### NEBRASKA COMMISSION OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

)

Case No. 1480

Keating, O'Gara, Nedved & Peter, PC, LLO

530 South 13th, Suite 100

Lincoln, NE 68508

CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN	) ) ) FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER
STATE OF NEBRASKA	)
and FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE, NEBRASKA PROTECTIVE SERVICES LODGE 88 (FOP 88).	NEBRASKA COMMISSION OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS FILED  FEB 28 2019
APPEARANCES:	CLERK
For State of Nebraska	A. Stevenson Bogue Abigail Moland McGrath North First National Tower, Suite 3700 1601 Dodge Street Omaha, NE 68102
For Fraternal Order of Police,	Gary L. Young

Before Commissioners Blake, Vannoy and Carlson

IN THE MATTER OF THE LABOR

### NATURE OF THE CASE

Nebraska Protective Services

Lodge 88

The Parties filed a Joint Submission of Unresolved Issues Under 81-1382 on January 15, 2019, after having reached impasse on the stated issues for the labor contract for contract term July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021, pursuant to the State Employee Collective Bargaining Act (SECBA). This matter was heard by the Commission on February 14, 2019. This is the first opportunity for

the Commission to set wages and benefits under the amendments to SECBA at Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 81-1382 and 81-1383 adopted by LB 397 (2011).

### ARRAY

The first step in the comparability analysis required is to determine the comparator states to be included in the array. The Parties have stipulated that Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Wyoming, and Wisconsin shall be included in the array of comparable peers. The State of Nebraska has proposed South Dakota, Arkansas and Oklahoma for inclusion in the array. The FOP has proposed Colorado and North Dakota for inclusion in the array.

In order to determine the array the Commission is guided by Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 81-1383(2), which states:

- (c) For purposes of determining peer employer comparability, the following factors shall be used by the commission:
- (i) Geographic proximity of the employer;
- (ii) Size of the employer, which shall not be more than twice or less than one-half, unless evidence establishes that there are substantial differences which cause the work or conditions of employment to be dissimilar;
- (iii) The employer's budget for operations and personnel; and
- (iv) Nothing in this subdivision (2)(c) of this section shall prevent parties from stipulating to an array member that does not otherwise meet the criteria in such subdivision, and nothing in such subdivision shall prevent parties from stipulating to less than seven or more than nine array members.

The statute sets out three factors in picking an array. Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 81-1383(2)(c)(i) and (iii) do not define proximity or budget considerations. However, it is clear that size of the employer has a clear parameter. If a potential array member is less than half the size of Nebraska, then that state does not qualify as a comparator. If it is more than twice the size of Nebraska, it does not qualify. With respect to determining the size of the employer, both Parties presented data with

respect to full-time, non-university employees in each state. However, there were significant differences with respect to the actual numbers of such full-time public employees, most notably in Colorado. While the FOP presented evidence that there were approximately 32,000 full-time non-university employees in Colorado (Exhibit 503), the State presented more credible evidence that there were approximately 37,000 such employees. (Exhibits 1,32, and 63). The State, additionally, presented evidence as to the overall populations of the five states not in the agreed upon array. We have reviewed both of those criteria, namely full-time non-university employees and overall population in determining whether the size of the prospective comparators meets the parameters provided in the statute. We place primary emphasis on the number of employees. Using those data categories, we find that Arkansas and Oklahoma both satisfy the statutory size requirements. Colorado, South Dakota and North Dakota are all disqualified from further scrutiny due to failure to fall within this size limitation.

With respect to proximity, both Parties presented the measure to be the distance between Lincoln, Nebraska, and the capitols of the other states. The Commission finds that, in the context of the application of Neb. Rev. Stat. §81-1383(2)(c)(i), the distance between the state capitols of Arkansas and Oklahoma and Lincoln, Nebraska, namely 484 and 371 miles respectively, does not disqualify those states from inclusion in the array. With respect to the operating and personnel budgets, there were disparities in the data presented by the parties. However, nothing in the evidence was persuasive to disqualify the remaining states of Arkansas and Oklahoma on the basis of the budget information provided.

Therefore we conclude that Arkansas and Oklahoma meet all of the comparator criteria. We select an array of 7 states, which includes the five stipulated states of Iowa, Kansas, Wyoming, Wisconsin and Indiana; plus Arkansas and Oklahoma.

### **PAY RANGES**

Now we must turn to the pay ranges in the array states and Nebraska. The statute is clear that we must look at total compensation by job class or by bargaining unit.

In establishing wage rates, the commission shall take into consideration the overall compensation received by the employees at the time of the negotiations, having regard to:

- (A) Wages for time actually worked;
- (B) Wages for time not worked, including vacations, holidays, and other excused time, and all benefits received, including insurance and pensions; and
- (C) The continuity and stability of employment enjoyed by the employees.

  Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 81-1383(2)(b)(i).

The bargaining unit in this case is rather diverse, with members in twelve different job classifications. The Parties have stipulated that the job classifications for each job in the bargaining unit have been appropriately matched by the Parties, and to the minimum and maximum rates of pay in the array states for the positions of Corrections Corporal, Corrections Officer, Corrections Sergeant, Corrections Unit Caseworker, Mental Health Security Specialist I, Mental Health Security Specialist II, Youth Security Specialist II, Security Communications Specialist, Security Guard, and Developmental Disabilities Safety & Habilitation Specialist. (Exhibit 553). We will determine total compensation by job classification.

The statute is also clear that we must include wages and benefits that can be quantified with a dollar value and determine total compensation for comparisons with the array states. We have evidence of the minimums and maximums of the pay ranges in comparator states for the job classifications. For some of these classifications the evidence includes all seven array states. For the job classification of Developmental Disabilities Safety & Habilitation Specialist there is data

from only two array states. Unfortunately, we must decline to make any pay range changes for the job classification without data for at least three states. To do so would be speculation and conjecture.

Once we determine the comparisons based on total compensation, Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 81-1383(2)(b)(ii) requires that any changes to the pay scale in Nebraska be made to wage rates. Exhibit 558 shows the current pay ranges for all classes involved in this case in all of the array members, including the midpoints of both the minimums and maximums of the pay ranges. This data is also shown on Tables 1 through 10. It also shows the current minimums and maximums of the pay ranges in the bargaining unit. For instance, the midpoint for Corporals in the array is a minimum of \$15.84 per hour, and a maximum of \$25.28 per hour. Nebraska's current pay range is from \$18.44 to \$24.84 per hour for Corporals. (See Exhibit 558, page 1). compensation for Corporals in the array has a midpoint of \$23.25 per hour at the minimum and \$36.58 per hour at the maximum. 98% of this maximum is \$35.85 per hour. Nebraska's current total compensation minimum for Corporals is \$26.60 per hour and the maximum is \$35.38 per hour. At the maximum rate, insurance and miscellaneous benefits total \$8.68 per hour plus 7.5% of hourly pay as pension benefit. It can be argued that the result of this should be that the pay range in Nebraska should be stretched out by reducing the hourly rate of pay below what corporals are now paid, while increasing the maximum hourly pay.

Similar reductions in minimum pay could result from the evidence before us in other classifications. However, we decline to decrease minimum pay in any of the job classifications. Using Corporals as the example, we set the minimum hourly pay at a range from \$18.44 per hour to a maximum of \$25.27 per hour. (See Table 1).

There are several persuasive reasons for not decreasing the minimum hourly pay rates in this bargaining unit and instead setting the minimums at the current rates, among them:

- Nebraska has a published minimum pay that is the actual minimum pay. This is not the
  case in at least some of the array states. (Exhibit 545).
- Nebraska moves people up the pay scale very slowly, if at all. Approximately 85% of the corporals are now paid at the minimum hourly rate, and this is found throughout the bargaining unit. (Exhibit 546). There is very little movement within the pay ranges in Nebraska. The evidence is that this is not prevalent, but again, the evidence does not provide a means for the Commission to quantify this.
- The evidence is persuasive that morale and longevity in the bargaining unit is a significant concern, and adding to this condition could not serve the people of Nebraska well.
- Staffing needs under very difficult conditions.
- The State admitted that no wages should be decreased as a result of our findings in this
  case.
- Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 81-1383(2)(b)(i) states that when considering overall compensation,
   the Commission is to have regard to the continuity and stability of employment enjoyed by
   the employees.

These wage ranges shall apply to both current and new employees. (See Tables 1-10).

### PLACEMENT

We turn next to placement of employees on the pay scale. The Parties each argue for a method of placing employees on the new pay scale in a way that will place them in the same relative position they have occupied. We have previously referred to this as a compa-ratio method. The parties may not have correctly understood our intent in doing this. As we have used the term,

compa-ratio does not necessarily mean the employee's new pay scale placement is to be preserved relative to either the minimum or the maximum pay. Both methods have been used in the past in order to provide just results and avoid anomalies that could result from strict adherence to either method of calculations. In this case, current employees shall be placed by looking at their position on the old pay range as a percentage of the distance between the minimum and maximum pay and placing the employee at the same percentage on the new pay scale.

For example, a Corporal who is currently paid at the minimum hourly rate of \$18.44 has not advanced up the pay scale at all. Their pay will remain \$18.44 per hour. A Corporal who has been paid above the minimum has progressed a percentage of the spread between the minimum and maximum. The spread for the Corporal range has been \$6.40 between minimum and maximum pay. (See Table 1). A Corporal paid at the rate of \$24.00 per hour has advanced 86.9% along that spread, and will be placed on the new pay scale at that same point on the spread. The new spread from \$18.44 to \$25.27 per hour is \$6.83, and to place the Corporal on the new pay scale at 86.9% of the range, his or her wages shall be increased to the rate of \$24.38 per hour.

Another example can be described using the Corrections Officer classification. The spread from \$17.00 to \$24.41 is \$7.41. (See Table 2). An Officer who has been paid at the hourly rate of \$20.585 has been at 61% of the spread, and is now placed in the same position in the new spread. 61% of \$7.41 is \$4.52. When adding this amount to \$17.00, the result is placement on the pay scale at \$21.52 per hour.

### MOVEMENT WITHIN THE WAGE RANGE

The wage range movement information presented by the Parties demonstrates that it is prevalent to have some movement within the range (See Exhibits 16 and 516). While there may be movement within pay range, the data presented by the Parties does not demonstrate either that there is a consistent and prevalent methodology for such movement or that there is reliable evidence of the amounts of such movement. The State's expert testified that the movement within the wage range, which is described as "Combination," could include legislative action, executive order, merit pay, etc. and that such movement does not necessarily take place on a consistent regular or yearly basis. We note that, as described below, the survey data presented by the Parties clearly shows that no step system is prevalent among the comparators. Accordingly, while movement is prevalent, there is no prevalent and comparable methodology for such movement. and, under existing Commission precedents in wage and benefits setting matters, the Commission concludes that it cannot enter an Order of comparability in that regard. We reject, as unsupported by the data, the opinion of the FOP's expert that a movement of one percent to one and one-half percent should be ordered, since such personal opinion was not based on the data of the prevalent or comparability. (See Exhibit 549). The Commission finds that it is prevalent among the comparators that there should be no step movement within the pay range (Exhibits 16 and 516), and, accordingly, orders that there be no change in the existing practice and structure of no steps within the wage range.

### MANDATORY OVERTIME

The Commission finds that it is not prevalent among those states in the selected array to impose any restrictions upon the practice of mandatory overtime. Further it is not prevalent to restrict the total number of hours of mandatory overtime. While the testimony offered at the

hearing concerning the impact of mandatory overtime was compelling, the Commission declines to order any such restrictions.

### HOLIDAY/OVERTIME HOURS

The State has presented evidence to support its position that holiday hours should not be considered, when the holiday is not worked, to be hours worked for the purposes of calculating overtime. The data presented (Exhibit 19) clearly supports the conclusion that counting such hours is not prevalent. Accordingly, it is ordered that the present practice of counting such hours during the calculation of overtime be discontinued.

### LIFE INSURANCE

A review of the data submitted by both Parties (Exhibits 23 and 528) indicates that the present level of employer paid life insurance, namely \$20,000 should be increased. Accordingly, we order that such increase should be consistent with the midpoint of the array data rounded to the nearest \$1,000. (See Table 11). Such rounding would not undermine comparability. See *IBEW*, *Local 1521 v. MUD*, 18 CIR 319(2012).

### **ORDER**

IT IS ORDERED, that for the contract term of July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2021:

1. The rates of pay for the bargaining unit classifications of Corrections Corporal, Corrections
Officer, Corrections Sergeant, Corrections Unit Caseworker, Mental Health Security
Specialist I, Mental Health Security Specialist II, Youth Security Specialist I, Youth
Security Specialist II, Security Communications Specialist, and Security Guard, shall be
set as shown in the attached Tables. Where the Tables show that total compensation for a
classification in Nebraska has been less than ninety three percent of the array midpoint, the

wage rate increase for any employee whose wage rate would be increased to such extent

shall receive such increase in three equal annual increases.

2. The rates of pay for Developmental Disabilities Safety & Habilitation Specialist shall

remain unchanged.

3. The hourly rate of pay for current employees that currently earn above that minimum shall

be adjusted in accordance with the formula above.

4. There shall be no change in the existing practice and structure of movement, including no

steps within the wage ranges.

5. The Commission declines to impose restrictions on the use of mandatory overtime.

6. The present practice of counting unworked holiday hours towards the calculation of

overtime shall be discontinued.

7. The present level of employer-paid life insurance shall be increased consistent with the

midpoint of the array members.

All Panel Commissioners join in the entry of this Order.

Entered this 28th day of February, 2019.

NEBRASKA COMMISSION OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

William G. Blake, Commissioner

TABLE 1

### CORRECTIONS CORPORAL

		<b>I</b>	Hourly	I	Hourly						_						-	Total	۳	Total
		,34	Wage		Wage	Ξ	finimum	Maximum	Ę	Health		Health	Minimum	Ē	Maxi	Maximum	ŏ	Comp.	S	Comp.
State	Title	Ξ	Minimum	Σ	Maximum		Pension	Pension		Insurance		nsurance	Misc.	ď	Misc.	SC.	Ž	Minimum	Max	Maximum
Arkansas	Correctional Corporal	\$\$	15.58	s	22.59	s	2.26	\$		\$ 3.05	5	3.05	ş	1.44	ş	3.43	[ 40	22.32	٠,	32.34
Oklahoma	Correctional Security Officer III	\$	12.08	\$	22.14	<b>₹</b>	1.99	\$	3.65	\$ 4.10	0	4.10	\$	1.21	\ v	403	ŀ٧	19.38		33.92
Indiana	Correctional Officer	\$	15.00	ş	25.28	4	1.68	\$ 2	2.83	\$ 4.12	2	4.12	. 45	8		4.17	٠ .	22.60		36.40
lowa	Senior Correctional Officer	ş	21.24	ş	31.76	s	2.01	\$ 3	3.00	\$ 5.10	o S	5.10	V	1 74	٠	492		30.08	, ,	44.78
Kansas	Corrections Officer II	s	15.03	w	21.13	S	1.99	\$ 2	67.5	\$ 3.67	7 \$	3.67	· 47	33	٠,	2 8	, <del>.</del>	22.02	,	30.68
Wisconsin	Correctional Officer	\$	16.65	ş	28.47	\$	1.78	 د	3.05	\$ 4.48	8	4.48	·	2,1	· v	4.43	· .	24.61	, s	40.43
Wyoming	Wyoming Corrections Corporal	Ş	17.09	45	25.63	45	1.43	٠	2.15	\$ 6.20	S C	6.20	Ş	19	اح	4.75		4.75 \$ 26.33	.ب	38.73
				ĺ										1			٠		١	

Mean	\$ 16.	5.10   \$	25.29		_	:		\$ 2	23.91   \$	36.75
		Ĺ								
Wedian	\$ 15.5	85	25.28		_			4	22 En 🕏	36.40
	ļ	Į.								
Midpoint	\$ 15.8	84	25.28					\$ 23	23.25 \$	36.58

NE % of Midpoint -3.27%	Maximum:	mum:   98% of
		New Hourly Wage   Min

1.86 \$ 5.08 \$ 5.08 \$ 1.70 \$ 3.60 \$ 26.60 \$ 35.38

1.38 \$

24.84 \$

18.44 \$

Nebraska | Corrections Corporal

			Maximum:
New Hourly Wage	Minimum:	111	98% of
Computation	No Change	a	Midpoint
Total Compensation	\$ 26.60	0	\$ 35.85
Health Ins.	\$ (5.08)	8	\$ (5.08)
Misc.	\$ (1.70)	6	\$ (3.60)
Subtotal	\$ 19.82	7	\$ 27.17
Pension (7.5%)	\$ 1.38	8	\$ 1.90
New Hourly Wage	\$ 18.44		\$ 25.27

TABLE 2
CORRECTIONS OFFICER

State Title Arkansas Corre			2	2		_		_		_					_	į	144	ŀ	1
Sas		<u> </u>	_	-												=	TOTAL	_	OT S
sas		3	Wage	Wage	Ξ	Minimum	Maximum	Ę	Health	<u> </u>	Health	Minimum		Maximum	E	ಽ	Comp.	Ŝ	Comp.
		Minim	E I	Maximum		Pension	Pension		Insurance		Insurance	Misc.	,;	Misc.		Z	Minimum	Maxi	Maximum
1	Correctional Officer I	ş	13.94	\$ 20.25	\$	2.02	\$ 2.	2.94	\$ 2.76		2.76	Ş	1.29	ئد س	7	S	20.01	Ş	29.07
Oklahoma Corre	Correctional Security Officer II	\$	10.98	\$ 20.13	ş	1.81	\$	3.32	\$ 3.62	ş	3.62	s	9	دي س	3.75	, v	17.51	ا	30.82
Indiana Corre	Corrections Officer	ş	15.00	\$ 25.28	\$	1.68	\$ 2.	2.83	\$ 3.64	₩.	3.64	\$	28	S	4.15	V	22.10		35.90
lowa Corre	Corrections Officer	ş	19.51	\$ 28.91	\$	1.84	\$ 2.	2.73	\$ 4.67	ۍ.	4.67	5	19	\ \sqrt{2}	4.54		27.63	. .	40.85
Kansas Corre	Corrections Officer I (A&B)	\$	13.61	\$ 20.13	\$	1.80	\$ 2.	2.66	\$ 3,54	\s	3.54	3	5	,	2 96	· ·	20.16	, ,	20,00
Wisconsin Corrections Officer	sctions Officer	s	16.65	\$ 28.47	\$	1.78	ۍ ښ	3.05	\$ 4.06	\ \ \	4.06	S	1.70	\$ \$	4.43	· V	24.19	- v	40.01
Wyoming   Corrections Officer	ections Officer	v	15.56 \$	ı	45	1.30	\$ 1	1.95	\$ 5.66	·   ~	5.66	\$	1.47	V	4.43 \$		23.99	· .	35.39

Mean	٠	15.04	'n	23.79		_		[	<u> </u>			\$ 22	22.23 \$	34.48	<u></u>
Median	Ý	15.00	7	75 50	┞	  -			1		ĺ				Т
	۸	20.02	4	23.34	-							\$ 22	22.10   \$	35,39	
Midpoint	v	15.02	٠Ņ	23.56				•	_	_		, ,	22 16 4	34 92	٦,
							7		1	$\frac{1}{1}$	1	; }	<u>}</u>	,	ī

		Ž	Maximum:
New Hourly Wage	Minimum:	···	98% of
Computation	No Change		Midpoint
Total Compensation	\$ 24.51	\$	34.23
Health Ins.	\$ (4.67)	ş	(4.67)
Misc.	\$ (1.57)	Ş	(3.32)
Subtotal	\$ 18.27	\$	26.24
Pension (7.5%)	\$ 1.27	ş	1.83
New Hourly Wage \$	\$ 17.00	ş	24.41

-6.68%

1.57 \$ 3.32 \$ 24.51 \$ 32.60

4.67

4.67 \$

1.27 \$

\$ 17.00 \$ 22.90 \$

Nebraska Corrections Officer

### TABLE 3 CORRECTIONS SERGEANT

			2	1			-		-							ľ	,		
		<u>-</u>		É	- August												Total	<u>~</u>	Total
_			Wage	5	Wage	Minimum		Maximum		Health	Health		Minimum		Maximum	Ŭ	Comp.	ප	Comb.
State	Title	Ž	Minimum		Maximum	Pension	5	Pension	_	Insurance	Insurance		Misc.		Misc.	Ž	Minimum	Max	Maximum
Arkansas	Correctional Sergeant	Ϋ́	17.38	Υ	25.20	\$	2.52	\$ 3.65	ļ-	3.71	\$ 3.71	47	1,60	4	3.78	1	25.22	v	75 35
Oklahoma	Correctional Security Manager	ş	17.68	\$	32.42	\$	2.92	\$ 5.35	8	5.23	\$ 5.23	\ \	17	, ,	5.45	v	27.60	٧ ٧	48.45
Indiana	Correctional Sergeant	8	15.45	8	27.64	\ \ \ \	1 73	\$ 310	ľ	5.24	2 5 24	} v	1 00	٠	200	٠ ٠	20.72	١.	
10,10				ŀ		֡֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֡֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֡֓֜֡֓֜			<u>\</u>		7	2	1.03	Դ	, ,	<u>م</u>	24.31	<sub>ጉ</sub>	40.25
PMO	Correctional Seupervisor	Λ	22.35	Λ.	37.29	\$	2.11	\$ 3.52	s	6.11	\$ 6.11	<u>1</u>	1.83	Ś	5.65	s	32,41	'n	52.58
Kansas	Corrections Supervisor I	44	17.39	⋄	24.28	\$	2.30	\$ 3.23	Ş	3.99	\$ 3.99	۷ 0	1 54	\ \ \	3 40	V	25.32		25.20
Wisconsin	Correctional Sergeant	\$	17.45	s	30.39	\$	1.87	\$ 3.25	42	5.47	· v	7 2	, ×	,	77.7	v	26.57	2 0	43.85
Wyoming	Vyoming Correctional Sergeant	45	21.59	s	32.39	S	1.81	\$ 2.71	\ \	7.47	٠,	, .	203	√ ا	7 70	) v	70 CE \$ 07.27	۰ ۰	76.97

	ľ					i						
Mean	₩.	18.47	'n	29.94		_		-	_	5 77.75	7.	43.61
-	-		ŀ	Ì				1			,	5
Median	'n	17.45	S	30.39			_	_		\$ 26.57	2 4	13.85
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ŀ		ŀ	T		1		1	+	,	}	43.03
Wiidpoint	vs	17.96	'n	30.17						\$ 27.16	9	43 72
							$\left  \right $	-				,

9 \$ 38.56	-11.82%
3.85 \$ 30.19	NE % of Midpoint
\$ 6.14 \$ 1.90	
1.99 \$ 6.14	i
5.58 1.54	
\$ 20.60 \$ 26	
Corrections Sergeant	
Nebraska	

		Maximum:
New Hourly Wage	Minimum: No	98% of
Computation	Change	Midpoint
Total Compensation	\$ 30.19	\$ 42.85
Health Ins.	\$ (6.14)	\$ (6.14)
Misc.	\$ (1.90)	\$ (3.85)
Subtotal	\$ 22.15	\$ 32.86
Pension (7.5%)	\$ 1.55	\$ 2.29
New Hourly Wage	\$ 20.60	\$ 30.57

### CORRECTIONS UNIT CASEWORKER

													H		L			
		Hourly		Hourly												Total		Total
		Wage	_	Wage	Min.	Minimum Maximum	Maxi	mnm	Health		Health	Minimum		Maximum		Con		e de c
State	Title	Minimum		Maximum		Pension		Pension	Insurance	e Inst	Insurance			ĭ		Minimum		Maximum
Arkansas	ADC/DCC Treatment Coordinator	\$ 19.39	<u>ئ</u>	28.12	ş	2.81	1		\$ 2.8	2.86 \$	2.86	ş	1.79	4.16	· ·	416 \$ 7685	<del></del>	39.22
Oklahoma	Correctional Case Mgr II	\$ 13.38	& \$÷	24.53	\$	2.21	s	4.05	\$ 3.78	-51	3.78		34	4 3F	\ <del>'</del>	20.71	٠,٠	36.73
Indiana	Corrections Caseworker 4	\$ 12.84	4 \$	22.45	V.	1 44	v	251	281		6	, ,	2	F	۱ (		ŀ	1 6
							•	;	,	,	3.01	÷	'n	0.73	<u>م</u>	70.67	^	37.70
owa	Correctional Counselor	\$ 23.29	ۍ ص	35.31	Ŷ	2.20	⋄	3.33	\$ 4.82	2 3	4.82	Ş	1.89	5.38	٠.	32.20	v	48.84
Kansas	Corrections Counselor I	\$ 17.39	\$	24.48	ν	2.30 \$	ź.	3.73	\$ 3.59	tr.	2.50	- V	1 5	2 40	1	20 00	, .	2 70
Wisconsin			_							<u>}</u>	3	i }		7	<u>. </u>	10:47	٦_	24./3
Wyoming	/yoming Caseworker	\$ 19.9	8	29.89	٠ <u>٠</u>	1.67	ļ	2 50	1993 \$ 2989 \$ 167 \$ 250 \$ 505 \$ 505 \$ 505 \$ 505	V	100		100	100	·	5	ŀ	
			-		,	-		2	2		2.00	٠ <del>١</del>	8	CC.C .	<u>^</u>	27.33	^	43.59
															1		4	

\$ 25 59   \$ 39.28	٠.	16.16 ¢ co.c2 ¢	\$ 25.71 \$ 38.62
17.70 \$ 27.46	18.39 \$ 26.33		.us \$ 26.89
n \$ 17.	lan \$ 18.	Soint 6 40	7 Tg:02

27.09 \$ 36.76	-4.82%
3.81 \$ 2	<b>NE % of Midpoint</b>
\$ 1.78	S
4.64	
4.64	
1.97	
1.44	
\$ 26.33	
\$ 19.23	
Corrections Unit Caseworker	
Nebraska	

		Maximum:
New Hourly Wage	Minimum: No	98% of
Computation	Change	Midpoint
Total Compensation	\$ 27.09	\$ 37.85
Health Ins.	\$ (4.64)	\$ (4.64)
Misc.	\$ (1.78)	\$ (3.81)
Subtotal	\$ 20.67	\$ 29.40
Pension (7.5%)	\$ 1.44	\$ 2.05
New Hourly Wage	\$ 19.23	\$ 27.35

## TABLE 5 MENTAL HEALTH SECURITY SPECIALIST I

_		;													
		Houriy	_	Hourly									Total	Total	쿋
		Wage		Wage	Minimum	Ē	Maximum	Health	Health	Minimum		Maximum	Comb.	Como	Ď,
State	Title	Minimum	_	Maximum	Pension		Pension	Insurance	Insurance				Minimum	2	E E
Arkansas	Behavioral Health Aide	\$ 12.52	2 \$	\$ 18.15	\$ 1.82	32	5 2.63	\$ 3.78			9	_	19.28		7 40
Oklahoma						H				ŀ	}		7	,	
Indiana	Behav Hith Recovery Attendnt	\$ 11.26	S	20.61	45	1.26	\$ 2.31	\$ 5.35	\$ 5.35	Į,	1.45 ¢	2 70	10 27	ų.	24.75
lowa	Residential Treatment Worker	\$ 15.89	5	23.21	٠,	5	2 70	-   ·	}   •	, ,	7 20 1	7 6	10.04	ን <sup>6</sup>	
Kansas	Mental Health/Dev Disab Tech	\$ 12.35	5	17.39	,   -	3 6	2 30	, .	<u> ۲</u>	<b>م</b> د	200	20.0	10.42	م م	20.45
Wisconsin	Residental Care Tech Objective	\$ 14.76	5	24.55	\$ 1.1	85	2.63	} }	٧,	3 V	5 V	2077	23.41	ر د د د	26.03
Wyoming	Health Care Assistant	\$ 12.60 \$	\$	18.90	\$ 1.0	1.05	5 1.58	· ·	× •		1 19 \$	3 8	22.44	٧	200

	31.56	1	20.88 \$ 31.82	21.15 \$ 31.69
Ŀ	\$ 13.23   \$ 20.47	\$ 12.56 \$ 19.76	١	\$ 12.90   \$ 20.11
	Medil	Median		Widpoint

\$ 29.83	-5.86%									
21.89										
2.79	NE % of Midpoint									
1.23 \$ 2.79	NE % of									
6.37 \$		<del></del>							<b>.</b>	_
6.37 \$		Maximum:	98% of	Midpoint	31.05	(6.37)	(2.79)	21.89	1.53	70.37
		Σ			\$	\$	\$	ş	❖	v
1.44	Ė		um: No	Change	21.89	(6.37)	(1.23)	14.29	1.00	13.29
\$ 00.			Minimum: No	Cha	Ş	\$	\$	\$	\$	·
13.29 \$ 19.24 \$ 1.00 \$ 1.44 \$			New Hourly Wage	Computation	Total Compensation \$	Health Ins.	Misc.	Subtotal	Pension (7.5%)	New Hourly Wage
Nebraska   Mental Health Security Specialist						•				

# TABLE 6 MENTAL HEALTH SECURITY SPECIALIST II

		Hourly Wage		Hourly Wage	_	Minimum	Maxi		Health	Health		Minimum	. –	Maximum		Total Comp.		Total Comp.
Arkansas		WILLIAM WITH		Maximum	- 1	Pension	- Pe	Pension	Insurance Insurance	Insuran	2	Misc.	Σ	Misc.	Ξ	Minimum		Maximum
Oklahoma			+		_						1				┵			
Indiana Spec	Special Attendant	\$ 11.	76	11.76 \$ 22.53	\$	1.32	s	2.52	\$ 3.53	ş	3.53	5 1.43	ş	3.72	42	3.72 \$ 18.04	22	32.30
ю Реус	Psych Sec Spec/Res Treat Tech	\$ 18.	18.14	\$ 28.91	\$	1.71	\$	2.73	\$ 4.57	ş	4.57	1.51	\$	4.54	s	25.63		40.75
Kansas Men	Mental Heatth/Dev Dis Tech	\$ 12.	12.35 \$	\$ 17.39	\$	1.63	s	2.30	\$ 3.51	8	3.51	1.09	Ş	2.62	s	18.58	5	25.82
Wisconsin Psyc	lisconsin Psychiatric Care Tech Adv	\$ 17.	17.45 \$	\$ 30.39	s	1.87	₩	3.25	\$ 3.97	\$	3.97	3 1.78	\s	4.73	٠	25.07	\$	42.34
Wyoming Heal	yoming Health Care Technician	\$ 17.	60	17.09 \$ 25.63 \$	\$	1.43	\$	2.15	\$ 5.54	\$	5.54 \$	3 1.61 \$	s	4.75	\$	4.75 \$ 25.67 \$	1	38.07

Mean	Ŷ	15.36	\$	24.97					<u></u>	\$ 22	22.60   \$	35.86
Median	٠	17.09	ş	25.63		<u> </u>		-		\$ 25	25.07 \$	38.07
Midpoint	ş	16.22	Ś	25.30		_				\$ 23	23.83 \$	36.96

3.22 \$ 22.48 \$ 31.69

4.56 \$ 1.42 \$

4.56

1.67

\$ 15.35 \$ 22.24 \$

Nebraska | Mental Health Security Specialist II

-14.27%

-5.67%

NE % of Midpoint									
	Maximum:	98% of	Midpoint	\$ 36.23	\$ (4.56)	\$ (3.22)	\$ 28.45	\$ 1.98	\$ 26.46
	Minimum:	98% of	Midpoint	\$ 23.36	\$ (4.56)	\$ (1.42)	\$ 17.38	\$ 1.21	\$ 16.16
		New Hourly Wage	Computation	Total Compensation	Health Ins.	Misc.	Subtotal	Pension (7.5%)	New Hourly Wage

TABLE 7

# SECURITY COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST

		Rourly	Hourly				:				l	Total
State	Title	wage Minimum	wage Maximum		E 3	Minimum Maximum Pension Pension	Health Insurance	Health		Minimum Maximum Misc. Misc.	Comp.	Comp. Comp. Minimum Maximum
Arkansas					$\vdash$				<u></u>			
Oklahoma												ļ ļ
Indiana					-	<u> </u>						
lowa	Corrections Center Spec I	\$ 17.13	17.13 \$ 25.08	\$ 1.62	2 \$	2.37	\$ 2.37 \$ 3.81	s	3.81 \$ 1.42	\$ 4.03 \$ 23.98 \$	\$ 23.98	\$ 35,28
Kansas	Communications Officer	\$ 14.30	\$ 20.13	\$ 1.89	\$	2.66	\$ 3.27	S	\$ 1.27	\$ 2.96	\$ 20.72	
Wisconsin		\$ 16.05	\$ 24.55	\$ 1.72	2 \$	2.63	\$ 3.22	\$ 3.22	ŝ	S	100	1
Wyoming												1

Mean	'n	15.83	ş	23.25		-	 		_	\$ 22.44	4 5	32.84
	L	_		Ì		İ						
Median	'n	16.05	s	24.55						5 22 63	ý	24.22
	ŀ			Ť			-			,		]
Midpoint	s	15.94	s	23.90				_		\$ 22.54	\$ 5	33.53
						j				1	٠.	

\$ 86.0

\$ 13.09 \$ 18.96

Nebraska Security Communications Specialist

2.75 \$ 19.04 \$ 26.89

-19.80%

-15.52%

	Maximum:	98% of Midpoint	32.86	(3.76)	(2.75)	26.35	1.84	24.51
-		FL.	ş	\$ (	\$	\$	\$	ş
	Minimum:	98% of Midpoint	\$ 22.09	\$ (3.76)	\$ (1.21)	\$ 17.12	\$ 1.19	\$ 15.92
		New Hourly wage Computation	Total Compensation   \$	Health Ins.	Misc.	Subtotal	Pension (7.5%)	New Hourly Wage \$

### TABLE 8 SECURITY GUARD

		Hourly	<b>T</b>	Hourly											<u>ح</u> ر	Total	Total
	<del></del>	Wage	_	Wage	Minimum	mg .	Maximum	표	Health	ľ	Health	Minimum	E	Maximum	ა	Comp.	Comp.
State	Title	Minimum	Σ	Maximum	Pension	.o.	Pension		Insurance	Inst	Insurance	Misc.		Misc.	Ž.	Minimum	Maximum
Arkansas	Security Officer	\$ 12.52		\$ 18.18	٠Ş	1.82	\$ 2.	.63	\$ 2.20	٠,	2.20	\$ 1.1	9	\$ 1.82 \$ 2.63 \$ 2.20 \$ 2.20 \$ 1.16 \$ 2.84 \$ 17.69	ý	17.69	\$ 75.87
Oklahoma								T					-				
Indiana	Security Officer 3	\$ 9.53	45	17.18	\$	1.07	\ \$	1.92	\$ 2.69	Ş	2,69	\$ 1.1	16	2.84	۰	\$ 14.44	\$ 24.63
lowa	Security Guard II	\$ 13.81	₩	19.88	ŝ	1.30	\$ 1	88	\$ 3.81	\$	3.81	\$ 1.1	1.18	3.35		20.10	
Kansas	Safety & Security Officer I	\$ 13.61	\$	19.16	s	1.80	\$ 2.	2.53	\$ 3.27	\sqr	3.27	\$ 1.2	21 \$	2.84	ŀ	19.88	\$ 27.80
Wisconsin	Visconsin Security Officer II/III	\$ 13.18	٠	24.35	٠.	1.41	\$ 2	2.61	\$ 3.22	⋄	3.22	\$ 1.3	.34	3.79	·	19.16	\$ 33.97
Wyoming	Vyoming Security Guard II	\$ 13.94	\$	20.92	ζņ	1.17 \$	ļ	1.75	\$ 4.58	5	4.58	\$ 1.3	1.31	4.09 \$	٠ ٧٥	21.00	ŀ

18 18 71   \$ 18 71   \$ 18 71   \$ 18 74	· v	·	
7 \$ 19.95	0 \$ 19.52	8 \$ 19.73	
\$ 12.7	\$ 13.44	\$ 13.03	
Mean	Median	Midpoint	

2.55 \$ 18.78 \$ 26.09

1.12

4.57

4.57

1.32

\$ 12.18 \$ 17.64 \$ 0.91 \$

Nebraska Security Guard

-8.62%

NE % of Midpoint

New Hourly Wage	Minimum: No	Maximum: 98% of
Computation	Change	Midpoint
Total Compensation	\$ 18.78	\$ 27.98
Health ins.	(4.57)	(4.57)
Misc.	(1.12)	(2.55)
Subtotal	\$ 13.09	\$ 20.86
Pension (7.5%)	\$ 0.91	\$ 1.46
New Hourly Wage	\$ 12.18	\$ 19.40

TABLE 9
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST I

State         Title         Maximum         Hourly         Hourly         Maximum         Minimum           Arkansas         Youth Services Technician         \$ 13.96         \$ 20.25         \$ 2.02           Oklahoma         Juvenile Security Officer II         \$ 10.31         \$ 18.30         \$ 1.70           Indiana         Correctional Officer         \$ 15.00         \$ 25.28         \$ 1.68           Iowa         Youth Services Worker         \$ 16.36         \$ 25.28         \$ 1.68           Kansas         Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 13.61         \$ 20.13         \$ 1.80           Wisconsin         Youth Counselor         \$ 16.55         \$ 27.68         \$ 1.80										
Hourly Hourly Hourly Hourly Hourly Wage Wage Wage Wage Wage Wage Worker   13.96 \$ 20.25										
Title         Wage         Wage           Youth Services Technician         \$ 13.96         \$ 20.25           Juvenile Security Officer II         \$ 10.31         \$ 18.30           Correctional Officer         \$ 15.00         \$ 25.28           Youth Services Worker         \$ 16.36         \$ 23.91           Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 16.36         \$ 20.13           Youth Counselor         \$ 16.65         \$ 27.68	_							Total		Total
Title         Minimum         Maximum         Pens           Youth Services Technician         \$ 13.96         \$ 20.25         \$           B. Juvenile Security Officer II         \$ 10.31         \$ 18.30         \$           Correctional Officer         \$ 15.00         \$ 25.28         \$           Youth Services Worker         \$ 16.36         \$ 23.91         \$           Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 13.61         \$ 20.13         \$           Youth Counselor         \$ 16.65         \$ 27.68         \$	Wage		Maximum	Health	Health	Minimum	Maximum	Comb.		Como.
Youth Services Technician         \$ 13.96         \$ 20.25         \$           a Livenile Security Officer II         \$ 10.31         \$ 18.30         \$           Correctional Officer         \$ 15.00         \$ 25.28         \$           Youth Services Worker         \$ 16.36         \$ 23.91         \$           Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 13.61         \$ 20.13         \$           Vouth Counselor         \$ 16.65         \$ 27.68         \$	Maximum		Pension	Insurance	Insurance			Minimum		Maximum
Juvenile Security Officer II         \$ 10.31         \$ 18.30         \$           Correctional Officer         \$ 15.00         \$ 25.28         \$           Youth Services Worker         \$ 16.36         \$ 23.91         \$           Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 13.61         \$ 20.13         \$           Youth Counselor         \$ 16.65         \$ 27.68         \$	\$ 13.96 \$	2.02	2.94	\$ 2.37	\$ 2.37	\$ 1.29	\$ 3.12	\$ 19.65	٠	28.68
na         Correctional Officer         \$ 15.00         \$ 25.28         \$           Youth Services Worker         \$ 16.36         \$ 23.91         \$           as         Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 13.61         \$ 20.13         \$           onsin         Youth Counselor         \$ 16.65         \$ 27.68         \$	\$ 10.31 \$	1.70 \$	3.02	\$ 2.95	\$ 2.95	\$ 1.03	\$ 3.50	\$ 15.99	5	77.76
Youth Services Worker         \$ 16.36         \$ 23.91         \$           as         Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 13.61         \$ 20.13         \$           onsin         Youth Counselor         \$ 16.65         \$ 27.68         \$	٠,	1.68 \$	2.83	\$ 2.98	\$ 2.98	\$ 1.76	٠,	\$ 21.42	2 2	35.77
Juvenile Corrections Officer I A&B         \$ 13.61         \$ 20.13         \$           Isin         Youth Counselor         \$ 16.65         \$ 27.68         \$	\$ 16.36 \$	1.54 \$	2.26	\$ 4.07	\$ 4.07	\$ 1.37	· ~		1 4	34.12
Youth Counselor \$ 16.65 \$ 27.68 \$	\$ 13.61 \$	1.80	2.66	\$ 3.35	5 3.35	171	\$ 2.96		۷ و	29 10
	5	1.78 \$	2.96	\$ 3.48	\$ 3.48	\$ 1.70	\$ 4.31	\$ 23.61	) v	38.44
Wyoming Youth Services Security Officer \$ 13.95 \$ 20.92 \$ 1.1	\$ 13.95 \$	1.17 \$	1.75	\$ 4.92	S	\$ 1.31	۰	٠	5.	31.68

\$ 14.26 \$ 22.35	. 0	ş
14.26	13.96	14.11
S	\$	100
ean	ledian	lidpoint

4.51 \$ 4.51 \$ 1.23 \$ 2.79 \$ 20.02 \$ 27.98

\$ 13.29 \$ 19.24 \$ 1.00 \$

Nebraska Youth Security Specialist I

-4.92% -12.32%

NE % of Midpoint								
	Max: 98% of	Midpoint	\$ 31.27	\$ (4.51)	\$ (2.79)	\$ 23.97	\$ 1.67	\$ 22.30
	Min: 98% of   Max: 98% of	Midpoint	\$ 20.64	\$ (4.51)	\$ (1.23)	\$ 14.90	\$ 1.04	\$ 13.86
	New Hourly Wage	Computation	Total Compensation	Health Ins.	Misc.	Subtotal	Pension (7.5%)	New Hourly Wage
•								

TABLE 10
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST II

				-												
		Hourly Wage	Hourly Wage		Minimum	Minimum Maximum		Health	Health	Minimum		Maximum	ט⊥	Total Comp.	Total	[e] 21
State	Title	Minimum	Maximum		Pension	Pension	Ē	Insurance	Insurance			Misc.	Σ	<u></u>	Maximum	
Arkansas							<del> </del>				<u> </u>					
Oklahoma	Juvenile Security Officer III	\$ 10.98	\$ 20.13	13	5 1.81	\$ 3.32	\$	3.57	\$ 3.57	\$ 1.10	÷	3.75	8	3.75 \$ 17.46 \$	1	30.77
Indiana	Correctional Officer	\$ 15.00	\$ 25.28	78	\$ 1.68	\$ 2.83	3	3.60	s	ş	Ş	4.14	ا	22.05	1	35.86
lowa	Youth Services Technician	\$ 17.88	۲S	8	\$ 1.69	\$ 2.48	3	4.63	\$ 4,63	٠	₹S	4.20	·γ	25.69	\$	37.61
Kansas	Juvenile Corrections Officer II	\$ 15.73	\$ 21.13	13	\$ 2.08	\$ 2.79	\$	3.53	\$ 3.53	S	\$	3.08	۰	22.73	ş	30.53
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Youth Counselor Advanced	\$ 17.45	\$	39	5 1.87	\$ 3.25	\$	4.03	\$ 4.03	s	Ş	4.73	w	25.12	\$	42.40
Wyoming	Wyoming Youth Services Specialist II	\$ 17.09	\$ 25.63	63	\$ 1.43	\$ 2.15	43	5.61	\$ 5.61	ş	ş		٠,	4.75 \$ 25.74 \$	1	38.14
								İ						1	ı	]

			ŀ		-	ľ	ŀ		Ì				
Mean	\$	15.69	ഗ	24.81		_		_		Ş	23.13	'n	35.89
Median	`` \$	16.41	ν,	25.46	_		<u> </u>			· \	23.92	· v	36.74
Widpoint	\$	16.05	s	25.13			-			8	23.53	Ş	36.31
		Ì	ĺ									-	

\$ 22.35 \$ 31.56

3.22

4.43 \$ 4.43 \$ 1.42

1.67

1.15

\$ 15.35 \$ 22.24

Nebraska Youth Security Specialist II

-5.00% -13.08%

New Hourly Wage	Min: 98% of Max: 98% of	Max: 98%
Computation	Midpoint	Midpoint
Total Compensation	\$ 23.06	\$ 35.58
Health Ins.	\$ (4.43)	\$ (4.43)
Misc.	\$ (1.42)	\$ (3.22)
Subtotal	\$ 17.21	\$ 27.93
Pension (7.5%)	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.95
New Hourly Wage   \$	\$ 16.01	\$ 25.99

TABLE 11 LIFE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

	Calculation
State	Amount
Arkansas	\$10,000.00
Oklahoma	\$20,000.00
Indiana	\$55,839.00
lowa	\$20,000.00
Kansas	\$55,839.00
Wisconsin	\$37,226.00
Wyoming	\$50,000.00
Mean	\$35,557.71
Median	\$37,226.00
Midpoint	\$36,391.86
Nebraska	\$20,000.00