00 | \＄55．00 | No charge | Yes | Some | Yes，exempt |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | 40 | No | Varies | Yes | \＄0．29 | \＄31．00 | \＄52．00 | \＄68．25 | Some | Yes | No |
| Wyoming＊＊＊ | 40 | No | 30 minutes | Yes | \＄0．28 | \＄60．00＊＊＊ |  | No charge | Yes | Yes | No |
| ＊Illinois－Only upon a closing of a facility． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ＊＊Oregon－\＄100 in Portland for a few employees． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ＊＊Wyoming－covers in－state travel for both lodging and meals．Out of State is actual expenses． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



The highest amount of state contribution for heath insurance and dentral insurance (family or single plan) was also used.
The highest amount of vacation leave accrual for 5 years of service was used.
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