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## INTRODUCTION

## INTRODUCTION

- The Legislative Council of the Indiana General Assembly assigned the Budget Committee ("the Committee") the task of completing a total rewards study (i.e., compensation and benefits) for the Indiana State Police Department ("ISP").
- The Committee asked Mercer to complete a total rewards analysis of all ranking officers of the ISP.
- Mercer worked with officials within the Indiana State Budget Agency and Personnel Department ("Project Team") to coordinate the review.
- This report contains detailed analysis of the data collected by Mercer for the benefit of the State of Indiana.
- This report will be provided to the Committee at a meeting in the Spring of 2016.

It is important to note that Mercer collected and is reporting information used for hiring new officers, as well as data on the compensation and benefits provided to existing officers. For these reasons, the data reported is robust and in some cases, complex. This report does not contain recommendations. It is intended to provide the Indiana Legislative Council with an understanding of the competitive positioning of ISP total rewards.

## O V ERARCHINGMETHODOLOGY

## Data Collection

- Mercer worked with the ISP Project Team to develop a comparator group of police entities from surrounding states and certain cities and counties within the state of Indiana to assess the competitive offering of total rewards from all quadrants and the central part of Indiana. These police entities include:

1. Illinois State Police ("Illinois")*
2. Kentucky State Police ("Kentucky")
3. Michigan State Police ("Michigan")*
4. Ohio State Police ("Ohio")*
5. Fort Wayne Police Department ("Fort Wayne")*
6. Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department ("Indianapolis")*
7. Scottsburg Police Department ("Scottsburg")
8. Valparaiso Police Department ("Valparaiso")*
9. Hamilton County Sheriff's Office ("Hamilton County")
10. Knox County Sheriff's Department ("Knox County")
11. Marion County Sheriff's Department ("Marion County")


## OVERARCHING METHODOLOGY

## Data Collection (continued)

- Mercer prepared a data request (see Appendix A) that was distributed in a memo by Brian Bailey, Doug Carter, and Denny Darrow and sent to representatives within each comparator police entity (see Appendix B for list of participant contacts).
- Mercer collected data, as available, for benefits, base pay, and other compensation pay elements, including overtime, shift differentials, hazardous duty pay, uniform allowances, education reimbursement, take home vehicles, and special bonuses, Social Security exemption and pension funding status for the following officer classifications: Trooper Trainee, Probationary Trooper, Trooper, Corporal, Sergeant, First Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Major, Lieutenant Colonel, Colonel and Superintendent.
- Each police entity was provided with a redacted version of this report and was asked to validate Mercer's representation of their data. A copy of the full report will also be distributed to each police entity in early 2016, once feedback from the Indiana Budget Committee is received and the report is finalized.


## Compensation

- Compensation data was collected as of August 2015. Actual pay analysis is derived from the 2014 payroll files received from each police entity, which represents a full year of payment for the various compensation elements highlighted in this report.
- Unlike Indiana, not all police entities utilize a 20 year pay matrix, which is a schedule of the pay officers will receive upon hire and at various points in time thereafter. The two main practices are 1) a year-by-year pay matrix with maximums of 20 or 25 years or 2) fixed base pay for all officers within a rank plus longevity pay based on years of service. For analysis purposes, all police entities have been converted to a year-by-year pay matrix, using base pay plus the respective longevity pay, if any.
- ISP compensation data are compared to the pay matrices at the comparator group's 25 th percentile, median, average, and 75 th percentile for competitive assessment purposes.
- ISP data are not included in the comparator group's data set for the competitive assessment.


## Compensation (continued)

- To account for pay differences due to cost of labor variances across states compared to the state of Indiana, Mercer applied a geographic differential to the state police entities (i.e., Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio). Geographic differentials were collected from Economic Research Institute's Geographic Assessor.
- Geographic differentials applied to the state police entities are represented below (negative numbers indicate that wages are higher in the comparator state than those of Indiana and positive numbers indicate that wages are lower in the comparator state than Indiana):
- Illinois to Indiana adjustment: -9.5\%.
- Kentucky to Indiana adjustment: $+3.5 \%$.
- Michigan to Indiana adjustment: -7.0\%.
- Ohio to Indiana adjustment: -2.9\%.
- Geographic differentials were not applied to data represented within Indiana.
- Geographical differentials had a small impact on the analysis.
- Not all comparator police entities utilize the ISP officer classifications for which data was solicited. In these instances, "classification not in use" is abbreviated as CNIU throughout the report. Additionally, to account for titling differences, some police entity positions were combined (Refer to Appendix C).
- Detailed Project Methodology is included in Appendix D.
- Details of police entity compensation and benefits data, as well as any assumptions and footnotes made in reporting their data within this report, are provided in Appendix E.


## OVERARCHING METHODOLOGY

## Benefits

- Benefits data was collected as of August 2015.
- Benefits are valued using the coverage replacement method. The values represent the cost to the officer of employer provided benefits if he or she left the employer and were to purchase coverage to duplicate the benefits in the marketplace. This approach removes the influence of claims utilization and vendor fee negotiations from the cost of providing benefit coverage.
- When multiple benefit plans were present, the plan with the highest number of officer enrollments was included in the study.
- When multiple retirement plans were present, the plan being offered to new hired officers was included in the study.
- Total benefits consists of time loss, health, and retirement benefits.
- Time loss benefits include paid leave (i.e., paid time off, vacation, holidays, personal leave, and sick time) and short-term and long-term disability.
- Health benefits include medical insurance, dental insurance, life insurance, dependent care flexible spending accounts (FSA), and health care FSAs.
- Retirement benefits include defined benefit and defined contribution plans.
- Median total benefits reported are of the comparator group and are not equal to the sum of median time loss, health, and retirement benefits.


## Total Rewards

- Total rewards consists of actual median pay plus health and retirement benefits. Time loss benefits are excluded because they are considered to be a part of compensation.
- Median total rewards reported are of the comparator group and do not equal the sum of median pay, health, and retirement.


## Payroll

- Data was collected as of 2014, the last full year of compensation data available. Data was not aged because entities generally do not provide yearly pay increases.


## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Workforce Distribution

- ISP's management to non-management ratio is $1: 15$ (approximately $94 \%$ of the workforce).
- The aggregate comparator group management to non-management ratio is $1: 11$ (approximately $92 \%$ of the workforce).
- The state police entities management to non-management ratio is $1: 11$ (approximately $91 \%$ of the workforce).


## Workforce Distribution


© MERCER 2016
Note: Workforce distribution calculated using incumbent weighting (See Appendix D for Detailed Methodology). *No Trooper Trainees at this time.

## EXECUTIVESUMMARY

## Actual Compensation (displayed with geographic differentials)

- In aggregate, ISP officers' actual pay is below the comparator group median by 6\%.
- Most competitive officer rankings include Trooper Trainee and Corporal, which are above the comparator group median by $28 \%$ and $32 \%$, respectively.
- Least competitive officer rankings include First Sergeant and Lieutenant Colonel, which are below the comparator group median by $38 \%$ and $26 \%$ respectively.
- Note that officer positions of Corporal and First Sergeant are used only by Indiana and one other police entity; if removed from the analysis, the aggregate positioning for ISP would be $3 \%$ below the comparator group median.

ISP Actual Median Pay v. Comparator Group Median Pay

*No Trooper Trainees at this time; using starting pay of $\$ 37,590$ for reporting/analysis purposes.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Benefits (displayed with geographic differentials)

- In aggregate, ISP officers' benefits are below the comparator group median by $14 \%$.
- ISP's benefits offered for life insurance and retirement are below the comparator group median (Refer to Appendix F).
- ISP provides a basic life insurance benefit of $\$ 20,000$ to all officers ${ }^{1}$. The most common life insurance benefit provided by the comparator group is $100 \%$ of pay.
- ISP's defined benefit plan requires a mandatory employee contribution of 6\%, compared to the comparator group median of $3 \%$. Additionally, ISP historically has not provided cost-of-living adjustments ${ }^{2}$ to plan benefits, whereas the comparator group median provides an adjustment tied to the Consumer Price Index, up to $2 \%$.
- Benefits such as time loss and retirement are tied directly to compensation. Therefore, ISP positions that are below the comparator group median in compensation also tend to be below the median for benefits.
- Note that officer positions of Corporal and First Sergeant are used only by Indiana and one other police entity; if removed from the analysis, the aggregate positioning for ISP would be $11 \%$ below the comparator group median.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Total Rewards (displayed with geographic differentials)

- In aggregate, ISP officers' total rewards are below the comparator group median by $10 \%$.
- Note that officer positions of Corporal and First Sergeant are used only by Indiana and one other police entity; if removed from the analysis, the aggregate positioning for ISP would be $8 \%$ below the comparator group median.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Compensation Pay Matrices Analysis (displayed with geographic differentials)

- In aggregate, ISP officers' pay matrices are below the comparator group median at starting pay ( $-13 \%$ ), 10-year pay ( $-11 \%$ ), and maximum pay (-9\%).
- At the Captain rank and below, ISP officers' pay matrices are generally aligned with the comparator group median (excluding Corporal and First Sergeant).
- ISP's Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel pay matrices are not well aligned with the comparator group.
- Despite the yearly increases, pay is generally not competitive with the comparator group at starting pay, 10-year pay, and maximum pay.

|  | Starting Pay |  |  | 10-Year Pay |  |  | Maximum Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position | ISP | Median | Position | ISP | Median | Position | ISP | Median | Position |
| Trooper Trainee | \$37,590 | \$29,414 | 128\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Probationary Trooper | \$39,213 | \$43,496 | 90\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trooper | \$40,902 | \$46,425 | 88\% | \$50,489 | \$53,555 | 94\% | \$61,208 | \$54,755 | 112\% |
| Corporal* | \$43,859 | \$35,825 | 122\%* | \$54,568 | \$46,662 | 117\%* | \$64,770 | \$48,162 | 134\%* |
| Sergeant | \$49,980 | \$54,258 | 92\% | \$62,728 | \$65,772 | 95\% | \$67,830 | \$69,567 | 98\% |
| First Sergeant* | \$53,040 | \$85,072 | 62\%* | \$65,279 | \$96,887 | 67\%* | \$70,381 | \$125,196 | 56\%* |
| Lieutenant | \$56,098 | \$57,087 | 98\% | \$67,828 | \$71,881 | 94\% | \$72,930 | \$77,807 | 94\% |
| Captain | \$58,140 | \$63,855 | 91\% | \$69,870 | \$78,115 | 89\% | \$76,500 | \$81,415 | 94\% |
| Major | \$61,198 | \$67,011 | 91\% | \$73,948 | \$67,011 | 110\% | \$79,560 | \$67,011 | 119\% |
| Lieutenant Colonel | \$68,339 | \$86,300 | 79\% | \$81,854 | \$110,926 | 74\% | \$85,681 | \$112,808 | 76\% |
| Colonel | \$75,479 | \$101,435 | 74\% | \$88,993 | \$101,435 | 88\% | \$90,781 | \$101,435 | 89\% |
| Aggregate v. Median |  |  | 87\% |  |  | 89\% |  |  | 91\% |
| Aggregate v. Median |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (excluding Corporal | First Se | geant) | 89\% |  |  | 90\% |  |  | 95\% |

[^0]** Superintendent pay was not included in Pay Matrices analysis because it is a single incumbent pay.

## TOTAL REWARDS REVIEW

## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION TROOPER TRAINEE

- ISP Trooper Trainee's median total rewards is above the comparator group median by $24 \%$, driven by above median compensation.
- ISP Trooper Trainees receive health benefits, with the value aligning closely to the comparator group median.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION PROBATIONARY TROOPER

- ISP Probationary Trooper's median total rewards is below the comparator group median by $20 \%$.
- All elements of total rewards are below the comparator group median.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION TROOPER

- ISP Trooper's median total rewards is below the comparator group median by $11 \%$.
- All elements of total rewards are below the comparator group median.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION CORPORAL

- Marion County is the only other police entity that utilizes the Corporal position.
- ISP Corporal's median total rewards is above Marion County by $27 \%$.
- All elements of total rewards are above Marion County, with compensation being the driving factor in the total rewards positioning.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION SERGEANT

- ISP Sergeant's median total rewards is closely aligned with the comparator group median.
- Compensation is slightly above the comparator group median, but below median retirement benefits decreases total rewards positioning.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION FIRST SERGEANT

- Illinois is the only other police entity that utilizes the First Sergeant position.
- ISP First Sergeant's median total rewards is below Illinois' total rewards by $38 \%$.
- All elements of total rewards are below Illinois.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION LIEUTENANT

- ISP Lieutenant's median total rewards is closely aligned with the comparator group median.
- Compensation is slightly above the comparator group median, but below median retirement benefits decreases total rewards positioning.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards
■Indiana ■Comparator


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION <br> CAPTAIN

- ISP Captain's median total rewards is closely aligned with the comparator group median.
- Compensation is slightly above the comparator group median, but below median retirement benefits decreases total rewards positioning.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION MAJOR

- ISP Major's median total rewards is closely aligned with the comparator group median.
- Compensation is slightly above the comparator group median; slightly below median retirement benefits decreases total rewards positioning.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION LT COLONEL

- ISP Lieutenant Colonel's median total rewards is below the comparator group median by $29 \%$.
- All elements of total rewards are below the comparator group median.
- Low positioning on compensation leads to low positioning on retirement.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## TOTAL REWARDS REPORTED BY POSITION COLONEL

- ISP Colonel's median total rewards is below the comparator group median by $14 \%$.
- All elements of total rewards are below the comparator group median.
- Low positioning on compensation leads to low positioning on retirement.

ISP Median Total Rewards v. Comparator Median Total Rewards


## PAY STRUCTURE REVIEW

(Data in this section are sorted in descending order by 10-year pay unless stated otherwise.)

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION TROOPER TRAINEE

- Data below are sorted by starting pay in descending order.
- ISP's Trooper Trainee starting pay is aligned above the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the comparator group; the 2015 class graduated in November 2015.

|  | Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Indianapolis | 1st Year Patrolman (Rec | 92 | \$39,446 | \$40,446 |
|  | Ohio | Cadet | 161 | \$38,813 | \$38,166 |
|  | Indiana | Trooper Trainee | $46^{3}$ | \$37,590 | CNIU |
|  | Kentucky | Cadet Trooper | 91 | \$34,442 | \$30,5394 |
|  | Illinois ${ }^{5}$ | Cadet | 36 | \$32,076 | \$32,076 |
|  | Marion County | Trainee | CNIU | \$29,414 | \$29,414* |
|  | Michigan ${ }^{6}$ | Recruit | 212 | \$24,113 | \$23,088 |
|  | Scottsburg | Trainee | CNIU | \$22,048 | \$22,048* |
|  | Fort Wayne |  | CNIU |  |  |
|  | Hamilton County |  | CNIU |  |  |
|  | Knox County |  | CNIU |  |  |
|  | Valparaiso |  | CNIU |  |  |
|  | 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Excluding ISP <br> Data |  | \$26,764 | \$26,251 |
|  | Median |  |  | \$32,076 | \$30,539 |
|  | Average |  |  | \$31,479 | \$30,825 |
|  | 75th Percentile |  |  | \$36,627 | \$35,121 |
|  | Variance from Median |  |  | 17\% | 23\% |
|  | 25th Percentile |  |  | \$25,914 | \$25,672 |
|  | Median |  |  | \$29,414 | \$29,414 |
|  | Average |  |  | \$30,877 | \$30,215 |
|  | 75th Percentile |  |  | \$36,701 | \$34,364 |
|  | Variance from Median |  |  | 28\% | 28\% |

[^1]
## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION PROBATIONARYTROOPER

- Data below are sorted by starting pay in descending order.
- ISP's Probationary Trooper starting pay is below the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the comparator group.
- The majority of police entities require newly-hired troopers to complete a 1 -year probationary period.

| Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [Illinois | Probationary Trooper | CNIU ${ }^{7}$ | \$60,036 | \$60,036* |
| Indianapolis | 2nd Year Patrolman (Probationary) | CNIU | \$47,651 | \$47,651 |
| Fort Wayne | Probationary Patrolman | 21 | \$45,904 | \$45,904* |
| Michigan | Trooper-E 10 | 215 | \$45,811 | \$48,307 |
| Ohio ${ }^{8}$ | Probationary Trooper | CNIU | \$44,762 | \$44,762* |
| Valparaiso | Probationary Patrolman | 1 | \$42,524 | \$45,072 |
| Indiana | Probationary Trooper | 40 | \$39,213 | \$39,156 |
| $\stackrel{\widetilde{0}}{0}$ Scottsburg | Rookie Patrolman | CNIU | \$35,275 | \$35,275* |
| - Hamilton County |  | CNIU |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{3}$ Kentucky |  | CNIU |  |  |
| $\simeq \sim$ Knox County |  | CNIU |  |  |
| Marion County |  | CNIU |  |  |
| 25th Percentile |  |  | \$43,643 | \$44,917 |
| Median |  |  | \$45,811 | \$45,904 |
| Average |  |  | \$45,995 | \$46,715 |
| 75th Percentile | Excluding |  | \$46,778 | \$47,979 |
| Variance from Median | ISP |  | -14\% | -15\% |
|  |  |  | \$42,664 | \$44,284 |
| . ${ }^{\text {O }}$ O Median | Data |  | \$43,496 | \$45,137 |
| 응 어 Average |  |  | \$44,641 | \$45,338 |
| 항 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ 75 Percentile |  |  | \$46,778 | \$46,778 |
| $\stackrel{0}{\sim}$ O |  |  | -10\% | -13\% |

[^2]
## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION <br> TROOPER

- ISP's Trooper starting pay and 10-year pay are between the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the median of the comparator group; however, their maximum pay is above the comparator group median with the recognition of annual pay matrix increases.

| Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Illinois | Trooper ${ }^{9}$ | 993 | \$60,036 | \$85,884 | \$114,528 | \$75,622 |
| Michigan | Trooper E11/11 | 1,363 | \$53,954 | \$67,032 | \$69,422 | \$64,834 |
| Indianapolis | Patrol Officer | 539 | \$64,052 | \$66,614 | \$70,096 ${ }^{10}$ | \$65,406 |
| Hamilton County | Deputy Sheriff/Detective | 43 | \$48,432 | \$60,540 | \$67,804 | \$54,008 |
| Ohio | Trooper | 1,076 | \$44,762 | \$59,168 | \$61,406 | \$56,867 |
| Valparaiso | Patrolman ${ }^{11}$ | 27 | \$46,425 | \$53,555 | \$54,755 | \$49,157 |
| ๘ Fort Wayne | Patrolman | 339 | \$51,004 | \$52,704 | \$53,704 | \$53,104 |
| $\cdots$ Indiana | Trooper | 806 | \$40,902 | \$50,489 | \$61,208 | \$48,650 |
| 3 Marion County | Deputy | 311 | \$35,123 | \$45,960 | \$47,460 ${ }^{12}$ | \$43,515 |
| ๙ | First Class Patrolman | 5 | \$39,279 | \$42,814 | \$47,135 | \$44,015 |
| K Kentucky | Trooper ${ }^{13}$ | 630 | \$37,382 | \$40,616 | \$40,616 ${ }^{14}$ | \$42,372 ${ }^{15}$ |
| Knox County | Deputy | 13 | \$35,850 | \$35,850 | \$35,850 | \$33,551 |
| 25th Percentile | Excluding ISP <br> Data |  | \$38,331 | \$44,387 | \$47,297 | \$43,765 |
| Median |  |  | \$46,425 | \$53,555 | \$54,755 | \$53,104 |
| Average |  |  | \$46,936 | \$55,522 | \$60,252 | \$52,950 |
| $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | \$52,479 | \$63,577 | \$68,613 | \$60,850 |
| $\underset{\bar{W}}{\cdots}$ |  |  | -12\% | -6\% | 12\% | -8\% |
|  |  |  | \$39,007 | \$44,387 | \$47,297 | \$43,959 |
| - ${ }^{\circ}$ O Median |  |  | \$46,425 | \$53,555 | \$54,755 | \$53,104 |
| 잉 0 Average |  |  | \$46,149 | \$54,426 | \$58,912 | \$51,960 |
| \% ${ }^{\circ}$ 75th Percentile |  |  | \$50,709 | \$61,587 | \$66,336 | \$57,919 |
| © Variance from Median |  |  | -12\% | -6\% | 12\% | -8\% |
| © MERCER 2016 |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION <br> CORPORAL

- Only one other police entity utilizes the Corporal position.

| Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [ Indiana | Corporal | 24 | \$43,859 | \$54,568 | \$64,770 | \$57,287 |
| Marion County | Corporal | 65 | \$35,825 | \$46,662 | \$48,162 ${ }^{12}$ | \$43,551 |
| Fort Wayne | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hamilton County | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indianapolis | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| ธ Kentucky | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| -ั Knox County | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\text { z }}{ }$ M Michigan | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\simeq$ Ohio | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scottsburg | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valparaiso | CNIU |  |  |  |  |  |
| $25^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Excluding ISP <br> Data |  | Insufficient Datalnsufficient DataInsufficient Datalnsufficient Data |  |  |  |
| Average |  |  | \$35,825 | \$46,662 | \$48,162 | \$43,551 |
| $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | Insufficient Datalnsufficient DataInsufficient Datalnsufficient Data |  |  |  |
| $\geqslant \pi$ Variance from Marion County |  |  | 22\% | 17\% | 34\% | 32\% |
| . |  |  | Insufficient Datalnsufficient Datalnsufficient Datalnsufficient Data |  |  |  |
| ㅇㅇ Average |  |  | \$35,825 | \$46,662 | \$48,162 | \$43,551 |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ \% $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | Insufficient Datalnsufficient Datalnsufficient Datalnsufficient Data |  |  |  |
| O Variance from Marion County |  |  | 22\% | 17\% | 34\% | 32\% |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION SERGEANT

- ISP's Sergeant pay is between the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the median of the comparator group at all levels of pay.

| Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [llinois | Sergeant | 235 | \$77,100 | \$98,676 | \$127,500 | \$105,073 |
| Michigan | Sergeant 12 | 247 | \$75,565 ${ }^{16}$ | \$77,368 | \$80,008 | \$75,360 |
| Indianapolis | Sergeant | 82 | \$71,178 | \$73,740 | \$77,222 ${ }^{10}$ | \$76,102 |
| Ohio | Sergeant | 330 | \$52,250 | \$69,713 | \$72,326 | \$70,994 |
| Hamilton County | Sergeant | 8 | \$54,902 | \$65,988 | \$73,907 | \$59,413 |
| Fort Wayne | Sergeant | 63 | \$62,405 | \$65,555 | \$68,855 | \$66,405 |
| Indiana | Sergeant | 203 | \$49,980 | \$62,728 | \$67,830 | \$65,499 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\pi}$ Valparaiso | Sergeant | 13 | \$53,613 | \$54,413 | \$55,613 | \$52,480 |
| Marion County | Sergeant ${ }^{17}$ | 66 | \$46,245 | \$46,545 | \$48,045 ${ }^{12}$ | \$43,315 |
| < Kentucky | Sergeant | 120 | \$44,174 | \$44,174 | \$44,174 ${ }^{14}$ | \$49,489 ${ }^{15}$ |
| $\simeq$ Scottsburg | Sergeant | 4 | \$40,264 | \$43,799 | \$48,119 | \$47,619 |
| Knox County |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Excluding ISP <br> Data |  | \$47,746 | \$48,512 | \$49,993 | \$50,236 |
| Median |  |  | \$54,258 | \$65,772 | \$70,590 | \$62,909 |
| Average |  |  | \$57,769 | \$63,997 | \$69,577 | \$64,625 |
| 75th Percentile <br> Variance from Median |  |  | \$68,985 | \$72,733 | \$76,393 | \$74,269 |
|  |  |  | -8\% | -5\% | -4\% | 4\% |
|  |  |  | \$47,377 | \$48,512 | \$49,993 | \$51,578 |
|  |  |  | \$54,258 | \$65,772 | \$69,567 | \$62,909 |
|  |  |  | \$56,617 | \$62,597 | \$67,902 | \$63,198 |
|  |  |  | \$68,415 | \$71,154 | \$74,546 | \$70,058 |
| © |  |  | -8\% | -5\% | -2\% | 4\% |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION FIRST SERGEANT

- Only one other police entity utilizes a First Sergeant position.

|  | Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# of } \\ \text { Officers } \end{gathered}$ | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Illinois | Master Sergeant | 212 | \$93,144 | \$106,080 | \$137,076 | \$121,290 |
|  | Indiana | First Sergeant | 52 | \$53,040 | \$65,279 | \$70,381 | \$68,538 |
|  | Kentucky |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ohio |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Michigan |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fort Wayne |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hamilton County |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Indianapolis |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Knox County |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Marion County |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Scottsburg |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | Valparaiso |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
|  | $25^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Excluding ISP <br> Data |  | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Dat | Insufficient Data |
|  | Average |  |  | \$93,144 | \$106,080 | \$137,076 | \$121,290 |
|  | $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data |
|  | Variance from Illinois |  |  | -43\% | -38\% | -49\% | -43\% |
|  | 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Dat | Insufficient Data |
|  | Average |  |  | \$85,072 | \$96,887 | \$125,196 | \$110,778 |
|  | 75 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Dat | Insufficient Data |
|  | Variance from Illinois |  |  | -38\% | -33\% | -44\% | -38\% |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION LIEUTENANT

- ISP's Lieutenant pay is between the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the median of the comparator group at all levels of pay.

|  | Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Illinois | Lieutenant | 65 | \$107,928 | \$113,508 | \$146,676 | \$127,696 |
|  | Ohio | Lieutenant ${ }^{18}$ | 101 | \$59,550 | \$88,008 | \$100,017 | \$83,360 |
|  | Indianapolis | Lieutenant | 25 | \$78,821 | \$81,383 | \$84,865 ${ }^{10}$ | \$84,795 |
|  | Michigan | Lieutenant ${ }^{19}$ | 107 | \$55,370 | \$78,821 | \$102,272 | \$93,212 |
|  | Fort Wayne | Lieutenant | 11 | \$69,345 | \$72,495 | \$75,795 | \$75,845 ${ }^{20}$ |
|  | Hamilton County | Lieutenant | 4 | \$61,575 | \$71,267 | \$79,819 | \$64,889 |
|  | Indiana | Lieutenant | 41 | \$56,098 | \$67,828 | \$72,930 | \$71,500 |
| \% | Valparaiso | Lieutenant | 7 | \$56,308 | \$57,108 | \$58,308 | \$55,697 |
| - | Marion County | Lieutenant ${ }^{17}$ | 46 | \$49,172 | \$49,472 | \$50,972 ${ }^{12}$ | \$46,658 |
| $\underset{\sim}{3}$ | Kentucky | Lieutenant | 42 | \$48,087 | \$48,087 | \$48,087 ${ }^{14}$ | \$55,764 ${ }^{15}$ |
| $\simeq$ | Scottsburg | Lieutenant | $2$ | \$41,248 | \$44,783 | \$49,104 | \$49,622 |
|  | Knox County |  | CNIU | +1,248 |  |  |  |
|  | 25th Percentile | Excluding ISP <br> Data |  | \$50,721 | \$51,381 | \$52,806 | \$55,714 |
|  | Median |  |  | \$57,929 | \$71,881 | \$77,807 | \$70,367 |
|  | Average |  |  | \$62,740 | \$70,493 | \$79,591 | \$73,754 |
|  | 75 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | \$67,402 | \$80,742 | \$96,229 | \$84,436 |
|  | Variance from Median |  |  | -3\% | -6\% | -6\% | 2\% |
|  | 25th Percentile |  |  | \$50,303 | \$51,646 | \$52,806 | \$56,218 |
|  | Median |  |  | \$57,087 | \$71,881 | \$77,807 | \$70,367 |
|  | Average |  |  | \$61,447 | \$68,917 | \$77,540 | \$72,001 |
|  | 75th Percentile |  |  | \$67,402 | \$79,450 | \$92,887 | \$83,847 |
|  | Variance from Median |  |  | -2\% | -6\% | -6\% | 2\% |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION CAPTAIN

- ISP's Captain pay is between the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the median of the comparator group at all levels of pay.

| Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Illinois | Captain | 30 | \$115,488 | \$121,452 | \$156,924 | \$152,052 |
| Michigan | Captain ${ }^{11}$ | 17 | \$94,451 | \$110,080 | \$125,709 | \$115,128 |
| Ohio | Captain | 21 | \$72,134 | \$106,733 | \$110,339 | \$96,656 |
| Indianapolis | Captain | 10 | \$87,517 | \$90,079 | \$93,561 ${ }^{10}$ | \$93,091 |
| Hamilton County | Captain | 5 | \$63,855 ${ }^{22}$ | \$79,819 | \$89,398 | \$72,504 |
| Fort Wayne | Captain | 9 | \$74,965 | \$78,115 | \$81,415 | \$81,465 ${ }^{19}$ |
| ¢ Indiana | Captain | 16 | \$58,140 | \$69,870 | \$76,500 | \$74,653 |
| V Valparaiso | Captain | 1 | \$61,684 | \$62,484 | \$63,684 | \$60,616 |
| 3 Kentucky | Captain | 27 | \$52,392 | \$52,392 | \$52,392 ${ }^{14}$ | \$64,77015 |
| ๙ Marion County | Captain ${ }^{17}$ | 15 | \$51,953 | \$51,953 | \$51,953 | \$51,953 |
| Scottsburg | Captain | 2 | \$42,227 | \$45,762 | \$50,083 | \$50,811 |
| Knox County | Captain | 6 | \$36,550 | \$36,550 | \$36,550 | \$34,209 |
| $25^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Excluding ISP <br> Data |  | \$52,172 | \$52,172 | \$52,172 | \$56,285 |
| Median |  |  | \$63,855 | \$78,115 | \$81,415 | \$72,504 |
| Average |  |  | \$68,474 | \$75,947 | \$82,910 | \$79,387 |
| $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | \$81,241 | \$98,406 | \$101,950 | \$94,874 |
| $\overline{\bar{\sigma}} \frac{\pi}{\pi}\left[\frac{\text { Variance from Median }}{25^{\text {th }} \text { Percentile }}\right.$ |  |  | -9\% | -11\% | -6\% | 3\% |
|  |  |  | \$53,119 | \$53,119 | \$53,119 | \$56,285 |
| . 0 O Median |  |  | \$63,855 | \$78,115 | \$81,415 | \$72,504 |
| 융 Average |  |  | \$66,988 | \$74,231 | \$80,812 | \$77,466 |
|  |  | \$81,241 <br> $-9 \%$ |  | \$96,468 | \$100,390 | \$93,507 |
| ¢ ƠT Variance from Median |  |  |  | -11\% | -6\% | 3\% |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION <br> MAJOR

- ISP's Major pay is between the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the median of the comparator group at starting pay and between the median and the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile for 10 -year pay and maximum pay.

| Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ohio | Major | 5 | \$79,477 | \$118,769 | \$122,743 | \$110,108 |
| Indianapolis | Major/Commander ${ }^{23}$ | 9 | \$102,516* | \$102,516* | \$102,516* | \$102,516 |
| Indiana | Major | 13 | \$61,198 | \$73,948 | \$79,560 | \$78,000 |
| Marion County | Major ${ }^{17}$ | 4 | \$67,011 | \$67,011 | \$67,011 | \$67,011 |
| Kentucky | Major | 7 | \$57,126 | \$57,126 | \$57,126 ${ }^{14}$ | \$71,523 ${ }^{15}$ |
| Knox County | Major/Chief | 2 | \$38,760 | \$38,760 | \$38,760 | \$36,360 |
| Illinois |  | CNIU ${ }^{24}$ |  |  |  |  |
| \% Michigan |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| - Fort Wayne |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| $3_{0}$ Hamilton County |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| $\simeq \sim$ Scottsburg |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| Valparaiso |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| $25^{\text {th }}$ Percentile |  |  | \$57,126 | \$57,126 | \$57,126 | \$67,011 |
| Median |  |  | \$67,011 | \$67,011 | \$67,011 | \$71,523 |
| Average |  |  | \$68,978 | \$76,836 | \$77,631 | \$77,504 |
| $75^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Excluding |  | \$79,477 | \$102,516 | \$102,516 | \$102,516 |
| Variance from Median | ISP |  | -9\% | 10\% | 19\% | 9\% |
| \} |  |  | \$59,192 | \$59,192 | \$59,192 | \$67,011 |
| . | Data |  | \$67,011 | \$67,011 | \$67,011 | \$74,109 |
| 응 ${ }^{0}$ Average |  |  | \$68,941 | \$76,578 | \$77,350 | \$77,398 |
| 흥 |  |  | \$77,229 | \$102,516 | \$102,516 | \$102,516 |
| ¢ ¢ Variance from Median |  |  | -9\% | 10\% | 19\% | 5\% |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION LIEUTENANT COLONEL

- ISP's Lieutenant Colonel pay is below the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the comparator group at all levels.

| Police Entity | Police Entity Specific Title | \# of Officers | Starting Pay | 10-Year Pay | Maximum Pay | Actual Median Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Michigan | Sr. Deputy Director | 3 | \$110,142 | \$124,560 | \$138,978 | \$136,741 |
| Illinois | Lieutenant Colonel | 6 | \$115,488 | \$121,452 | \$156,924 | \$154,261 |
| Ohio | Lieutenant Colonel | 2 | \$87,859 | \$119,188 | \$123,581 | \$119,917 |
| Indianapolis | Deputy Chief | 1 | \$112,808* | \$112,808* | \$112,808* | \$112,808 |
| Marion County | Lieutenant Colonel ${ }^{17}$ | 5 | \$86,300 | \$86,300 | \$86,300 | \$86,300 |
| Fort Wayne | Deputy Chief | 6 | \$79,376 | \$82,526 | \$85,826 | \$85,751 |
| ๙ Indiana | Lieutenant Colonel | 1 | \$68,339 | \$81,854 | \$85,681 | \$84,001 |
| \% Kentucky | Lieutenant Colonel | 4 | \$62,335 | \$62,335 | \$62,335 ${ }^{14}$ | \$85,080 ${ }^{15}$ |
| 3 Hamilton County |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| ๙ Knox County |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| Scottsburg |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| Valparaiso |  | CNIU |  |  |  |  |
| 25th Percentile |  |  | \$82,838 | \$84,413 | \$86,063 | \$86,025 |
| Median |  |  | \$87,859 | \$112,808 | \$112,808 | \$112,808 |
| Average |  |  | \$93,473 | \$101,310 | \$109,536 | \$111,551 |
| 75th Percentile | Excluding |  | \$111,475 | \$120,320 | \$131,279 | \$128,329 |
| $\geq{ }^{\text {Variance from Median }}$ | ISP |  | -22\% | -27\% | -24\% | -26\% |
| 丞 ${ }_{\sim}^{\sim}$ |  |  | \$82,375 | \$84,413 | \$86,063 | \$87,228 |
| -응 Median | Data |  | \$86,300 | \$110,926 | \$112,808 | \$112,808 |
| त- Average |  |  | \$90,977 | \$98,479 | \$106,113 | \$108,314 |
|  |  |  | \$104,197 | \$114,312 | \$124,972 | \$122,147 |
| © Variance from Median |  |  | -21\% | -26\% | -24\% | -26\% |

## BASE PAY REPORTED BY POSITION <br> COLONEL

- ISP's Colonel pay is below the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the comparator group at starting pay and between the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentiles and median at 10-year pay and maximum pay.



## UPCOMING BASE PAY CHANGES

- The projected 2016 average base pay increase for employees in governmental agencies is $2.6 \%$ according to Mercer's 2015/2016 US Compensation Planning Survey.
- Four of the police entities have approved or are in the process of negotiating changes to their base pay programs.
- Fort Wayne: Approved increasing base pay for all positions by 2\%, effective 2016.
- Hamilton: Approved significant 2016 actual base pay increases, ranging from $6 \%$ to $23 \%$, with an average increase of 11\%.
- Indianapolis: Approved increasing base pay for all positions by $\$ 1,400$, ranging from $1.5 \%$ to $2 \%$, based on rank.
- Michigan: Approved increasing pay matrices by 1\%, to be effective October 1, 2016.
- Ohio: Police entity is currently undergoing contract negotiations that are anticipated to be finalized in 2016.


## PAY PRACTICES

(Data in this section are sorted alphabetically by state thencity and county unless stated otherwise.)

## PAY PRACTICES

## OVERTIME(OT)

- Data are sorted by OT as a percentage of payroll for Troopers in descending order.
- In general, ISP as a percentage of payroll paid more OT than most of the other police entities.
- When compared to state police entities, ISP is more aligned.
- Amount of OT paid to ISP Lieutenants and Captains is high.

| Police Entity | Trooper |  | Sergeant |  | Lieutenant |  | Captain |  | Total OT Paid | Total OT Paid as \% of Payroll |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OT as \% of Payroll | Avg. Amount / Officer | OT as \% of Payroll | Avg. Amount / Officer | OT as \% of Payroll | Avg. Amount / Officer | OT as \% of Payroll | Avg. Amount / Officer |  |  |
| Michigan | 5.2\% | \$9,072 | 1.2\% | \$7,777 | 0.1\% | \$2,148 | 0\% | \$0 | \$9,099,278 | 6.5\% |
| Indiana ${ }^{27}$ | 4.8\% | \$4,147 | 1.9\% | \$6,657 | 0.4\% | \$6,587 | 0.1\% | \$6,378 | \$5,065,899 | 7.2\% |
| Illinois ${ }^{28}$ | 4.6\% | \$8,120 | 1.5\% | \$11,534 | 0.1\% | \$3,186 | 0.1\% | \$3,165 | \$11,076,088 | 6.3\% |
| Kentucky | 4.5\% | \$3,257 | 1.1\% | \$3,650 | 0.2\% | \$2,691 | 0.1\% | \$1,142 | \$2,696,530 | 5.9\% |
| Ohio ${ }^{29}$ | 4.2\% | \$5,243 | 1.3\% | \$4,768 | 0.2\% | \$1,709 | 0.1\% | \$3,169 | \$7,478,867 | 5.8\% |
| Hamilton County ${ }^{30}$ | 2.8\% | \$2,407 | 0.8\% | \$3,934 | 0.1\% | \$1,057 | 0\% | \$0 | \$130,464 | 3.7\% |
| Marion County | 2.4\% | \$1,667 | 0.5\% | \$1,725 | 0.3\% | \$1,583 | 0.2\% | \$2,373 | \$740,850 | 3.5\% |
| Scottsburg | 2.0\% | \$3,154 | 1.2\% | \$2,423 | 0.6\% | \$5,094 | 2.2\% | \$8,802 | \$48,158 | 6.0\% |
| Indianapolis | 1.3\% | \$3,385 | 0.2\% | \$4,461 | 0.1\% | \$8,446 | <0.1\% | \$4,165 | \$1,840,524 | 1.6\% |

OT not reported for the following police entities: Fort Wayne, Knox County, and Valparaiso.

## PAY PRACTICES

## SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL PAY

- Seven police entities provide shift differential pay to Troopers working afternoon and evening shifts.
- Five police entities pay a fixed shift differential ranging from $\$ 0.50$ to $\$ 1.00$ per hour.
- One police entity pays a percent of payroll, which is $5 \%$.
- One police entity pays a bonus.

| Police Entity |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { じ } \\ & \text { \% } \\ & \text { ob } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 5 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 | $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega}}{\stackrel{\pi}{2}}$ |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Shift Differential Policy

- Afternoon shift (minimum of half of the scheduled hours fall between the hours of 3 p.m. and 11 p.m.): $\$ 0.50 /$ hour

| Illinois | CNIU CNIU | Y | Y | N | N | N | N | N | Midnight shift (minimum of half of the scheduled hours fall between the hours of 11 p.m. and 7 a.m.): $\$ 0.75 /$ hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Michigan | N Y | Y | Y | Y | N | CNIU | N | CNIU | $5 \%$ premium for hours worked on afternoon (shift begins between 2 p.m. and 8 p.m.) and night shifts (shift begins between 8 p.m. and 5 a.m.) |
| Ohio | ND CNIU | Y | Y | ND | ND | ND | ND | CNIU | $\$ 1 /$ hour for second and third shifts (shifts beginning between 2 p.m. and 12 a.m.) |
| Fort Wayne ${ }^{31}$ | CNIU N | Y | Y | Y | Y | CNIU | Y | Y | B-shift (2 p.m. - 10:30 p.m.): $\$ 3,300 /$ year <br> - C-shift (10 p.m. $-6: 30$ a.m.): $\$ 6,300 /$ year |
| Hamilton County | CNIU CNIU | Y | N | N | N | CNIU | CNIU | N | \$0.50/hour for officers working the 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. shift |
| Indianapolis ${ }^{32}$ | ND CNIU | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | $\$ 0.70$ / hour for officers working shifts beginning between 1 p.m. and 1 a.m. |
| Marion County ${ }^{33}$ | CNIU CNIU | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ | Y | $Y$ |  |  | $\$ 0.60 /$ hour for officers working middle and late shifts (shifts scheduled between 3 p.m. and 7 a.m.) |

[^3]
## PAY PRACTICES

## HAZARDOUS DUTY PAY

- Four out of eleven comparator police entities provide hazardous duty pay to officers.


## Police Entity

Illinois

Hazardous Duty Pay Policy

- \$350 annually + \$50 monthly to Troopers and Sergeants
- $5 \%$ premium for officers on the bomb squad

Michigan

- \$4/day allowance for Emergency Response Compensation ${ }^{34}$

Fort Wayne

- Ranges from $\$ 350-\$ 650$, depending on assigment ${ }^{35}$
- Merit ranks assigned to motorcycle, SWAT, EOD, horse patrol, K-9, helicopter observers, firing range, or as a negotiator receive $\$ 529$ annually

Police entities not providing hazardous duty pay: Kentucky, Ohio, Hamilton County, Indiana, Knox County, Marion County, Scottsburg, and Valparaiso.

## PAY PRACTICES

## UNIFORM/CLOTHING ALLOWANCE

- Eight out of eleven comparator police entities provide their officers with some sort of clothing allowance.
- When clothing allowance is provided, the average allowance amount is $\$ 1,068$.
- When a uniform allowance is not provided, uniforms and equipment are provided and replaced as needed by the police entity.

| Police Entity | Allowance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | - Trooper - Sergeant: $\$ 600$ |  |
| Illinois | - Master Sergeant and above: $\$ 400$ |  |
| Kentucky | - $\$ 450-\$ 900$, depending on qualifying assignment |  |
| Michigan | - $\$ 572$ |  |
|  | Tritial uniforms provided |  |
|  | - Sergeant and above: $\$ 1,700$ |  |
| Fort Wayne | - $\$ 900$ |  |
| Indianapolis | - $\$ 1,750$ |  |
| Knox County | - $\$ 1,600$ |  |
| Scottsburg |  |  |
| Valparaiso |  |  |

Police entities providing uniforms and equipment: Ohio, Hamilton County, Indiana, and Marion County.

## PAY PRACTICES <br> EDUCATION REIMBURSEMENT / INCENTIVE PAY

- Seven out of eleven comparator police entities provide some sort of tuition reimbursement or educational incentive program.

| Police Entity | Education Reimbursement/Incentive Policy |
| :---: | :---: |
| Illinois | - Budget of $\$ 55,000$ a year for work-related courses for Sergeants and below <br> - Budget of $\$ 10,000$ a year for Master Sergeants <br> - No specified program for Lieutenants and above |
| Michigan | - Partial tuition reimbursement for all officers participating in work-related courses; limited to $\$ 700$ per officer per fiscal year |
| Ohio | - The department will reimburse up to $100 \%$ of tuition for any training or work-related courses |
| Fort Wayne | - Offers an educational incentive program: $\$ 450 /$ year for Associate's Degree; $\$ 900 /$ year for Bachelor's Degree; $\$ 1,400$ for Master's Degree; $\$ 1,900$ for Doctorate/PhD |
| Hamilton County | - The County will reimburse a maximum of six approved credit hours per officer per calendar year |
| Indianapolis | Offers an educational incentive program: <br> - Annual bonus of $\$ 250 /$ year of college <br> - Maximum of $\$ 1,000$ for a Bachelor's Degree <br> - Maximum of $\$ 1,250$ for a Master's degree |
| Valparaiso | - Pay for additional training, ranging from $\$ 100$ to $\$ 1,000$ per year |

## PAY PRACTICES <br> TAKE HOME VEHICLE

- Market prevalence is for vehicle to be taken home and used while off-duty.

| Police Entity | Take Home Vehicle Policy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Illinois | - Yes, take-home cars for officers, but only Master Sergeant and above allowed off-duty use |
| Kentucky | - Yes, any off-duty time must be authorized by supervisor |
| Michigan | - Yes, based on employer discretion; goal is to get approximately 50\% of officers one |
|  | - Yes, highway patrol officers are eligible based on assignment and in part, on an officer's |
| Ohio | availability to return to duty in a timely fashion when an emergency situation arises. The use of |
| Fort Wayne | - Officers are eligible after two years of service. Off-duty use allowed within the county |
| Hamilton County | - Yes, based on assignment and off-duty use allowed |
| Indianapolis | - Yes, only officers that live in Marion Co or one of the 7 contiguous counties for buse |

Indiana

- Yes, take-home vehicle is provided to all troopers for on-duty as well as off-duty use


## PAY PRACTICES SPECIAL BONUSES

- Only three out of eleven comparator police entities provide a bonus.

| Police Entity | Bonus Policy <br>  <br> Michigan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Spot bonus provided to Captains and above for outstanding performance; median bonus |  |
| amount is $\$ 2,831$ |  |

Police entities not providing special bonuses: Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Hamilton County, Indianapolis, Knox County, Marion County, Scottsburg, and Valparaiso.

## PAY PRACTICES <br> SOCIAL SECURITY

- Six out of eleven comparator police entities are exempt from Social Security and do not pay into it or draw a benefit from it.

| Police Entity | Social Security Exemption Policy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Illinois | Exempt |
| Ohio | Exempt |
| Michigan | Exempt |
| Fort Wayne | Exempt |
| Indianapolis | Exempt ${ }^{36}$ |
| Scottsburg | Exempt |
| Indiana | Exempt ${ }^{37}$ |

Non-Exempt entities: Kentucky, Hamilton County, Knox County, Marion County, and Valparaiso.

## PAY PRACTICES

## PENSION FUNDING STATUS

- ISP's pension funding status is above the comparator police entities median (76\%).
- ISP's pension funding is the highest of the state police entities.

| Police Entity | Pension Funding Status |
| :--- | :---: |
| Fort Wayne | $106 \%^{*}$ |
| Indianapolis | $106 \%^{*}$ |
| Scottsburg | $106 \%^{*}$ |
| Valparaiso | $106 \%^{*}$ |
| Hamilton County | $95 \%$ |
| Indiana | $85 \%$ |
| Marion County | $76 \%$ |
| Knox County | $71 \%$ |
| Ohio | $70 \%$ |
| Michigan | $63 \%$ |
| Kentucky | $36 \%$ |
| Illinois | $34 \%$ |

* Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, Scottsburg, and Valparaiso participate in the 1977 Police Officers' and Firefighters' Pension and Disability Fund, a stateadministered cost-sharing plan (Source: Indiana Public Retirement System).


## APPENDICES

## A: DATA REQUEST

B: PARTICIPANT CONTACT INFORMATION
C: LIST OF POSITIONS
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E: POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES
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## APPENDIX A:

## DATA REQUEST

|  | STATE OF INDIANA | Michael R. Pence Governor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | STATE BUDGET AGENCY <br> 212 State House Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2796 317-232-5610 | Brian E. Bailey Director |
| MEMORANDUM |  |  |
| TO: | Colleagues in Surrounding States and City and County Government |  |
| FROM: | Brian Bailey, State Budget Directo |  |
|  | Doug Carter, State Police SuperintendentD $\triangle$ |  |
|  | Denny Darrow, State Personnel Director $\qquad$ |  |
| RE: | Indiana Law Enforcement Salary Study |  |
| DATE: | August 11, 2015 |  |

The Legislative Council of the Indiana General Assembly assigned the Indiana State Budget Committee the task of comparing the compensation of the Indiana State Police Department to city, county, and surrounding state law enforcement agencies. A final report must be submitted to the Legislative Council by November 1, 2015.

As we have limited time in which to collect and analyze the data necessary to conduct this study, we have engaged Mercer, a professional services human resources firm, to assist in the completion of this study for the State Budget Committee. However, to expedite the data collection process, my colleagues and I are sending out this request directly to you and your colleagues with the hopes that you will be able to expedite the data collection.
As part of this study, we hope to gather information from the following entities:

| Entity | Type |
| :--- | :--- |
| Illinois | Surrounding State |
| Kentucky | Surrounding State |
| Michigan | Surrounding State |
| Ohio | Surrounding State |
| Knox County Sheriff's Department | Rural County |
| Marion County Sheriff's Department | Urban County |
| Valparaiso Police Department | Suburban City |
| Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department | Urban City |
| Hamilton County Sheriff's Department | Suburban County |
| Scottsburg Police Department | Rural City |
| Fort Wayne Police Department | Urban City |

If possible, we are asking for all infornation to be sent to the Mercer contact person lister below, no later than August 28, 2015:

## Pete Eddings

Analyst
400 West Market Street, Suite 700
Louisville, KY 40202
+15025614696
pete.eddings@mercer.com
ww.mercer.com
Outlined below is the information we are requesting

1) A list of all state trooper or police officer position titles and their rank or level
) A salary matrix or pay plan, which includes minimum/starting pay rates, step promotion pay rates and definition for timing of the step (e.g., after 1 year), and the maximum pay rate, if applicable, for each state trooper or police officer position
2) A year-end 2014 payroll file for all state troopers or police officers containing their title, date of hire, and a separate row for each individual reporting annual hours and earnings for the following, which are labeled: base pay, overtime, shift differential, hazardous duty pay, education reimbursement, longevity pay, uniform allowance, aniform cleaning allown, a
3) The placy
4) The eriplesee hany policies and procedures trocedures, post orders, executive directives, and any policies and procedures that are specific to active and retired police acation, sick, holiday, jury, sabbatical, etc.), and take home vehicles
5) Summary plan descriptions for all benefit plans, including retirement/pension or other fficerse or deferred compensation benefit programs provided to active or retired police
6) The benefit cost sheet for all programs provided, which report total cost, the portion paid by the employer and the portion paid by police (please include retiree costs, if provided)
7) Any programs in place related to sign-on bonuses, referral bonuses, and retention bonuses or any other type of bonuses provided
8) A description of any agreement with the federal government to exempt police officers from Social Security
9) Any other perquisites not included in the above materials

If you have any questions related to this request or believe that you will not be able to provide the data by the end of the month, please contact Deputy State Budget Director Zac Jackson at zackson@sba.in.gov

We greatly appreciate your assistance. As a thank you for your assistance, we will provide you with a full report of the study that is prepared by Mercer in November

## APPENDIX B: <br> PARTICIPANT CONTACTINFORMATION

| Police Entity | Contact Name | Titile | E-Mail | Phone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indiana | Pam Douglas Kristi Hall | Human Resources Manager <br>  <br> Organizational Design, State Personnel <br> Department | pdouglas@isp.in.gov <br> klhall@spd.in.gov | $\begin{aligned} & 317.233 .3610 \\ & 317.234 .2956 \end{aligned}$ |
| Kentucky | Angela Parker | Branch Commander, Strategic Planning Branch | Angela.parker@ky.gov | 502.782 .1848 |
| Michigan | Jacques McNeely | Office of Public Protection and Resources | mcneelyi@michigan.gov | 517.241 .5205 |
|  | Dave Morris |  <br> Fleet Unit | morrisd1@michigan.gov | 517.241 .1050 |
|  | Robert Olney | Budget Manager, Michigan State Police | olneyR1@michigan.gov | 517.241.1032 |
| Ohio | C.J. Linek | Captain, Office of Personnel | clinek@dps.sate.oh.us | 614.752 .2110 |
| Illinois | Steve Lyddon | Chief of Staff | steve lyddon@isp.state.il.us | 217.782.7263 |
| Indianapolis | Nathan Maners | Deputy Director--Operations | nathan.maners@indy.gov | 317.327.5713 |
| Marion County | Angela Grider | Director of Human Resources | angela.grider@indy.gov | 317.327.1516 |
| Knox County | Mike Morris | Sheriff | mmorris@knoxcounty.in.gov | 812.882 .7660 |
|  | Jennifer Bunn |  | jbunn@knoxcounty.in.gov | 812.885.2502 |
| Hamilton County | Mark Bowen | Sheriff | mark.bowen@hamiltoncounty.in.go | 317.773.1872 |
| Fort Wayne | Scott Caudill | Sergeant, Planning \& Research Section | scott.caudill@cityoffortwayne.org | 260.427.2315 |
| Scottsburg | Karen Middleton Scott Zellers | Police Chief | kmiddleton@c3bb.com SAZellers@live.com | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 812.752 .4343 \text { ext. } 227 \\ & 812.595 .0680 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Valparaiso | Lynn Gralik | Human Resources (city of Valparaiso) | Igralik@valpo.us | 219.462.1161 |
|  | Natalie Mahlmann | Administrative Assistant | nmahlmann@valpopd.com | 219.476.7914 |

## APPENDIX C:

LIST OF POSITIONS

| Indiana | Illinois | Kentucky | Michigan | Ohio | Fort Wayne | Indianapolis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trooper Trainee | Cadet | Cadet Trooper | Recruit | Cadet |  | $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Patrolman (Recruit Trainee) |
| Probationary Trooper | Probationary Trooper |  | Trooper-E 10 | Probationary Trooper | Probationary <br> Patrolman | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year Patrolman <br> (Probationary) |
| Trooper | Trooper <br> Trooper $1^{\text {st }}$ Class <br> Master Trooper <br> Sr Master <br> Trooper | Trooper Senior Trooper | Trooper-E11/11 | Trooper | Patrolman | Patrol Officer |
| Corporal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sergeant | Sergeant | Sergeant | Sergeant 12 | Sergeant | Sergeant | Sergeant |
| First Sergeant | Master Sergeant |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lieutenant | Lieutenant | Lieutenant | Lieutenant 14 First Lieutenant 15 | Lieutenant Staff Lieutenant | Lieutenant | Lieutenant |
| Captain | Captain | Captain | State Office <br> Administrator 17 <br> State Bureau <br> Administrator 18 <br> Senior Policy <br> Executive 18 | Captain | Captain | Captain |
| Major |  | Major | Major | Major |  | Major Commander |
| Lieutenant Colonel | Lieutenant Colonel | Lieutenant Colonel | Lieutenant Colonel | Lieutenant Colonel | Deputy Chief | Deputy Chief |
| Colonel | Colonel | Colonel (currently do not have any) |  |  | Assistant Chief | Assistant Chief |
| Superintendent | Superintendent | Commissioner | Colonel (Top Officer) | Colonel (Top Officer) | Chief | Chief |

## APPENDIX C: <br> LIST OF POSITIONS

| Indiana | Hamilton Co | Knox Co | Marion Co | Scottsburg | Valparaiso |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trooper Trainee |  |  | Trainee | Trainee |  |
| Probationary Trooper |  | Probationary Merit Deputy |  | Rookie Patrolman | Probationary Patrolman |
| Trooper | Deputy Sheriff Detective | Deputy | Deputy | First Class Patrolman | 3rd Class Patrol <br> $2^{\text {nd }}$ Class Patrol <br> $1^{\text {st }}$ Class Patrol |
| Corporal |  |  | Corporal |  |  |
| Sergeant | Sergeant |  | Assistant Unit Commander | Sergeant | Sergeant |
| First Sergeant |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lieutenant | Lieutenant |  | Unit Commander | Lieutenant | Lieutenant |
| Captain | Captain | Captain | Assistant Section Commander | Captain | Captain |
| Major |  | Major Chief | Assistant Division Commander |  |  |
| Lieutenant Colonel |  |  | Division Commander |  |  |
| Colonel | Major, Chief Deputy |  | Colonel Chief Deputy | Assistant Chief Major | Assistant Chief |
| Superintendent | Sheriff | Sheriff | Sheriff | Chief | Chief |

## APPENDIX D: <br> DETAILED PROJECT METHODOLOGY

- The data disclosed by police entity are the pay unadjusted for geographic differential. However, when calculating market statistics (i.e., 25th percentile, median, composite, and 75th percentile) both adjusted and unadjusted data are shown.
- While geographic differentials were applied, it did not always have an impact on the market statistics. For example, if a city or county holds the median position for both raw and geographically-adjusted statistics, the median will not change because city and county police entities were not adjusted for geographic differences.
- When calculating workforce distribution, Mercer utilized an incumbent weighting (i.e., the sum of all officers at a rank regardless of police entity, divided by the total workforce).
- For payroll analysis, base pay was annualized for comparison.
- Superintendent pay was used when calculating aggregate positioning, but it is not disclosed because it is single incumbent pay.


## APPENDIX E: <br> POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES ILLINOIS STATE POLICE

- Illinois is a collective bargaining state.
- Illinois utilizes a 25 -year pay matrix, so no adjustments were necessary for comparison.
- Per bargaining agreement, Trooper is considered probationary for first 365 days; pay equals $1^{\text {st }}$ year Trooper, per contact at Illinois.
- Probationary Trooper not specified in payroll file, so assumed none on record.
- Footnotes:

5. Per discussion with Lt. Lyddon, officers listed in payroll file as Trooper with hire date of $2 / 2 / 2014$ are deemed Cadets, who graduated in 2014. Cadet pay is $\$ 2,673$ monthly, which annualized equals $\$ 32,076$.
6. The payroll file provided does not list any Probationary Troopers, so it is assumed the classification is not currently in use.
7. Illinois has the following positions: Trooper, Trooper 1st Class, Master Trooper, Sr. Master Trooper; an officer progresses based on years, similar to Indiana's Trooper; therefore, all four ranks have been considered a match for "ISP Trooper."
8. According to state legislature, Illinois has a position for the rank of Major; however, per discussion with Lt. Lyddon, the police entity regulations does not have a Major. They currently do not have any officers at the rank and cannot promote any, so they have been excluded from the Major analysis.
9. The payroll file provided by Illinois does not have separate values for shift differential and OT. For OT analysis, the combined number provided was used.

## APPENDIX E: <br> POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES INDIANA STATE POLICE

- Actual median pay is calculated based on annualized pay to 2210 hours, standard working hours for ISP.
- Footnotes:

1. ISP officers' beneficiaries receive a line-of-duty death benefit equal to $\$ 150,000$. In addition to the life insurance death benefit, an officer's spouse and/or children are not required to pay tuition or mandatory fees at any state supported college, university, or technical school (Indiana Statutes 21-14-06-02 and 21-14-06-03). Neither this benefit, nor any line-of-duty death benefits for other entities, were valued in the study.
2. Cost-of-living Adjustment ("COLA") was granted in 2015, with the last COLA being granted eight years prior. Given COLA is discretionary and ad-hoc, no assumption for COLA was used to value benefits.
3. ISP does not currently employ any Trooper Trainees. The 2015 graduating class consisted of 46 Trooper Trainees.
4. Prior to July 2015, Indiana State Police Officers were granted compensatory time off for regular duty overtime and compensated monetarily for special project overtime.
5. Majority of officers pay into Medicare but are exempt from Social Security.

- Trooper Trainees pay both Medicare and Social Security taxes.
- Officers hired before 1986 do not pay Medicare tax or Social Security tax.


## APPENDIX E: POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES KENTUCKY STATE POLICE

- Footnotes:

4. Cadets with fewer than 12 months of service were annualized to 12 months.
5. Promotion from Trooper to Senior Trooper is automatic according to the following criteria:

- Graduation from KSP Academy and minimum of 5 years of service as a Trooper.
- Graduation from KSP Academy, 32 credit hours from an accredited college or university, and minimum 4 years of service as a Trooper.
- Graduation from KSP Academy, 60 credit hours from an accredited college or university, and minimum 3 years of service as a Trooper.

14. Kentucky does not have a maximum pay in their structure, per contact, but base pay was included as the maximum pay for analysis.
15. Kentucky currently does not have longevity pay; however, not every officer within a rank has the same pay due to historical yearly pay increases. In 2007, pay increases were eliminated entirely. As a result, actual median pay is higher than listed pay structure.

APPENDIX E:
POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES

## MICHIGAN STATE POLICE

- Michigan is a collective bargaining state. Per bargaining agreement, pay matrix for Recruit through Sergeant 12 derived from the FOP contract step matrix plus longevity outlined below:
- Years 5-8: \$260.
- Years 9-12: \$300.
- Years 13-16: \$370.
- Years 17-20: \$480.
- Years 21-24: \$610.
- Years 25-28: \$790.
- Years 29+: \$1,040.
- Lieutenant and above has minimum and maximum ranges published on Michigan's Civil Service Commission website; 10-year pay was calculated by taking the midpoint between minimum and maximum pay.
- Actual median pay is calculated based on annualized pay to 2080 hours.
- Footnotes:

6. Troopers listed as Trooper-E E10 in the 2014 payroll file with an hourly rate of $\$ 11.10$ were assumed to be recruits.

- Recruit pay is $52.67 \%$ of the Trooper 10 base rate, per the most recent Collective Bargaining Agreement.

16. Sergeant starting pay shown is Step 1 pay.
17. Michigan has both a Lieutenant and First Lieutenant rank; for the purpose of comparing to Indiana, they have been converted into one position.
18. Michigan's Captains have official titles of State Office Administrator, State Bureau Administrator, and Senior Policy Executive.
19. Top Officer is Colonel, so this position has been excluded from the Colonel match.
20. Each officer with at least one year time in service is compensated an additional \$4 per calendar day as Emergency Response Compensation, to be paid biweekly.

- Ohio is a collective bargaining state. Pay matrix derived from pay rate tables on Ohio's Department of Administrative Services (DAS) website plus longevity pay outlined in Ohio State Trooper Association collective bargaining agreement.
- Longevity pay begins after five years of service and is equal to one-half percent ( $1 / 2 \%$ ) times the number of years of service times the first step of the pay rate of the officer's classification for a total of twenty (20) years.
- Mercer obtained a payroll file from Ohio's Department of Administrative Services (DAS) website, which include officer name, title, and gross pay.
- Actual median pay was calculated based on other state police entities' (IL, IN, KY, MI) pay practices, taking their base plus longevity as a percentage of gross pay and applying it to Ohio's gross pay.
- Footnotes:

8. Per bargaining agreement, trooper is considered probationary for first 365 days; assumed starting pay equals 1 st year Trooper.

- Probationary trooper not specified in payroll file, so assumed classification not currently in use.

18. Ohio has both a Lieutenant and Staff Lieutenant rank; for the purpose of comparing to Indiana, they have been converted into one position.
19. Top Officer is Colonel, so this position has been excluded from the Colonel match.
20. OT analysis was calculated based on other state police entities' pay practices, taking their OT as a percentage of gross pay and applying it to Ohio's gross pay.

- Average amount spent per officer was calculated based on departmental OT numbers provided on DAS website.
- Fort Wayne operates under a collective bargaining agreement. Per agreement, pay matrix derived from base rates provided plus longevity pay.
- Patrolman:
- Years 2-4: \$700.
- Year 5: \$1,200.
- Year 6+: $\$ 1,200+\$ 100$ for each additional year of service, up to a maximum of $\$ 2,700$.
- Sergeant and Above:
- Years 1-15: \$350 per year.
- Years 16+: \$200 per year, up to a maximum of $\$ 6,500$.
- Footnotes:

20. Longevity pay is now capped at $\$ 6,500$; those who currently have longevity over $\$ 6,500$ are capped at $\$ 8,000$. The pay matrix was constructed utilizing the $\$ 6,500$ cap; the median pay for Captain is above the maximum because several officers have over \$6,500 in longevity pay.
21. Shift differential eligibility is not explicitly stated in the documentation provided, but according to payroll, officers up to and including Assistant Chief receive payment.
22. Special Duty Pay:

- Homicide Team/Crime Scene Supervisors: \$650/year.
- Emergency Services Team: \$650/year.
- Bomb Squad: \$450/year.
- Crisis Response Team: \$550/year.
- Fatal Traffic: \$350/year.
- K-9 Supervisor/Handler: \$650/year.
- Investigative Division: \$500/year.
- Hamilton County utilizes a 25-year pay matrix, so no adjustments were necessary for comparison.
- Footnotes:

22. Captain starting pay show is year 1 pay, which is defined as base pay in matrix.
23. The payroll file provided by Hamilton County did not have separate values for shift differential and OT. For OT analysis, the combined number provided was used.

## APPENDIXE: <br> POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES INDIANAPOLIS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

- Indianapolis is covered by a collective bargaining agreement. Per bargaining agreement, pay matrix derived from base rates provided plus longevity pay:
- Longevity pay begins after 3 years of service and is equal to one-half percent ( $1 / 2 \%$ ) of the base pay of the $3^{\text {rd }}$-year patrol officer, continuing through the $20^{\text {th }}$ year; after 20 years, officer receives an additional $\$ 100$ per year (no maximum specified).
- Actual median pay is calculated based on annualized pay to 2080 hours.
- Footnotes:

10. Because no maximum longevity is specified, "maximum pay" shown is the 25-year pay.
11. Have both a Major and Commander rank, where Commanders are chosen from the Majors.
12. Shift differential eligibility is not explicitly stated in the documentation provided, but according to payroll, officers up to and including Major receive payment.
13. Former Marion County Sheriff's Deputies that were moved to IMPD are not exempt from Social Security.

## APPENDIX E: POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES KNOX COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

- Knox County does not utilize a pay matrix or longevity pay.


## APPENDIX E: <br> POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES MARION COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- Pay matrix derived from base rates provided plus longevity pay (only deputies through lieutenants):
- Officers receive regularly scheduled pay increases for first 7 years; beginning in the $8^{\text {th }}$ year of service, officers receive $\$ 100$ per year of service, up to a maximum of $\$ 4,300$.
- Actual median pay is calculated based on annualized pay to 2080 hours.
- Footnotes:

12. Maximum pay shown is the 25-year service pay, for a better comparison to the other peers.
13. Titles in payroll file, specified by police entity contact are: Assistant Unit Commander (Sergeant), Unit Commander (Lieutenant), Assistant Section Commander (Captain), Assistant Division Commander (Major), Division Commander (Lieutenant Colonel).
14. Shift differential eligibility is not explicitly stated in the documentation provided, but according to payroll, officers up to and including Major receive payment (these officers are almost exclusively assigned to the jail).

## APPENDIX E: <br> POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES SCOTTSBURG, INDIANA POLICE DEPARTMENT

- Pay matrix derived from base rates provided plus longevity pay:
- Longevity pay begins after one full year of service and is equal to $1 \%$ of the base pay of a First Class Patrol Officer, with $1 \%$ additional for each full year after, up to a maximum of $20 \%$.


## APPENDIX E:

POLICE ENTITIES DETAILS AND FOOTNOTES VALPARAISO, INDIANA POLICE DEPARTMENT

- Valparaiso operates under a collective bargaining agreement. Per agreement, pay matrix derived from base rates provided plus longevity pay:
- Years 3-5: \$200.
- Years 6-8: \$500.
- Years 9-11: \$800.
- Years 12-14: \$1,100.
- Years 15-17: \$1,400.
- Years 18-19: \$1,700.
- Year 20+ : \$2,000.
- Footnotes:

11. Pay schedule for trooper is broken down by 3rd Class Patrolman, 2nd Class Patrolman, and 1st Class Patrolman, but payroll file does not specify. All three were used when building pay matrix for trooper position.

## APPENDIX F：

BENEFITS ASSESSMENT

## Benefit Values

Displayed below is the competitive relationship of ISP＇s plans to the comparator group．The ratio of ISP＇s plans＇actuarial values to the median values of the comparator group is denoted symbolically according to one of seven ranges：

个个个 Over $25 \%$ above median
个个 $15 \%$ to $25 \%$ above median
个 $5 \%$ to $15 \%$ above median
$=$ Median（＋or－ $5 \%$ ）
$\downarrow 5 \%$ to $15 \%$ below median
$\downarrow \downarrow 15 \%$ to $25 \%$ below median $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ Over $25 \%$ below median

Benefit values will vary by officer depending on key demographic factors such as pay，family status，and age and service．Profiles have been defined to measure competitiveness for the indvidual job．The workforce profile results were calculated using a composite of ISP＇s census．

|  | Salary Profiles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Trpr } \\ \text { Trn } \end{gathered}$ | Prob <br> Trpr | Trpr | Crpl | Sgt | 1st Sgt | LT | Cpt | Mjr | Lt CL | CL | Workforce Profile |
| Time Loss | ヘヘィ | $\downarrow$ | ＝ | ヘヘ个 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $=$ |
| Paid Leave | ヘヘ个 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | 个个 | ＝ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | $=$ | $=$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Paid Time Off Vacation |  | $=$ | ＝ | 个个 | ＝ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | ＝ | $=$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Holiday | ヘヘ入 | $=$ | $\uparrow$ | ヘヘT | ヘヘT | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow \uparrow$ | $\uparrow \uparrow$ | 个ヘヘ | $\downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Personal Leave | 个ヘヘ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | ヘヘヘ | － | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | ＝ | ＝ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Sick Leave | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ |
| Short－term Disability Long－term Disability |  | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $=$ | ヘヘT | 个个个 | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个ヘT | $=$ | 个个 | $\uparrow$ |
| Retirement／Savings |  | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | ヘヘ入 | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ |
| Defined Benefit |  | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ |
| Defined Contribution |  | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | ヘヘャ | 个个 | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | 个个 | 个个 | ヘヘヘ | 个ヘ介 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Health／Group | ＝ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $=$ | $\uparrow$ | $=$ | $\downarrow$ | $=$ | － | ＝ | $\downarrow$ | $=$ | $=$ |
| Medical | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | ＝ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Dental | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 | 个个个 |
| Life Insurance |  | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ |
| Dependent Care FSA | ヘヘ个 | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | 个ヘT | $=$ | $\downarrow$ | ＝ | $=$ |  |  | ＝ | ＝ |
| Health Care FSA <br> Post－retirement Medical | ヘヘ个 | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | ヘヘT | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | $\downarrow$ |
| Total Remuneration | ヘヘ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | ヘヘヘ | ＝ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | ＝ | ＝ | ＝ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Total Benefits | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | ヘヘ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | ＝ | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |


| Profile Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salary | \＄37，590 | \＄39，156 | \＄48，650 | \＄57，287 | \＄65，499 | \＄68，538 | \＄71，500 | \＄74，653 | \＄78，000 | \＄84，001 | \＄89，001 | \＄53，211 |
| Age | 25 | 26 | 39 | 43 | 46 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 51 | 58 | 48 | 40 |
| Service | 1 | 1 | 13 | 16 | 21 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 28 | 36 | 25 | 15 |
| \＃Incumbents | 46 | 40 | 806 | 24 | 203 | 52 | 41 | 16 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 1244 |
| \％Married |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80\％ |
| \％With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 87\％ |

# MAKE <br> ( MERCER TOMORROW, TODAY 


[^0]:    * The positions of Corporal and First Sergeant are only used by ISP and one other police entity and are therefore considered as outliers.

[^1]:    © MERCER 2016

    * Payroll file does not specify Trooper Trainee; pay schedule value used for analysis.

[^2]:    © MERCER 2016 * Payroll file does not specify Probationary Trooper; pay schedule value used for analysis.

[^3]:    Police entities not paying shift differentials: Indiana, Kentucky, Knox County, Scottsburg, and Valparaiso. However, Valparaiso does switch shifts once per year.

