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## INTRODUCTION



The pay rates for the State's classified workforce will be established in accordance with a system that generally considers such factors as availability of applicants, the quality of the applicant pool, turnover rates, federal law, market competition, pay practices of market competitors, the evaluation system ranking, employee performance and level of funding available. The State will not be a market leader, but, for the most part, will follow the market as the value of jobs change."
C.S. Rule 6.1

Article $X$ of the Louisiana State Constitution requires the State Civil Service Commission to establish and maintain a uniform pay plan to ensure that classified state employees are compensated appropriately and in accordance with state and federal law. The Commission has strived to set compensation levels that enable state agencies to recruit and reta in quality employees that are needed to deliver effective services to our citizens, while adhering to a fiscally conservative philosophy.

The Commission has documented its compensation philosophy in Civil Service Rule 6.1. Through the adoption of Civil Service Rule 6.2,
the Commission has appointed the Director of State Civil Service to a nalyze the effectiveness of the classified compensation plan at least annually, and to recommend appropriate changes based upon the results. After considering such recommendations at a public hearing, the Commission may adopt changes to the pay plan. However, these changes become effec tive only after a pproval by the Govemor.

This report presents the results of the compensation analysis on behalf of the Director of State Civil Service for the members of the State Civil Service Commission.

## DEFINITIONS

## Benchmark Job

A job commonly found throughout all industries that is used as a reference point to make pay comparisons between employers.

## Lag

The amount in which a job's pay range midpoint falls behind its comparable in the public and/or private sector. May also refer to a compensation strategy to "lag" the market.

## Market

The relevant labor market from which an organization draws or loses employees.

## Market Rate

The prevailing rate of compensation employers are paying for a job. For the purposes of this report, it is an average of the actual median salaries for a group of similar benchmark jobs.

## Market Ratio

An index that is used to determine the lag of SCS benchmark jobs a gainst the market rate. It is calculated by dividing the SCS pay range midpoint by the market rate. This figure is subtracted from 100\% to determine the SCSlag.

## Median Salary

The middle value in a set of data responses that are ranked from lowest to highest and representative of a ctual sala ries.

## Midpoint

The middle value in a defined pay range. It is commonly used to adjust an organization's competitive position against the market rate for a given job.

## Pay Range

A salary range that an organization is willing to pay for a given job. A pay range consists of a minimum and maximum salary.

## Private Sector

Organizations with a "for profit" status that participated in the salary surveys in the southem region consisting of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

## Public Sector

State, federal, local govemment, or not-for-profit organizations that participated in the salary surveys in the southem region consisting of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Director, after consultation with appointing authorities and the state fiscal officer and after conducting such research as he may deem appropriate, shall cause to be prepared for submission to the Commission, a uniform pay plan, or amendments thereto, for the classified service."

- C. S. Rule 6.2(a)

$T$he Department of State Civil Service (SCS) is required by Civil Service Rule 6.2 to conduct an annual review of the compensation plan for classified state employees, and make recommendations to the State Civil Service Commission based upon the results. The purpose of this review is to provide an analysis of the health of the SCS pay schedules as compared to the market in order to remain competitive in recruiting and retaining qualified personnel. The analysis does not include data on unclassified employees.

Civil Service Rule 6.1 states the SCS compensation philosophy as, "The state will not be a market leader, but, for the most part, will follow the market as the value of jobs change." This is accomplished by comparing SCS pay range midpoints with median salaries for similar jobs within a relevant geographic area. The midpoint of a pay range typically represents an
organization's competitive market position for the jobs assigned to that pay range. It is the level at which an organization chooses to set its pay against the extemal market and established as a strategy against an organization's competitors in recruiting and retaining personnel (WorldatWork, 2009).

This report provides an analysis of SCS pay schedule midpoints as compared to public and private sector median market rates for specific benchmark jobs. The a nalysis will assist in determining the competitiveness of pay ranges for classified jobs against the going market rates. Over 400 benchmark jobs are included in this a nalysis.

This report also shows how the actual median salaries of classified employees compare to those of actual median salaries for employees in the public and private sectors for benchmarked jobs.

## SC S CLASSIFIED PAY SCHEDULES LAG THE MARKET

The data indic ates that, on average, SCS pay sc hedule midpoints for classified benchmark jobslag public sectormedians by $6.5 \%$ to $16.1 \%$ and lag private sectormedians by 14.7 \% to $28.1 \%$.

| Administrative <br> Pay Schedule <br> (AS) | Protective <br> ServicesPay <br> Schedule <br> (PS) | Social Services <br> Pay Schedule <br> (SS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public <br> sector lag <br> $16.1 \%$ | Public <br> sectorlag <br> $-0.1 \%$ | Public <br> sector lag <br> $6.5 \%$ |
| Private <br> sectorlag <br> $28.1 \%$ | Private <br> sectorlag <br> $22.9 \%$ | Private <br> sectorlag <br> $18.5 \%$ |



Skilled Trades Pay Schedule (WS)


## Private

 sectorlag 16.2\%Medical Pay Schedule (MS)

Public sectorlag 9.3\%

Private sectorlag 14.7\%

## SCS CLASSIFIED PAY SCHEDULE LAG TRENDS

A comparison against last year's data indicates that two classified pay schedules have fallen further behind both the public sector and the private sector.

# PUBLC SECTOR <br> LAG INCREASES IN <br> SCS PAY SC HEDULES <br> 2 <br> OUTOF 6 

PRIVATE SECTOR


OUTOF 6


## ACTUAL MEDIAN SALARIES OF CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

Administrative Pay Schedule (AS)

## Protective Senvic es Pay Sc hedule (PS)

## Social Senvic es Pay Schedule (SS)

## Technical \& Scientific Pay Schedule (TS)

Skilled Trades Pay Schedule (WS)

## Medical Pay Schedule (MS)

- Public sector lag : $12.2 \%$
-Private sectorlag : 26.2\%
The data indicates that, on a verage, actual median salaries of classified employees in benchmark jobslag public sector medians by 3.4\%to 31.6\% a nd lag private sector media ns by $17.3 \%$ to 41.6\%

| Protective Services Pay Schedule (PS) | -Public sector lag : 31.6\% <br> - Private sectorlag : 41.6\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Social Servic es Pay Schedule (SS) | -Public sectorlag : $11.8 \%$ <br> - Private sectorlag : $23.2 \%$ |
| Technical \& Scientific Pay Schedule (TS) | -Public sectorlag : 10.8\% <br> - Private sectorlag : 17.3\% |
| Skilled Trades Pay Schedule (WS) | - Public sectorlag : 6.7\% <br> - Private sectorlag : $17.4 \%$ |
| Medical Pay Schedule (MS) | -Public sectorlag : 3.4\% <br> - Private sectorlag : $12.0 \%$ |

## Compensation Survey Practices

## BENCHMARKS

The Department of State Civil Service conducted this analysis according to the benchmarking process and principles recommended by the WorldatWork Society of Certified Professionals
(www.worldatwork.org).
WorldatWork is the world's leading not-for-profit professional association dedicated to knowledge and leadership in the areas of total rewards, compensation, benefits, and worklife balance. The WorldatWork standards of professional practice are followed by compensation professionals nationally and worldwide.

The benchmarking process identifies jobs that are common throughout all industries. Examples include jobs such as receptionist, accountant, engineer, registered nurse, electrician, etc. Benchmark jobs are used as reference points to make pay comparisons between employers within a geographic area.

Benchmark jobs are used to represent multiple levels within occupations. This allows for the analysis of a "cross-section" of an occupation throughout the job market in order to make pay comparisons of entry-level to entrylevel, up through supervisor to supervisor and beyond. For example, a comparison using this method would include the following job titles:

- Accountant Technician
- Accountants 1, 2, and 3
- Accountant Supervisor
- Accountant Manager
- Accountant Administrator

Benchmark jobs typically have broad usage within the relevant job market in order to allow for the application of statistic ally significant sampling methods. Additionally, universal standards established among compensation practitioners are used to ensure consistency of comparability. Over 400 benchmark job comparisons are utilized in this analysis. A complete listing is provided in Appendix B.

## SALARY SURVERYS AND THE REEVANTEMPLOYMENTMARKET

Once applicable benchmark jobs have been identified, salary information for those jobs is obtained through surveys from professional compensation survey providers as well as from public compensation consortiums. The data in this report includes comparisons to median salaries of employers in Louisiana's relevant employment market.

The Department of State Civil Service defines the relevant employment market as public and private employers within the South Central and/or Southeastem regions, preferably in service-providing industries. States in the South Central and Southeastem regions include Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

In an effort to maintain consistency in the collection and analysis of data, the same surveys have been used for the past few years as follows:

- IBM ${ }^{\circledR}$ Kenexa ${ }^{\circledR}$ CompAnalyst ${ }^{\circledR}$
- The American Federation of Teachers
- Compdata
- National Compensation

Association of State Govemments (NCASG)

## IBM ${ }^{\circledR}$ Kenexa ${ }^{\circledR}$ CompAnalyst ${ }^{\circledR}$

An intemational salary survey firm that provides a platform for compensation data management, analysis, and modeling. This platform contains salary data for over 4,000 benchmark jobs. IBM ${ }^{\circledR}$ Kenexa ${ }^{\circledR}$ CompAnalyst ${ }^{\circledR}$ was used to obtain comparative public and private sector salary data.

The American Federation of Teachers Compiles salary data for a variety of public sector professional jobs such as Accountant, Engineer, Human Resources Analyst, etc. as well as teachers, for all 50 states.

## Compdata

A national compensation survey data and consulting firm. Compdata has amassed the largest and most comprehensive database of curent compensation and benefits information. Compdata typically collects information from a pproxima tely 34,000 org a niza tions.

## National Compensation Association of State Govemments (NCASG)

A national organization composed of state govemment human resources professionals. NCASG's mission is to provide a forum for compensation professionals from member states to exchange information, professional expertise, and knowledge related to the compensation of state govemment employees. Annually, NCASG conducts a compensation survey that collects salary data from member states for a variety of jobs typically found in state govemment.

## OCCUPATIONALGROUP COMPARISONS

Louisiana's classified pay plan divides state classified jobs into six pay schedules based on broad occupational categories. These six pay schedules are listed below. The jobs within each pay schedule have relatively similar rec ruitment, retention, and compensation needs. Therefore, salary data was analyzed separately for each of these six pay schedules.


## TEC HNIC AL/SCIENTIFIC (TS)

- ITProfessionals
- Engineers
- Geologists



## PUBLC/PRIVATE SECTOR COMPARISONS

Salary data from both public sector and private sector employers were included in this analysis. The relative value of the different comparisons varies among occupational groups based on the jobs that were compared in each group.

For the majority of classified jobs, competition for skilled employees comes not from other states, but from private employers within Louisiana. For example, an Accountant considering employment with the Department of

Transportation and Development would be more likely to compare the offerings of state employment to those of local private competitors such as Exxon, Blue Cross, or CB\&I.

Part of defining the relevant employment market involves identifying employers within the same industry. For this reason, it is important to show a comparison against public sectordata aswell.

## Pay Structure Competitiveness

## SCS Pay Schedule Midpoints vs. Median Market Salaries

## MEIHODOLOGY DETAILS

The following methodology is used for the next six charts to compare SCS pay schedule midpoints to median market salaries for comparable benchmark jobs. Common standards in compensation administration suggest comparing the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile (midpoint) of the pay range to the median market rate when recommending pay structure changes. This is because median salaries are said to be less susceptible to fluctuations caused by outliers in the survey data (Lind 2005).

SCS classified jobs were matched to benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors.

Pay range mid points were identified for each SCS benchmark classified job.

Median salaries were identified for each corresponding benchmark job in the public and private sectors.

Separate a nalyses for each sector were completed since some SC S benchmark jobswere isolated to one sector.

SCS pay schedule mid points for benchmarked jobs were averaged to show a single value representative of the pay schedule for each sector. The median sala ries of the jobs matched to SC S benchmarks in each sector were also a veraged to provide a single value forcomparison.

## RESULTS

As of J anuary 1, 2015, SCS pay schedule midpoints for benchmarked jobs trail the median salaries offered by other public employers from $6.5 \%$ to $16.1 \%$, and lag behind those offered by private employers from $14.7 \%$ to $28.1 \%$. In the graph below, the bars indicate the percentages by which the average SCS pay structure midpoint has fallen behind the corresponding public and private median market salary for benchmarked jobs. A detailed comparison foreach pay schedule can be found on the following pages.

Market Lag of SCSPay Schedule Midpoints


Average \%Behind Market

AS =Administrative Schedule
PS = Protec tive Servic es Schedule
SS = Social Servic es Schedule

TS = Technic al \& Sc ientific Schedule
WS = Skilled Trades Schedule
MS = Medical Schedule

[^0]191<br>BenchmarkJobs<br>7,117<br>Classified Employees within Benchmark jobs<br>16.1\%Lag<br>Public Sector Median Salaries

## ADMINISTRATIVE PAY SCHEDUE (AS)

A total of 191 jobs were benchmarked in the Administrative Schedule which represents 7,117 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. Jobs in this category include Accountants, Attomeys, Economists, Human Resource Officers, etc. The graph below shows SCS Administrative Schedule midpoints as compared to median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors. According to this data, the SCS Administrative Schedule is, on average, $16.1 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $28.1 \%$ lowerthan competing private employers.

SCS Midpoints vs. Median Market Salaries for Benchmarked Jobs (AS)


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

## PROTECTIVE SERVICES PAY SC HEDULE (PS)

A total of 18 jobs were benchmarked in the Protective Services Schedule which represents 3,577 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. Jobs in this category include Police Officers, Corrections Officers, Probation \& Parole Agents, Wild life Agents, etc. The graph below shows Protective Services Schedule midpoints as compared to median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors. According to this data, the SCS Protective Services Schedule is, on average, $22.9 \%$ lower than competing private employers. The average SCS mid point for these 18 benchmarked jobs is a pproximately equivalent to the average median market rate for competing public employers, as there is less than a $1 \%$ difference from the average median market rate.

SCS Mid points vs. Median Market Sala ries for Benc hmarked J obs (PS)

*The difference in the SCS Average Midpoints is a result of the sampling of different benchmark jobs for the public and private sector.

The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Ala bama, Arkansas, Kentuc ky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, a nd Texas.

5,984
Full Time Classified Employees in Protective Services Pay Schedule (as of 1/1/2015)
6.5\%เด9

Public Sector Median Salaries

## SOCIALSERVICES PAY SCHEDULE (SS)

A total of 24 jobs were benchmarked in the Social Services Schedule which represents 1,796 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. Jobs in this category include Social Workers, Child Welfare Specialists, Counselors, etc. The graph below shows Social Services Schedule midpoints as compared to median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors. According to this data, the SCS Social Services Schedule is, on average, $6.5 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $18.5 \%$ lower than competing private employers.

SC S Mid points vs. Median Market Salaries for Benchmarked Jobs (SS)


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

## TECHNICAL \& SCIENTIRC PAY SCHEDUE (TS)

A total of 109 jobs were benchmarked in the Technical \& Scientific Schedule which represents 2,102 classified employees as of J a nuary 1, 2015. Jobs in this category include Biologists, Chemists, Engineers, Geologists, etc. The graph below shows SCS Technical and Scientific Schedule midpoints as compared to median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors. According to this data, the SCS Technical and Scientific Schedule is, on a verage, $10.8 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $19.6 \%$ lower than competing private employers.

SCS Midpoints vs. Median Market Salaries for Benchmarked J obs (TS)

*The difference in the SCSAverage Midpoints is a result of the sampling of different benchmark jobs for the public

The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arka nsas, Kentucky, Louisia na, Mississip pi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

## SKIUED TRADES PAY SCHEDUE (WS)

A total of 68 jobs were benchmarked in the Skilled Trades Schedule which represents 4,308 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. Jobs in this category include Carpenter, Electrician, Maintenance Repairer, Mobile Equipment Operator, Trades Apprentice, etc. The graph below shows SCS Skilled Trades Schedule midpoints as compared to median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors. According to this data, the SCS Skilled Trades Schedule is, on average, $8.7 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $16.2 \%$ lower than competing private employers.

SCS Mid points vs. Median Market Sala ries for Benc hmarked Jobs (WS)


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

## MEDICALPAY SCHEDUE (MS)

A total of 58 jobs were benchmarked in the Medical Schedule which represents 1,418 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. Jobs in this category include Nurses, Psychologits, Therapists, etc. The graph below shows SCS Medical Schedule midpoints as compared to median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors. According to this data, the SCS Medical Schedule is, on average, $9.3 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $14.7 \%$ lower than competing private employers.

SCS Midpoints vs. Median Market Salaries for Benchmarked Jobs (MS)


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisia na, Mississip pi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

# Market Lag Trends (2014-2015) 

## SCS Pay Schedule Midpoints vs. Median Market Salaries

The following charts show how SCS schedule midpoints have lagged the median salaries offered by public and private sector employers for benchmarked jobs in the last two years.

As compared to benchmarked jobs in the public sector, two of the six pay schedules have fallen further behind the market since 2014 by amounts ranging from 0.7 percentage points for medical occupations to 2.5 percentage points forsocial services occupations.

SCS Pay Schedule Midpoints Lag - Public Sector Benchmarked Jobs Trends for 2014-2015


Average \%Behind Market

AS =Administra tive Schedule
PS = Protective Servic es Sc hedule
SS = Social Services Schedule

TS = Technical \& Sc ientific Schedule
WS = Skilled Trades Schedule
MS = Medic al Schedule

[^1]
## Market Lag Trends (2014-2015)

## SCS Pay Schedule Midpoints vs. Median Market Salaries

As compared to the private sector, two of the six pay schedules have fallen further behind the market since 2014 by amounts ranging from 0.1 percentage points for social services occupations to 7.9 percentage points for protective services occupations.

SCS Pay Schedule Midpoints Lag - Private Sector Benchmarked J obs Trends for 2014-2015


Average \% Behind Market

AS =Administra tive Schedule
PS = Protective Servic es Schedule
SS = Soc ial Services Schedule

TS = Technical \& Sc ientific Schedule WS = Skilled Trades Schedule MS = Medic al Schedule

## Median Salary Comparisons

## SCS Classified Median Salaries vs. Median Market Salaries

## MEIHODOLOGY DETAILS

The following methodology is used for the next six charts to compare actual State Civil Service (SCS) classified median salaries to median market salaries for comparable benchmark jobs. For a closer look at specific jobs and their median salaries, Appendix C provides individual job "snapshots" for some of the benchmarked jobs in each pay schedule.

SCS classified jobs were matched to benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors. Only those SC S benchmark jobs that were matched in both the public a nd private sectors were included in this a nalysis.

A median salary was identified for each SCS benchmark classified job.

Median salaries were identified for each corresponding benchmark job that was matched in both the public and private sectors.

Actual SC S classified median salaries for benchmarked jobs were a veraged to show a single value representative of the pay schedule. The median salaries of the jobs matc hed to SCS benchmarks in each sector were also averaged to provide a single value for comparison.

The lag of a ctual SC S median salaries was calc ulated by dividing the a ctual a verage SCS classified median by the average median for the a pplicable sector, a nd then subtracting that numberfrom 100\%.

## RESULTS

As of January 1, 2015, the average median salaries of SCS classified employees lag the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public sector by amounts ranging from $3.4 \%$ to $31.6 \%$. The average median salaries of SCS classified employees lag the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the private sector by amounts ranging from $12.0 \%$ to $41.6 \%$

Market Lag of SCS Employees' Average Median Salaries for Benchmarked Iobs


AS =Administrative Schedule PS = Protective Servic es Schedule SS = Social Servic es Schedule

TS = Technic al \& Sc ientific Sc hedule
WS = Skilled Trades Schedule
MS = Medic al Schedule

## ADMINISTRATIVE PAY SC HEDUE (AS)

A total of 84 jobs in the Administrative Schedule were benchmarked in both the public and private sectors, which represents 6,023 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. The graph below shows the average SCS median salary for classified employees in the Administrative Schedule as compared to the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors.

According to this data, the average median salary for SCS classified employees in the Administrative Schedule is approximately $12.2 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $26.2 \%$ lower than competing private employers for benchmarked jobs.

SCS Median Annual Salaries vs. Market Median Annual Salaries (AS) For Benchmarked Jobs


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

3<br>BenchmarkJobs<br>Classified Employees within Benchmark jobs<br>31.6\% La<br>Public Sector Median Salaries<br>41.6\% Lag<br>Private Sector Median Salaries

## PROTECTIVE SERVICES PAY SC HEDULE (PS)

A total of three jobs in the Protective Services Schedule were benchmarked in both the public and private sectors which represents 246 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. The graph below shows the average SCS median salary for classified employees in the Protective Services Schedule as compared to the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors.

According to this data, the average median salary for SCS classified employees in the Protective Services Schedule is approximately $31.6 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $41.6 \%$ lower than competing private employers for benchmarked jobs.

SCS Median Annual Salaries vs. Market Median Annual Salaries (PS) For Benchmarked Jobs


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

```
10
Benchmark Jobs
```

Classified Employees within Benchmark jobs
23.2\% Lag

Private Sector Median Salaries

## SOCIALSERVICES PAY SCHEDULE (SS)

A total of 10 jobs in the Social Services Schedule were benchmarked in both the public and private sectors which represents 346 classified employees as of J anuary 1, 2015. The graph below shows the average SCS median salary for classified employees in the Social Services Schedule as compared to the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors.

According to this data, the average median salary for SCS classified employees in the Social Services Schedule is approximately $11.8 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $23.2 \%$ lower than competing private employers for benchmarked jobs.

SCS Median Annual Salaries vs. Market Median Annual Salaries (SS) For Benchmarked Jobs


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

6,022
Full Time Classified Employees in Social Services Pay Schedule (as of 1/1/2015)

57<br>BenchmarkJobs<br>Classified Employees within Benc hmark jobs<br>10.8\%<br>Public Sector Median Salaries<br>17.3\%lag<br>Private Sector Median Salaries

## TECHNICAL \& SCIENTIRC PAY SCHEDULE (TS)

A total of 57 jobs in the Technical and Scientific Schedule were benchmarked in both the public and private sectors which represents 1,758 classified employees as of January 1, 2015. The graph below shows the average SCS median salary for classified employees in the Technical and Scientific Schedule as compared to the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors.

According to this data, the average median salary for SCS classified employees in the Technical and Scientific Schedule is approximately $10.8 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $17.3 \%$ lower than competing private employers for benchmarked jobs.

SCS Median Annual Salanies vs. Market Median Annual Salaries (TS) For Benchmarked Jobs


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Ala bama, Arkansas, Kentuc ky, Louisia na, Mississippi, Okla homa, Tennessee, and Texas.

46
BenchmarkJobs

Classified Employees within Benchmark jobs
6.7\%Lag

Public Sector Median Salaries
17.4\% 4 lag

Private Sector Median Salaries

## SKIUED TRADES PAY SCHEDUE (WS)

A total of 46 jobs in the Skilled Trades Schedule were benchmarked in both the public and private sectors which represents 3,702 classified employees as of J anuary 1, 2015. The graph below shows the average SCS median salary for classified employees in the Skilled Trades Schedule as compared to the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors.

According to this data, the average median salary for SCS classified employees in the Skilled Trades Schedule is approximately $6.7 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $17.4 \%$ lower than competing private employers for benchmarked jobs.

SCS Median Annual Salaries vs. Market Median Annual Sala ries (WS) For Benchmarked Jobs


Classified Employees within Benchmark jobs
3.4\%Lag

Public Sector Median Salaries
12.0\% $\%$ lag

Private Sector Median Salaries

## MEDICAL PAY SCHEDUE (MS)

A total of 40 jobs in the Medical Schedule were benchmarked in both the public and private sectors which represents 1,346 classified employees as of J anuary 1, 2015. The graph below shows the average SCS median salary for classified employees in the Medical Schedule as compared to the average median salaries for equivalent benchmark jobs in the public and private sectors.

According to this data, the average median salary for SCS classified employees in the Medical Schedule is approximately $3.4 \%$ lower than competing public employers and $12.0 \%$ lower than competing private employers for benchmarked jobs.

SCS Median Annual Salaries vs. Market Median Annual Salaries (MS) For Benchmarked lobs


The public and private sector include states in the southem region which consists of Ala ba ma, Arkansas, Kentuc ky, Louisiana, Mississip pi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas.

# Percent into Pay Range Analysis Classified Salaries 

To assist in determining the competiveness of SCS pay schedules, the actual pay of employees and how those salaries fall within the pay ranges should be taken into consideration. For example, if the majority of employees are clustered a round the maximums of their respective pay ranges, this data helps support raising pay range maximums. Percent into range data was collected for the last five years for all classified employees in all pay schedules.

The data indicates that the salaries of the classified workforce have remained relatively static for the last five years in regard to percent into range. It is assumed that this is due to economic conditions, retirements of senior employees, and the inability of state agencies to grant performance adjustments for several years. On average, the actual pay for a majority of the classified workforce (59.4\%) has been between the minimums and the midpoints of their respective pay rangessince 2010.

Percent into Pay Range of SCS Classified Salaries
(as of J a nuary 1, 2015)
3.2\%
Minimum

> 28.2\%
Minimum - $1^{\text {t }}$ Quartile
38.6\%
$1^{\text {st }}$ Quartile - Midpoint 33.3\%
Midpoint - $3^{\text {rd }}$ Quartile
19.1\%
3rd Quartile - Maximum
2.7\%
Maximum - Above Maximum

These figures remain consistent for 2015. As of January 1, 2015, the actual pay of approximately $56.2 \%$ of the classified workforce was between the minimums and midpoints of their respective pay ranges. Approximately $38.6 \%$ of employees were clustered between the first quartiles and the midpoints of their respective pay ranges, and nearly $33.3 \%$ of employees fall between the midpoint and the third quartile. A smaller percent of employees (28.2\%) were between the minimums and the first quartiles of their respective pay ranges, and even fewer employees (19.1\%) were between the third quartiles and the range maximums. Overall, a very small percent of employees (3.2\%) were at the range minimums. Only $2.7 \%$ of employees were at or above the pay range maximums.

## Tumover Statistics

Each fiscal year, SCS prepares an Annual Tumover Report that provides an a nalysis of the number of classified employees serving in non-temporary positions who are separated from state classified service during the fiscal year. Data throughout the report are categorized as Total Tumover, Involuntary Tumover, or Voluntary Tumover.

## Voluntary Tumover

Separations from state service due to resignation, retirement, ordeath.

## Involuntary Tumover

Separations from state service through dismissal, layoff, separation during probationary period, or nondisciplinary removal.

## Total Tumover

Voluntary Tumover + Involuntary
Tumover.
The voluntary tumover rate includes those individuals that may have separated for pay reasons, and therefore, should be considered when evaluating the
competitiveness of SCS pay ranges. Layoffs are included in involuntary tumover, which provides some insight into the financial ability of agencies to implement pay structure improvements. For this reason, it is important to review both voluntary and involuntary tumover rates.

The tumover report for FY 2014-2015 a nalyzes the number of nontemporary classified employees in state service on June 30, 2015, compared to the number of nontemporary classified employees who have separated from state service during the previous twelve months.

Both total and voluntary tumover rates have decreased since last fiscal year. The statewide total tumover rate for FY 2014-2015 was $16.09 \%$. This is a decrease of $7.69 \%$ from FY 2013-2014. The statewide voluntary tumover rate for FY 20142015 was $12.38 \%$. This is a decrease of $2.15 \%$ from FY 2013-2014.

## Voluntary \& Total Tumover FY 2014-2015

The following chart represents the total tumover and voluntary tumover by SCS pay schedule for non-temporary classified employees for FY 2014-2015. The Protective Services Schedule saw the highest total tumover rate at $25.39 \%$, with a voluntary tumover rate of $18.06 \%$.

Voluntary and Total Tumover by SCS Classified Pay Schedule
FY 2014-2015


| Pay <br> Schedule | \#of <br> Incumbents | Total <br> Tumover <br> Count | Total <br> Tumover\% | Voluntary <br> Tumover <br> Count | Voluntary <br> Tumover\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AS | 11,651 | 1,413 | $12.13 \%$ | 1,181 | $10.14 \%$ |
| MS | 2,662 | 638 | $23.97 \%$ | 430 | $16.15 \%$ |
| PS | 5,891 | 1,896 | $25.39 \%$ | 1,064 | $18.06 \%$ |
| SS | 5,994 | 931 | $15.53 \%$ | 774 | $12.91 \%$ |
| TS | 4,623 | 374 | $8.09 \%$ | 340 | $7.35 \%$ |
| WS | 6,168 | 1,045 | $16.94 \%$ | 753 | $12.21 \%$ |
| As 6.30-2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

As of 6-30-2015
Statewide total and voluntary turnover percentages were calculated to include classified separations from state service job titles that had at least one employee that left state service at some point during the fiscal year, but had no employees as of the end of the fiscal year. In most cases, this can be attributed to abolished job titles. Turnover cannot be assigned to a pay schedule for these job titles.

## Voluntary Tumover Trends FY 2013-2014 \& FY 2014-2015

All six SCS classified pay schedules saw a dec rease in voluntary tumover since FY 2013-2014. The Medical Schedule (MS) had the largest decrease in voluntary tumover (20.25\%). The Protective Services Schedule (PS) has the largest percent of voluntary tumover in the amount of $18.06 \%$ in FY 2014-2015.

Voluntary Tumover by SCS Classified Pay Schedule Trends for FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015


## Total Tumover Trends FY 2013-2014 \& FY 2014-2015

The only increase in total tumover since FY 2013-2014 occurred in the Technical Schedule (TS). Total tumover in the Technical Schedule has increased by $0.1 \%$. The Medical Schedule (MS) saw the largest decrease in total tumover in the amount of $74.5 \%$ since FY 2013-2014. The completion of the privatization of state hospitals contributed to the decrease in the total tumoverfor in the Medical Schedule for FY 2014-2015.

Total Tumover by SCS Classified Pay Schedule Trends for FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015


## Tumover Due to Retirement FY 2014-2015

Tumover due to retirement falls within the category of voluntary tumover. There were 1,522 retirements in FY 2014-2015 that contributed to the statewide voluntary tumover rate for the year. This is a decrease of $29.5 \%$ from the number of retirements that oc curred in FY 2013-2014.

The following chart represents the number of retirements by SCS pay sc hedule for FY 2014-2015.

Number of Retirements by SCS Pay Sc hedule for FY 2014-2015


## TURNOVER STATISIICS ADDIIONALINFORMATION

## Top 10 SCS C lassified J ob Titles with Highest Tumover FY 2014-2015

(Includes only those job titles with 50 or more employees.)

| Job Tite | Sep <br> Count | Job Title | Sep <br> Count |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1. Corrections Cadet | 379 | 6. Laborer | 34 |  |
| 2. Juvenile J ustice Spec 1 | 93 | 7. | Custodian 1 | 113 |
| 3. Residential Servic es Spec 1 | 82 | 8. Food Services Spec 3 | 20 |  |
| 4. Nursing Assistant 2 | 147 | 9. | Social Worker 3 | 23 |
| 5. Child Welfare Spec Trainee | 38 | 10. Social Services Analyst 1 | 58 |  |

## Top 10 SCS Classified J obs with Largest Number of Retirements FY 2014-2015

| 1. Administrative Coordinator 3 (70) | 6. Administrative Coordinator 2 (24) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. Corrections Sergeant - Master (62) | 7. Administrative Assistant 3 (22) |
| 3. Administrative Coordinator 4 (52) | 8. Administrative Prog Spec A (22) |
| 4. Social Services Analyst 2 (35) | 9. Administrative Assistant 5 (19) |
| 5. Administrative Assistant 4 (24) | 10. Custodian 2 (17) |

## ECONOMIC OUTLOOK INFORMATION

To assist in determining the competitiveness of the SCS classified pay structures, the state's current and future economic statuses must be taken into consideration. Employment in Louisiana is expected in grow by $11.6 \%$ by 2020 . Labor force participation in Louisiana increased by $2.2 \%$ since 2014. However, unemployment has increased by 1.7\% since 2014 (Eysink, 2015).

Several new projects and expansions in the state will create thousands of new jobs from 20152016. There will be job growth in industrial construction as it is estimated that over $\$ 100$ billion will be spent on current or prospective industrial projects. For example, the Lake Charles area (Calcasieu and Cameron parish) will add approximately 12,000 jobs from the potential construction of five LNG export terminals and various large projects, like Sasol's \$11-\$14 billion Gas-to-Liquids facility. In tum, the demand for construction labor will increase dramatically. According to Southwest Louisiana Alliance (SWLA) survey's, approximately 4,000 additional construction workers will be sought (Scott and Richardson, 2014).

Construction also seemed to be a major factor behind Baton Rouge's regional growth. Construction employment increased by $25.5 \%$ since 2012 (Eysink, 2015). The Baton Rouge region flourished from numerous industrial expansions due to the boom in the chemical industry. An estimated $\$ 16.0$ billion will be spent on the construction of multiple industrial plants, and some of these projects are already underway, such as Dow Chemical's two polyolefin plants, SE Tylose's chemical plant, and CF industries' nitrogen fertilizer plant (Scott and Richardson 2014).

Job growth in Louisiana is expected to last for years to come with several other industries expected to announce new jobs. For instance, the number of health care jobs in New Orleans will grow as 2,100 new jobs become a vailable due to the completion of two new medical complexes, University Medical Center (UMC) and the VA Hospital (Scott and Richardson, 2014). In addition, the professional, scientific, and technical services industry will experience the greatest growth by adding approximately 19,614 jobs within the next seven years (Eysink 2015).

## ECONOMIC OUILOOK INFORMATION



1. CASHIERS
2. RETAIL SALEPERSONS
3. WAITERS AND WAITRESSES
4. LABORERS \& FREIGHT, STOC K \& MATERIAL MOVERS
5. REG ISTERED NURSES
6. COMBINED FOOD PREPARATION \& SERVING WORKERS, INCLUDING FASTFOOD
7. PERSONALCARE AIDES
8. GENERAL \& OPERATIONS MANAGERS
9. SEC RETARIES AND ADM INISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS, EXCEPTLEGAL, MEDICAL \& EXECUTVE
10. OFFIC E CLERKS, GENERAL
11. FOOD PREPARATION WO RKERS
12. UCENSED PRACTICAL \& UCENSED VOCATIONAL NURSES
13. CUSTO MER SERVICE REPRESENTATIVES
14. J ANITO RS \& CLEANERS, EXC EPTMAIDS \& HOUSEKEEPING CLEANERS
15. CONSTRUCTION LABORERS
16. MAINTENANCES \& REPAIR WORKERS, GENERAL
17. NURSING ASSISTANTS
18. CARPENTERS
19. HEAVY \& TRACTOR-TRAILER TRUCK DRIVERS
20. SALES REPRESENTATIVES, WHOLESALE \& MANUFACTURING, EXC EPTTEC HNICAL \& SCIENTIFIC PRODUCTS
21. FIRST-UNE SUPERVISO RS OF RETAIL SALES WO RKERS
22. FIRST-UNE SUPERVISO RS OF OFFICE \& ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPO RTWO RKERS
23. STOC K CLERKS \& ORDER FILERS
24. HOME HEALTH AIDES
25. WELDERS, CUTERS, SOLDERERS, \& BRAZRS
[^2]
## ECONOMIC OUILOOK INFORMATION



[^3]
## SCS Structure Adjustment and Recommendation History

Louisiana's state budget has experienced challenges for the past several years. As a result, SCS pay schedules have not been adjusted since 2007. In 2007, the State Civil Service Commission and the Govemor approved a $\$ 0.72$ /hour increase for all classified employees and a 7\% increase to the minimums for all pay schedules. In addition, the maximums for all
schedules were increased by a mounts ranging from $10 \%-14 \%$.

Due to budgetary concems of the state govemment, SCS has not recommended any pay structure adjustments from 2009-2014. Appendix $D$ provides additional structure adjustment and general inc rease history.

## CONCLUSION

The research and analysis performed by the Compensation Division of the Department of State Civil Service indicate that the state classified pay schedules continue to lag behind prevailing rates used by private and public employers in the relevant employment market. In addition, actual median salaries of classified employees lag median salaries of employees in comparable jobs for both the public and private sectors.

This report indicates that SCS pay schedules lag comparable public sector jobs by $6.5 \%$ to $16.1 \%$ and lag comparable private sector jobs by $14.7 \%$ to $28.1 \%$. When comparing these figures to last year, the data shows that three pay schedules have fallen further behind the public and private sectors. As compared to the public sector, the lag has increased for two of the six pay schedules by a mounts ranging from 0.7 to 2.5 percentage points. As compared to the private sector, the lag has increased for two of the six pay schedules by amounts ranging from 0.1 to 7.9 percentage points.

This report also shows that the actual median salaries of SCS classified employees in benchmarked jobs lag those of employees in comparable jobs for the public sector by $3.4 \%$ to $31.6 \%$ a nd the private sector by $12.0 \%$ to $41.6 \%$. In reviewing the actual salaries of classified employees as compared to their placement within the respective SCS pay ranges, overall, the employees are well encompassed within the current pay ranges. The majority of classified employees (56.2\%) are clustered between the minimums and the midpoints of their respective pay ranges.

Voluntary tumover rates have decreased for all classified pay schedules in FY 2014-2015. In addition, total tumover rates have decreased in five of the six SCS classified pay schedules. The Protective Services Schedule had the greatest number of inc umbents that separated from the classified service. However, the Administrative Schedule had the largest number of retirements.

## RECOMMENDATION

The 2015 Annual Pay Plan report indicates a continued lagging of classified pay scales behind salaries offered by market competitors. In addition, actual salaries of employees in benchmark jobs fall behind salaries of their counteparts in both the public and private sector.

In order to fully understand and predict potential outcomes associated with a continued and growing gap between classified pay schedules and salaries as compared to benchmarks in the public and private sector, the Department recommends the creation of a study group. This study group should include representatives of the SCS Commission, the Division of Administration, and other relevant organizations.

The goal of this study group should be to ascertain the relative impacts of classified pay schedules and salaries which may no longer be competitive in the workforce market. In addition, this study group should formulate statistics, recommendations, and plans for actions should they be deemed necessary in order to safeguard the competitiveness of the state's classified pay schedules. Finally, the study group should weigh the ability of existing mechanisms in the Civil Service rules to provide state agencies the capacity to offer salaries at higher points in the pay schedules in order to offset competitive disadvantages in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel.

# AppendixA SCSClassified Jobs Starting Below Current Federal Minimum Wage 

## ADMINISTRATIVE SCHEDULE (AS)

Recreation Aide
Student Residence Houseparent

## MEDICALSC HEDULE (MS)

Patient Esc ort 1
Pa tient Escort 2
Nursing Unit Aide

## SOC IAL SERVICES SCHEDULE (SS)

Psychiatric Aide 1
Resid ential Services Spec ialist 1

## SKUED TRADES SC HEDULE (WS)

Barber
Beautician 1
Custodian 1
Custodian 2
Food Service Specialist 1
Food Service Specialist 2
Laborer
La undry Worker 1
La undry Worker 2
Research Farm Assistant 1
Seamstress

# Appendix B Benchmark Job Titles 

## ADMINISTRATIVE OCCUPATIONS

Accountant 1
Accountant 2
Accountant 3
Accountant 4
Accountant Admin 3
Accountant Admin 5
Accountant Mgr 1
Accountant Mgr 2
Accountant Mgr 3
Accountant Mgr 4
Accountant Supv 1
Accountant Supv 2
Accounting Spec 1
Accounting Spec 2
Accounting Tech
Admin Asst 2
Admin Asst 3
Admin Asst 6
Admin Coord 1
Admin Coord 2
Admin Coord 3
Admin Coord 4
Admin Law Jdg-Adv
Admin Prog Dir 2
Admin Prog Mgr 1
Admin Prog Mgr 2
Admin Prog Mgr 3
Admin Prog Spec A
Admin Supv 1
Admin Supv 2
Agri Market Inter Spec
Architect Historian 2
Archives Spec B
Attomey 1
Attomey 2
Attomey 3
Attomey Supv
Attor Dep Gen Coun 2
Audit Director 2
Audit Manager

Auditor 1
Auditor 2
Auditor 3
Auditor 4
Auditor Supv
Budget Admin 2
Budget Analyst 1
Budget Analyst 2
Budget Analyst 3
Budget Analyst 4
Budget Manager
Business Dev Mgr
Comm Dev Prog Spec 3
Compliance Exam 2
Compliance Exam Rev
Compliance Prog Spec 2
Compliance Prog Spec 3
Contr/Gnts Rev 2
Contr/Gnts Rev 3
Curator 2
Curator 3
Economist 3
Economist 4-A
Educ Prog Cons 2
Exec Mgmt Officer 1
Exec Staff Officer
Graphic Artist
Grp Ben Analyst 2
Grp Ben Manager
HR Analyst A
HR Analyst B
HR Analyst C
HR Asst Div Admin
HR Consultant A
HR Consultant B
HR Consultant C
HR C onsultant Spec
HR Director D
HR Div Admin
HR Manager A

HR Manager B
HR Spec ia list
HR Supervisor
Insurance Spec 2
Interpretive Ranger 2
Land Spec 1
Land Spec 2
Land Spec 3
Land Spec 4
Librarian 2
Librarian 3
Library Spec 2
Library Spec 3
Mgmt Analyst 2
Marketing Rep 1
Marketing Rep 2
Marketing Rep Supv
Mot Veh Comp Analyst 2
Museum Dir/Branch
ORSSpec 2
OSHA Ind Hth Hyg Cons
OSHA Occup Saf Cons
Paralegal 1
Paralegal 2
Park Manager 1
Park Manager 2
Photographer 3
Polic y Planner 2
Proc urement Dir 4-Ex
Procurement Mgr 1-EX
Procurement Spec 1
Procurement Spec 2
Procurement Spec 3
Procurement Spec 4-EX
Pub Health Ex Dir
Pub Info Director 1
Pub Info Director 2
Pub Info Director 3
Pub Info Officer 1
Pub Info Officer 2

## ADMINISTRATIVE OCCUPATIONS (continued)

Pub Info Officer 3
Purchasing Tech 1
Purchasing Tech 2
Retire Ben Analyst 2
Retire Ben Analyst 3
Rev Tax Analyst 2
Rev Tax Auditor 2
Right of Way Agent 2
Right of Way Agent 3
Right of Way Agent 7
Right of Way Appraiser 3
Safety Prog Coordinator

Safety Risk Agency Dir
Sa fety Risk Agency Mgr
Safety/Emerg Prep Coor
St Budg Mgmt Analyst 2
St Loss Prev Officer 1
St Risk Underwriter 1
St Risk Underwriter 2
St Risk Underwriter 3
St Risk Under Mgr
St Risk Under Supv
Statistic ian 2
Tax Commission Spec 2

Train/Dev Prg Staf Mgr2
Train/Dev Spec 1
Train/Dev Spec 2
Train/Dev Spec 3
TV Producer
Utilities Spec 2
Warehouse Mgr
Warehouse Supv
Work Dev Spec 2
Work Dev Spec 8
Wrk Comp Med Svs Mgr

Prac Nurse/Lic 2
Rad Tech Mgr
Rad Ther Tech 2
Rad TherTech 3
Rad Ther Tech Supv
Rad Technologist 2
Reg Diet/Nutr Svcs Adm
Reg Dietician
RN 2
RN 3
RN Adv Practice
RN Dir Nursing B
RN Mgr-House
RN Supv A
RN Manager
RN Prog Coord
Speech/Aud Spec 2
Surgical Tech 2
Veterina ria $n$

## PROTECTIVE SERVICES OCCUPATIONS

Corr Sgt-Mstr
CorrCapta in
CorrLieutenant
Corr Sergeant
Crim Investiga tor 2
Guard

Guard Supv

Juv Just Spec 2
Park Ranger 2
Police Officer 3A
Police Sergeant A
Prison Enter Supv

Nursing Asst 2
Occup Therp 2
Occup Therp Mgr
Occup Therp Asst 2
Patient Escort 2
PH Lab Dir
PH Lab Sci 1
PH Lab Sci 2
PH Lab Sci 3
Pharmacist 2
Pharmacist 3
Pharmacist 7
Pham Tech 2
Phlebotomist 2
Phys Themp 2
Phys Therp Asst
Phys Therp Mgr
Phys Them Tech
Physic ians Asst

Prob/Par Officer 2/Ad
Prob/ParSupv/Ad
PSC Enf Agent 2
STFire MarDep 2
Wild If Enf Agent

## SOCIALSERVICES OCCUPATIONS

Assoc 3/Psychol
Clinical Chapla in 1
Clinical Chapla in 2
Clinical Cha pla in 4
CorrClass Off 2
Fraud Investigator 2
Habilitation Instr 1

Ha bilitation Instr 3
Health Educator Licensing Spec 2
Nutrition Educator 2
Prof Counselor 2
Psych Aide 2
Rehab Counselor

Resid Svcs Spec 2
Soc Serv Analyst 2
Soc Serv Couns 2
Soc Serv Couns 5-A
Social Worker 2
Ther Rec Spec 2

## TECHNICAL\&SCIENTIRC OCCUPATIONS

Agri Spec 2
Architect 1
Architect 2
Arc hitect 3
Architect 5
Biologist 1
Biologist 2
Biologist DCL-B
Biologist Supv
Con Enf Spec 2
Crime Rec Analyst 2
Crime Lab Analyst 2
Engineer 3
Engineer 4
Engineer 5
Engineer 5/DCL
Engineer 7
Engineer 9
Engineer 9 DOTD
Eng Tech 2
Eng Tech 3
Eng Tech 4
Engineer Intem 1
Env Chem Spec 1
Env Chem Spec 2
Env Chem Spec 3
Env Chem Spec Adv
Env Chem Spec Staff
Env Scientist 2
Env Scientist 3

Fac Proj Plan 1
Fac Proj Plan 2
Fac Proj Plan 3
Fac Proj Plan 5-A
Forest Prog Spec
Geologist 1
Geologist 2
Geologist 3
Geologist DCL
ITApp Manager 1
ITApp Prog 1
ITApp Prog 2
ITApp Prog/Anyl 1
ITApp Prog/Anyl 2
ITApp Prog/Anyl 3DCL
ITApp Proj Ldr
ITDir 2
ITDir 3
ITEquip Oper 1
ITEquip Oper 2
ITEquip Oper 3
ITGeo Asst Sup Anyl
ITGeo Sen Supp Anyl
ITGeo Supp Anyl
ITGeo Tech Spec/DCL
ITLiaison Off 2
ITMgmt Cons Supv
ITMgmt Cons 1
ITOper Shift Supv
ITProd Control Tech 2

ITProd Control Tech 3
ITStwd Syst Anyl 2
ITStwd Syst Mgr
ITTech Supp Anyl 1
ITTech Supp Anyl 2
ITTech Supp Cons/DCL
ITTech Supp Mgr
ITTech Supp Spec 1
ITTech Supp Spec 2
ITTech Supp Spec 3
ITTech Supp Supv
ITTelecom Tech Anyl 1
ITTelecom Tech Anyl 3
Landscape Architect
Landscape Archt Chief
Landscape Archt Intem
Prof Chemist 1
Prof Chemist 2
Prof Chemist 3
Prof Chemist Mgr
Proj Mgr
Pub Hth Epidem
Sanita rian 2
Surveyor 3
Surveyor 4
Surveyor 5
Surveyor Int 1
Telecom Cons 2
Telecom Cons Sup
Wild life/Fish Tech 2

Carpenter Master
Custodian 1

Custodian 2
Custodian Supv 3
Electrician
Electrician Master
Electronic Tech
Electronic Tech Adv
Electronic Tech TR
Fac Main MgrB
Fac Main MgrC
Food Svc Spec 1
Food Svc Spec 2
Food Svc Spec 3
Food Svc Spec 6
Food Scv Spec 7
Helper
Hwy Foreman 1
Hort Attend

Hort Attend/Ldr
Housekeeper Supv
HVAC/Refrig Mstr Mech
HVAC/Refrig Mech Fore
HVAC/Refrig Mech
Laborer
Maint Super
Maint Foreman
Maint Repairer 1
Maint Repairer 2
Maint Repairer Mst
Mob Equip Main Mech
Mob Equip Mst Mech
Mob Eqp Mst Mech/Ldr
Mob Eqp Oper 1/Hvy
Mob Eqp Oper 2/Hvy
Mob Equip Oper/Lgt

Mob Equip Oper 1
Mob Equip Oper 2
Mob Equip Shop Foreman
Mobile Equip Shop Supt
Operating Eng 2
Pa inter
Pa inter Ma ster
Plumber/Pipefitter
Plumber/Pipefitter Mst
Police Radio Dispat
Print Master Oper
Printing Oper 2
Printing Supv
Trade Apprentice
Welder
Welder Master

# Appendix C BenchmarkJob Snapshots Median Salaries 

## Administrative Schedule

## Accountant 3

| LA Median | $\$ 52,499$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Public Median | $\$ 64,600$ |
| Private Median | $\$ 70,158$ |
| Range Midpoint | $\$ 49,182$ |
| \# of Incumbents | 199 |

## Ac counting Spec ialist 2

| LA Median | $\$ 33,628$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Public Median | $\$ 38,072$ |
| Private Median | $\$ 35,932$ |
| Range Midpoint | $\$ 35,069$ |
| \# of Incumbents | 170 |
|  |  |
| Administrative Assistant 3 |  |
| LA Median | $\$ 28,827$ |
| Public Median | $\$ 36,864$ |
| Private Median | $\$ 49,955$ |
| Range Midpoint | $\$ 32,771$ |
| \# of Incumbents | 421 |

## Administrative Coordinator 2

LA Median
\$25,459
Public Median $\$ 26,059$
Private Median \$34,299
Range Midpoint $\$ 28,621$
\# of Incumbents 509
Administrative Coordinator 3

| LA Median | $\$ 29,380$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Public Median | $\$ 45,114$ |
| Private Median | $\$ 50,573$ |
| Range Midpoint | $\$ 32,771$ |
| \# of Incumbents | 1,328 |

Administrative Program Spec A
LA Median $\$ 43,264$
Public Median $\$ 72,964$
Private Median $\$ 79,342$
Range Midpoint \$42,952
\# of Inc umbents 301

## Attomey 3

LA Median $\$ 73,060$
Public Median $\$ 113,454$
Private Median $\$ 142,000$
Range Midpoint $\$ 68,984$
\# of Incumbents 142
HR Analyst C
LA Median \$50,346
Public Median $\$ 67,578$
Private Median $\$ 66,500$
Range Midpoint $\$ 49,182$
\# of Inc umbents 122

## Library Spec ialist 3

LA Median $\$ 28,538$
Public Median $\$ 33,600$
Private Median $\$ 35,800$
Range Midpoint \$35,069
\# of Incumbents 71
Proc urement Spec ialist 3
LA Median $\$ 39,874$
Public Median $\$ 64,000$
Private Median $\$ 70,000$
Range Midpoint $\$ 42,952$
\# of Incumbents 39

## Medical Schedule

Nursing Assistant 2
LA Median
\$20,675
Public Median $\$ 24,400$
Private Median $\$ 25,700$
Range Midpoint $\$ 25,127$
\# of Incumbents 267
Pharmacist 3
LA Median \$109,491
Public Median $\$ 105,600$
Private Median \$114,700
Range Midpoint $\$ 90,917$
\# of Incumbents 24
Pharmacy Technician 2
LA Median $\$ 34,247$
Public Median $\$ 29,688$
Private Median $\$ 32,200$
Range Midpoint $\$ 30,784$
\# of Incumbents 34

Practical Nurse 2
LA Median \$34,632
Public Median $\$ 37,912$
Private Median $\$ 41,700$
Range Midpoint $\$ 35,246$
\# of Incumbents 94
Registered Nurse 2
LA Median \$49,920
Public Median \$54,643
Private Median $\$ 62,200$
Range Midpoint $\$ 52,905$
\# of Incumbents 49
Registered Nurse 3
LA Median \$60,736
Public Median $\$ 71,900$
Private Median $\$ 76,200$
Range Midpoint \$56,608
\# of Incumbents 336

Protective Services Schedule

## Guard

LA Median
Public Median $\$ 27,173$
Private Median $\$ 27,628$
Range Midpoint $\$ 27,862$
\# of Incumbents 79
Guard Supenvisor
LA Median $\$ 28,787$
Public Median $\$ 42,087$
Private Median $\$ 54,800$
Range Midpoint \$31,907
\# of Incumbents 7

Police Officer 3-A
LA Median $\$ 39,249$
Public Median $\$ 49,800$
Private Median $\$ 49,300$
Range Midpoint $\$ 41,829$
\# of Incumbents $\$ 160$

## Social Senvices Schedule

## Health Educator

| LA Median | $\$ 34,320$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Public Median | $\$ 45,383$ |
| Private Median | $\$ 56,500$ |
| Range Midpoint | $\$ 40,144$ |
| \# of Incumbents | 15 |

Psychiatric Aide 2
LA Median $\quad \$ 26,478$
Public Median $\$ 27,540$
Private Median $\$ 29,200$
Range Midpoint $\$ 25,002$
\# of Incumbents 187
Rehabilitation Counselor
LA Median
\$46,405
Public Median
\$55,600
Private Median $\$ 58,100$
Range Midpoint $\$ 45,958$
\# of Incumbents 44

## Social Worker 2

LA Median \$42,016
Public Median $\$ 48,980$
Private Median $\$ 56,500$
Range Midpoint $\$ 45,958$
\# of Incumbents 12

## Social Svc Counselor 2

LA Median $\$ 35,183$
Public Median \$46,300
Private Median $\$ 48,700$
Range Midpoint $\$ 40,144$
\# of Incumbents 22
Therapeutic Recreation Spec 2
LA Median \$33,363
Public Median $\$ 46,600$
Private Median $\$ 49,100$
Range Midpoint $\$ 37,524$
\# of Incumbents 40

## Technical and Scientific Schedule

## Biologist 2

| LA Median | $\$ 34,570$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Public Median | $\$ 47,851$ |
| Private Median | $\$ 50,000$ |
| Range Midpoint | $\$ 47,809$ |
| \# of Incumbents | 19 |

## Engineer Intem 1

LA Median
Public Median
\$48,818
Private Median $\$ 57,100$
Range Midpoint \$51,158
\# of Incumbents 27

Engineering Technic ian 4
LA Median \$42,723
Public Median $\$ 49,600$
Private Median $\$ 52,300$
Range Midpoint $\$ 44,679$
\# of Incumbents 231

## Engineer 4

LA Median \$72,530
Public Median $\$ 74,538$
Private Median \$84,943
Range Midpoint $\$ 67,049$
\# of Incumbents 73

## Technical and Scientific Schedule (continued)

Environmental Scientist 3
LA Median \$47,798
Public Median $\$ 63,700$
Private Median \$68,700
Range Midpoint \$54,735
\# of Inc umbents 224

TTApplications
Programmer/ Analyst 2
LA Median \$60,445
Public Median $\$ 75,300$
Private Median $\$ 82,700$
Range Midpoint \$58,562
\# of Incumbents 105

TManagement Consultant 1
LA Median
\$74,693
Public Median $\$ 70,384$
Private Median $\$ 67,600$
Range Midpoint \$67,049
\# of Incumbents 59
TTechnic al Support
Specialist 3
LA Median \$64,293
Public Median $\$ 74,815$
Private Median $\$ 80,500$
Range Midpoint $\$ 62,660$
\# of Incumbents 183

## Skilled Trades Schedule

## Capenter Master

LA Median \$40,581
Public Median \$43,500
Private Median $\$ 44,200$
Range Midpoint \$41,163
\# of Inc umbents 58

## Custodian 2

LA Median \$19,832
Public Median $\$ 24,043$
Private Median $\$ 24,594$
Range Midpoint $\$ 20,925$
\# of Incumbents 751

## Eectronic Technician

LA Median
\$48,069
Public Median $\$ 36,921$
Private Median $\$ 44,000$
Range Midpoint \$47,123
\# of Inc umbents 64

## Hortic ultural Attendant

LA Median $\$ 24,197$
Public Median $\$ 16,298$
Private Median $\$ 28,700$
Range Midpoint $\$ 31,408$
\# of Incumbents 68

## Laborer

LA Median $\$ 19,594$
Public Median $\$ 23,820$
Private Median $\$ 29,500$
Range Midpoint $\$ 20,925$
\# of Incumbents 59
Maintenance Repairer 2
LA Median $\$ 32,677$
Public Median $\$ 32,926$
Private Median $\$ 38,000$
Range Midpoint $\$ 38,470$
\# of Incumbents 394

## Skilled Trades Schedule (continued)

Mobile Equipment Operator 1/Hvy
LA Median $\$ 36,421$
Public Median $\$ 33,887$
Private Median \$36,874
Range Midpoint \$41,163
\# of Incumbents 435

## Mobile Equipment Operator 1

LA Median $\$ 24,981$
Public Median \$31,312
Private Median $\$ 46,247$
Range Midpoint $\$ 31,408$
\# of Incumbents 393

# Appendix D <br> Structure Adjustment and General Increase History 

| Date | Proposal |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1994 | Proposal to increase range minimums by 4\% and range maximums <br> by 10\%. Approval was not granted. |
| 1995 | Proposal to grant COLAs to all classified employees in the amount <br> of 5\% and to increase range minimums and range maximums by <br> $5 \%$. Approval was not granted. |
| 1997 | Proposal to increase General pay schedule range minimums by 4\% <br> and range maximums by 10\%. Approval was granted. |
| 1999 | Proposal to increase Medical pay schedule range minimums by 4\% <br> and range maximums by 10\%. Approval was granted. |
| 2000 | Proposal to grant COLAS to all classified employees in the amount <br> of 5\% and to increase range minimums and maximums by 5\% <br> Approval was not granted. |
| 2001 | Proposal to increase range minimums and maximums for General <br> and Medical pay schedules by 6\% (2\% each year for three years). <br> Approval wasgranted. |
| 2002 | Proposal to increase range minimums and maximums by 2\% for <br> Skilled Tradespay schedule. Approval was granted. |
| 2007 | Proposal to grant COLAs to all classified employees in the amount <br> of \$0.72 per hour and to increase the range minimums for all pay <br> schedules by 10-14\% and maximums by 10-14\%. Approval was <br> granted. |
| 2008 | Proposal to grant COLAS to all classified employees in the amount <br> of 2-5\% and to increase all pay range minimums to reflect federal <br> minimum wage. In addition, it was proposed to increase range <br> minimums for all pay schedules by 3-10\%. Approval was not <br> granted. |
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[^0]:    * The figure of $-0.1 \%$ for the PS schedule illustrates that the a verage SCS mid point is a pproximately equivalent to the average median market rate for these 18 benchmarked jobs, as there is less than a $1 \%$ difference from the average median market rate.

[^1]:    * The figure of $-0.1 \%$ for the PS sc hedule illustrates that the a verage SC S midpoint is a pproximately equivalent to the average median market rate for these 18 benchmarked jobs, as there is lessthan a $1 \%$ difference from the average median market rate.
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