

State of North Carolina 2011 Compensation & Benefits Report



Office of State Personnel
Linda Coleman
State Personnel Director
February 2011

Table of Contents

<i>I.</i>	<i>Executive Summary and Recommendations</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>II.</i>	<i>Total Compensation</i>	<i>4</i>
	Total Compensation Model	
	Wage and Salary Trends	
	Consumer Price and Employment Cost Indices	
	Recruitment and Retention	
<i>III.</i>	<i>Benefits</i>	<i>11</i>
	Paid Time Off Analysis	
	Vacation, Sick Leave & Holidays	
	Health Insurance	
	Comparison to Southeastern States	
	Comparison to Local Government Practices	
	Supplemental Insurance Products (Post-Tax and Pre-Tax Plans)	
	Statewide Flexible Benefits Program (NC Flex)	
	Retirement	
	Supplemental Retirement Programs	
<i>APPENDIX</i>		<i>15</i>
	History of Legislative Increases for N.C. Employees	

COMPENSATION & BENEFITS REPORT: FEBRUARY 2011

“Do you and your HR partners still take the old view of employees as commodities that are only interested in a paycheck, or do you view them as multi-dimensional human capital that can be motivated by more than money? It’s at times like these that employers, including those in the public sector, need to look beyond money to drive employee performance and motivation.”

--Ryan Johnson, WorldatWork

“We must run this state more like a business as we manage for results.”

--Governor Beverly Perdue

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

North Carolina state government currently faces an estimated budget deficit of \$2.7 billion for the next biennium beginning July 2011. Cabinet agencies are currently under a hiring freeze and serious restrictions on salary adjustments are in place. Governor Perdue has proposed a plan to reorganize state government which could include the consolidation or elimination of certain government programs and services. The elimination of many state employees’ jobs is a near certainty. Given these conditions, the Office of State Personnel is not in a position to recommend an across the board salary increase or any radical changes in compensation and benefits strategies. This year’s Compensation and Benefits Report will address current economic and labor market conditions and set the stage for strategic planning to address them once the state’s budget picture improves.

In spite of current economic conditions, North Carolina must continue to focus on its total compensation programs and recognize that its employees – or “human capital” – are its most valuable asset. Though legislative increases have not been granted since 2009 – and are not anticipated in 2011 -- past cost-of-living adjustments have not been reflective of such relevant economic indicators as the Consumer Price Index or average market movement. Across-the-board salary adjustments “reward” employees with the same percentage increase regardless of their level of contribution or value to the employing organization. For North Carolina to manage its talent effectively, its compensation programs must eventually change from a “one size fits all” mentality to a performance culture that assigns more value to high-performing employees in key roles. This includes seriously examining options other than base pay increases for recognizing and rewarding excellent performance.

Market movement has been relatively stagnant during the past two years because of the economic downturn, but is beginning to pick up again, particularly in the private sector. While many state job classifications’ average salaries received the benefit of staying current with labor market through such compensation mechanisms as Career-banding, others have lagged behind. The State should consider all feasible options -- including incentive pay, variable pay, bonus pay programs, and proactive compensation planning and management -- to enhance the recruitment and retention of employees across the state’s many diverse occupational groups. More attention must be paid to critical labor market shortages and addressing North Carolina’s competitive position in a rapidly changing talent market. The current “lull” in market movement presents an excellent opportunity to assess the state’s competitive position going forward.

Health care options have improved since the introduction of the Preferred Provider Organization (PPO) program, but continue to be costly. Serious State Health Plan budget deficits in 2008 led to changes in cost and coverage for state employees. Further cost containment measures were instituted with a smoking cessation program in 2010. In continuing difficult financial times, we must pursue creative ways of attracting and retaining high performing employees. This is especially critical as the “Baby Boomer” generation begins to age out of the labor market over the next several years. The average age of the state workforce is steadily increasing, and the need to recruit a new generation of employees is paramount. This next generation wants more flexibility in their total rewards package (direct compensation, benefits, development and work-life programs).

Legislative support for pay innovations and funding for strategic compensation studies, competency-based pay systems, performance-based reward systems, improving benefits and attention to work life balance issues will clearly move North Carolina closer to its goal as an employer of choice while maintaining a commitment to cost-effective systems for managing its investment in its human capital.

Recommendations made from data analysis in this report are as follows:

- In order to keep state employees’ salaries in line with overall labor market trends, base future cost-of-living increases on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and career growth increases on the relationship between CPI and average market movement.
- In keeping with past practice, increase the “Fair Minimum Rate” from \$22,067 to \$22,888 (125% of 2009-2010 Federal Poverty Guideline for a family of three – note that 2009-2010 poverty levels are still being used until 2010-2011 guidelines are released later this year).
- In order to increase participation and lower costs for the State Health Plan, consider a small monthly premium for Employee Only coverage and a higher subsidy for Employee/Children and Employee/Family coverage.
- Promote and support workforce planning, total compensation and employee engagement programs to recruit and retain talent. Consider the state’s workforce as “human capital” and make appropriate investments to maintain and increase its quality. This is considered to be especially critical as the “baby boomer” generation continues to age out of the state’s workforce and economic conditions begin to improve, leading younger workers to consider looking for jobs in the private sector.
- Provide an allocation to each agency and university to use to reward employees based on performance and competencies. This allocation differs from the traditional career-growth increase and performance bonus.
- Allow agencies and universities the flexibility to design performance and alternative pay systems based on their organizational needs and culture, with consultation from the Office of State Personnel. OSP maintains a Performance Solutions web site (www.performancesolutions.nc.gov) and has a staff of professionals dedicated to helping agencies and universities meet their workforce planning needs.

- Change the State Health Plan Year from July 1 - June 30 to January 1 - December 31, so that SPA employees can better plan their out-of-pocket expenses and strategies for NC Flex contributions and other benefit programs.
- Give employees flexibility in choosing how the employer's portion of the state health plan premium is allocated (i.e. family coverage, medical savings accounts, supplemental retirement plans, etc.) according to individual benefits needs and preferences.
- Match a portion of employees' 401(k) contributions to be more competitive with local governments and other Southeastern states (such as neighboring states Georgia and Virginia).
- In order to better utilize state retiree talents and skills, reduce waiting period for return to part-time employment from 6 months to 30 days.
- Centralize coordination of supplemental benefits and consolidate supplemental benefit plan offerings in a menu approach for portability and cost savings. Allow employees to select plan products that meet their needs.
- Increase the number of Holidays by one day in years where eleven are granted so that twelve are granted every year.

II. INTRODUCTION

This Compensation & Benefits report responds to the requirements expressed in NCGS 126-7(b) [State Personnel Act] to guide the Governor and the General Assembly in making funding appropriations for State employees' salary increases. The results of the compensation survey are presented to the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate no later than two weeks after the convening of the legislature in odd years (this year, February 9) and May 1st of even years.

This report conveys economic and pay trends, findings and data derived from compensation and benefits surveys that the Office of State Personnel regularly analyzes to determine whether or not salary ranges, rates and average salaries for state classifications and benefits for employees are competitive in the labor market. The report summarizes key findings and comparative data showing the relationship of the state's wages and compensation programs to those of competitors in both the private and public sectors, as well as in relation to talent management trends both nationally and internationally. It also presents findings and survey results showing North Carolina's rank in relation to that of other southeastern states and the nation in providing competitive total compensation programs for state employees.


North Carolina's Pay Philosophy

The State Personnel Act, G.S. 126, states *"It is the policy of the State to compensate its employees at a level sufficient to encourage excellence of performance and to maintain the labor market competitiveness necessary to recruit and retain a competent workforce."* This statutory provision expresses the state's philosophy in the development and administration of

compensation policies, rules and practices for all employees subject to the State Personnel Act. However, it is often in direct conflict with other state laws and practices.

For example, while the state currently requires a performance management system with performance rewards to be funded by the General Assembly, there has consistently been no funding for performance rewards of any kind for over ten years. This has allowed the state's performance management system to malfunction to the point that ratings are artificially inflated and distribution of those ratings is significantly skewed. As seen in Chart 1 below, the vast majority of state employees are rated as "Very Good" or "Outstanding" when it would be more appropriate to see most employees at "Good" (though 2010 data indicate this trend may be diminishing somewhat). While headway has been made in recent years to maintain labor market competitiveness, there has been very little in the way of monetary or systematic encouragement of performance excellence.

Chart 1: Distribution of Statewide Performance Ratings, 2006-2010



Source: NC Office of State Personnel

III. TOTAL COMPENSATION

The concept of *Total Compensation* is integral to any review or discussion of the state's compensation system. Total compensation measures an employee's base salary, benefits and other perquisites that the employer provides. When comparing compensation with that of other employers, whether public or private, the focus is on total compensation rather than base pay. This report includes comparisons of base pay as well as fringe benefits. It is important for employees to be knowledgeable of the value of their employment in terms of base pay, benefits, and other pay-related assets. When analyzing compensation surveys, base pay is often the common denominator in developing a comparative standard by which we can

determine whether or not North Carolina state government compensation is competitive in various labor markets.

Employee benefits are key ingredients in a total compensation package. A competitive benefits package is a primary attractor in the recruitment of prospective employees, particularly in difficult-to-recruit occupations. Benefits are equally critical in the retention of high performing employees. Benefits as a percentage of average base pay are depicted in the chart below. The state needs to communicate this important aspect of employees' compensation to both current and prospective employees.

Total Compensation Model

**Table 1: BENEFITS AS AN PERCENTAGE OF AVERAGE SALARY & WAGES
(CALCULATED AS OF 12-31-10)**

BENEFIT CATEGORY	PERCENTAGE OF AVERAGE SALARY	AVERAGE VALUE
Holidays	4.62%	\$1,927
Sick Leave	4.62%	\$1,927
Vacation Leave	7.69%	\$3,208
OASI – DI [Social Security]	7.65%	\$3,191
Retirement & Disability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retirement Systems Pension Fund 4.93% • Death Benefit Trust Fund .16% • Retiree Health Plan Reserve 4.90% • Disability Income Plan .52% 	10.51%	\$4,384
Health Insurance	11.82%	\$4,930
Longevity Pay	1.50%	\$626
Total Benefit Value	48.41%	\$20,193
In determining the <i>Percentage of Average Salary</i>, the average state employee's years of service are 11.0 years and average state employee salary is \$41,714. The total benefit value is added to employees' base pay to determine <i>Total Compensation</i>.		
	Average Base Pay	\$41,714
	Average Benefit Value	\$20,193
	Average Total Compensation	\$61,907

Sources: Office of State Personnel, State Health Plan, Office of State Budget and Management and the NC Retirement Systems Division

Once Average Total Compensation is derived, Salary and Benefits can in turn be calculated as a *Percentage of Total Compensation*. This allows for comparisons to be made between N.C.'s Average Percentage of Total Compensation and national trends, as seen in Table 2. This analysis indicates that North Carolina's salary and wages generally do not make up quite as large a portion of total compensation as is seen nationally, while N.C.'s paid time off benefits generally outpace national averages when expressed as a percentage of total compensation. N.C.'s portion of total compensation dedicated to health insurance lags the national average.

Other benefits are largely comparable. Note that this analysis generally includes only annually budgeted compensation items; other “variable” compensation and benefits such as overtime pay, workers compensation and unemployment are not included.

Table 2: **SALARY AND BENEFITS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL COMPENSATION**

BENEFIT CATEGORY	PRIVATE INDUSTRY PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL COMPENSATION	N.C. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL COMPENSATION	CHANGE FROM 2010
Salary & Wages	72.6%	68.4%	-0.3%
Paid Time Off	6.9%	11.6%	---
Health Insurance	8.3%	8.1%	+1.2%
Retirement	3.7%	6.7%	+1.8%
OASI-DI (Social Security)	8.5%	5.2%	-0.1%

Sources: Office of State Personnel, Office of State Budget and Management and the NC Retirement Systems Div., U.S. DOL Bureau of Labor Statistics “Employer Costs for Employee Compensation – September 2010.” Note that some categories from last year’s report were eliminated because BLS data was not available in the same format.

Another perspective on N.C.’s total compensation package is to consider the average value of continued employment with the state, in the form of anticipated salary, pension and health benefits. Using present-day values, average state employee data for 2010 and assuming 30 years of service with no changes in salary or premium costs (an unlikely trend, but difficult to project otherwise), the average value of continued employment – what the average employee can expect from this point forward with continued employment -- is nearly \$1.3 million. Table 3 below illustrates this example.

Table 3: **AVERAGE PRESENT-DAY VALUE OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT WITH THE STATE (GOING FORWARD)**

ASSUMPTIONS					
Current average state employee age					45
Current average state employee years of service					11
Assumed age upon hire					34
Projected retirement age (30 years service)					64
Current average state employee salary					\$41,714
Current average life expectancy					78
Current annual health care premium contribution					\$4,930
Current annual Medicare premium contribution (starting at age 65)					\$3,753
Continued Career Compensation	Continued Longevity Compensation	Projected Pension Compensation	Career and Retirement Health Care Premiums	Medicare Health Care Premiums	AVERAGE PRESENT-DAY VALUE OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT
\$792,566	\$23,360	\$318,862	\$98,600	\$48,789	\$1,282,177

Sources: Office of State Personnel, State Health Plan, Office of State Budget and the NC Retirement Systems Division

IV. ECONOMIC REVIEW

Wage & Salary Trends

According to salary surveys conducted by national firms engaged in the practice of compensation planning and consultation, data collected for calendar year 2010 (budgeted) project base pay increase budgets shown in Table 4. Figures include merit, across-the-board, and cost-of-living pay increases.

Table 4: **PROJECTED & ACTUAL BASE PAY INCREASE BUDGETS**

<u>National Firm</u>	<u>2008 Actual</u>	<u>2009 Actual</u>	<u>2010 Actual</u>	<u>2011 Projected</u>
William Mercer	3.8%	2.1%	2.3%	2.7%

Note: The above are projected and actual base pay salary increase percentages of payroll.


Source: Mercer Human Resources Consulting 2010/2011 US Compensation Planning Survey

Projected and actual wage increases have remained fairly stable at the national level for the best part of the past decade at or about the 4% percent level. However, with worsening economic conditions, actual wage increases declined dramatically in 2009. They increased slightly in 2010 and are projected to increase slightly again in 2011, but still are not approaching historical levels. A study conducted by Mercer Human Resources Consulting, *2010/2011 US Compensation Planning Survey*, revealed that during the calendar year 2010, pay increase budgets increased by 0.2% from 2009, after a 1.7% decline the previous year.

Analysis of data from a variety of national consulting and business firms places the projected budgeted average wage increase for 2011 at 2.7%.

In North Carolina, annual salary increases for state employees were less than average market movement in all but two of the last ten years (2006 and 2007), as displayed in Chart 1. Even when factoring in the above-market legislative increases in 2006 and 2007, salary increases in state government have still cumulatively trailed average market increases by 3.45% since 2006.

Chart 2: **NC Legislative Increases compared to actual average market movement 2000-2010 and projected average market movement for 2011**



Source: William Mercer, Incorporated


- *1.9% increase is based on a \$625 across the board payment divided by the 2001 average salary.
- **Ten days bonus leave granted in lieu of wage increase during 2002.
- ***Ten days bonus leave plus \$550 non-base building bonus granted in lieu of permanent wage increase during 2003.
- ****2.5% for employees with salaries over \$40K; \$1000 increase for employees with salaries below \$40K during 2004.
- *****The greater of \$850 or 2% for 2005, plus 5 days bonus leave.
- *****The greater of \$1100 or 2.75% for 2008
- + 2011 percentage is a market increase projection

Consumer Price and Employment Cost Indices

In addition to general labor market movement, the increase in the Consumer Price Index-Urban (CPI-U) for the 12-month period ending in December 2010 was 1.5%. This percentage measures the average change over a specific period of time in the prices paid by urban consumers for goods and services. The CPI-U includes all urban consumers that are roughly 87% of the population in the United States. Since most pay increases for state employees have included a cost-of-living component, the following chart compares the Consumer Price Index-Urban for the years indicated with the percent increase for the cost-of-living portion of legislative increases for the same period. All rates are as of December 31 of the year. [A history of legislative increases for the period 1992-2010 is included in the Appendix of this report.]

The graphed data in Chart 3 indicate that the cost-of-living portion of annual legislative increases from 2000 to 2010 trails the CPI-U percentages for the same time period, with the obvious exception of 2006-2008. This differential reflects that compensation for state employees has historically not kept pace with the consumer price index. However, over the past five years, the CPI-U has increased 10.9% while N.C. state employee pay has increased 12.25%, effectively continuing to level average employee “buying power” over previous years.

Chart 3: Comparison of CPI with Legislative Increases (COLA only) 1999-2009



Source: US Department of Labor/Bureau of Labor Statistics & NC Office of State Personnel

- *1.9% increase is based on a \$625 across the board divided by the 2001 average salary.
- **Ten days bonus vacation granted in lieu of base pay increase during 2002.
- *** Ten days bonus vacation, plus \$550 one-time bonus, granted in lieu of base pay increase for 2003.
- ****2.5% for employees with salaries over \$40K; \$1000 increase for employees with salaries below \$40K during 2004.
- *****The greater of \$850 or 2% for 2005, plus 5 days bonus vacation.
- *****The greater of \$1100 or 2.75% for 2008

Compensation Trends

A troubled economy, volatile job market, and rapidly aging workforce are challenging organizations to focus on creative ways of attracting and retaining key talent. Attraction and retention of talent will become more important as labor markets become increasingly competitive. Job families continuing to demand attention include Health Care, Information Technology, Accounting & Finance, Engineering and certain skilled trades.

One way to strengthen the state's compensation program is to incorporate occupation-specific pay programs, pay incentive programs and similar innovations to provide the state necessary tools to compete in an increasingly tight labor market for critical skills. Career-banding has allowed for some compensation flexibility for certain jobs. In 2008 Career-banding was extended to the Accounting, Engineering, Nursing and Library job families statewide, and was also implemented throughout the university system. But much more can be done, and many challenges are faced by agencies in having to maintain the salary grade system along with Career-banding, each having its own distinct sets of rules.

Table 5 outlines a number of compensation options that are becoming more prevalent among private and public sector organizations. Usage has remained generally consistent over the past few years.

- Signing bonuses are paid to certain hard-to-hire positions as an incentive to accept a position. This was an option granted by the 2008 General Assembly for Mental Health Nurses, and many other hard-to-recruit jobs could also benefit from an expansion of this program. For example, according to the 2010/2011 Mercer Compensation Planning Study, this is a very commonplace recruitment tool for Information Technology and Finance & Administration jobs (note that all of these tools experienced a decline in use in 2009/2010 but have begun to increase again).
- More aggressive pay increases are aimed at employees whose skills are critical and retaining them is crucial. This is an especially effective tool for use in retaining an organization's top talent.
- Project milestone awards are provided at key interim completion points of a project while spot cash awards are given to reward a specific project or piece of work successfully completed. These are considered to be highly effective and much more affordable than base pay increases for performance.

Table 5 **ATTRACTING AND MAINTAINING EMPLOYEES**

Functional Area	Signing Bonuses	More Aggressive Pay Increases	Project Milestone Awards	Spot Cash Awards
Information Technology	60%	39%	72%	77%
Finance & Administration	45%	19%	37%	73%
Human Resources	30%	7%	29%	73%
Customer Service	14%	10%	26%	68%

Source: William M. Mercer 2010/2011 US Compensation Planning Survey

Currently, the State Personnel Act prohibits such modern-day pay programs as monetary incentive awards. Pay increases are determined by the Legislature. Organizations continue to look to variable pay as they struggle to afford and sustain compensation levels. Additional

flexibility in this area will help the state to remain competitive. One innovative idea that would also be relatively simple to implement is to allow agencies to design bonus pay systems that utilize their lapsed salary funds. Bonus pay as a performance reward – even small amounts for milestone achievements -- is widely utilized in the modern workplace and is considered more effective than base pay increases. However, implementing programs like this for N.C. state government would require strong support from the legislature and the State Employees Association.

Recruitment & Retention

Many factors affect the capacity of an organization to recruit and retain a competent and qualified workforce. Given the organizational and occupational diversity of North Carolina's state government, there is no “one size fits all” solution to the myriad recruitment and retention issues facing its managers. Generally speaking, the state’s principle concerns include citizens’ expectations that state government will protect their health and safety; provide affordable and accessible education; maintain the quality and integrity of the state’s environment; offer diverse programs and services for cultural enrichment; and ensure a viable, safe infrastructure and transportation system. The state must meet these expectations and comply with legislative mandates for services to citizens.

A key challenge to the state and employers in general is that the “baby boomer” generation is beginning to age out of the workforce. It is anticipated that in the next ten to twenty years this will mean a tremendous and potentially crippling loss of organizational knowledge as senior employees leave the workforce at an accelerated pace. An analysis of this anticipated trend is included in the “Turnover Rates” section of this report

Compensation and benefits are obviously key factors in the recruitment and retention of employees for any organization. In North Carolina, pay for state employees has not been consistent for a number of years with various indices that measure cost-of-living and market movement. Also, North Carolina is significantly behind private and public industry by not offering a match in the State’s 401(k) program.

In a report from the Society of Human Resources Management (SHRM), two North Carolina metropolitan areas are in the top 20 for highest projected job growth in the decade from 2003 to 2013 (Raleigh-Durham and Charlotte at numbers 9 and 12, respectively), thus competition for qualified employees will grow. A joint SHRM/CNNfn (Cable News Network-Financial Network) Job Benefits Survey Report indicates the top five benefits most important to overall employee job satisfaction are health care/medical benefits, paid time off, retirement benefits (e.g., defined contribution plans and defined benefit plans, such as 401(k)), dental insurance and a prescription drug plan.

As one example, medical and allied health occupations continue to present particular recruitment and retention concerns. A national shortage of nursing professionals since 1999 has exacerbated the state’s chronic difficulty in recruiting and retaining these direct care professionals in the state’s psychiatric and prison hospitals, student health services, and similar clinical settings. As reported in past reviews, there are a limited number of psychiatric nurses, as it is a specialized field and many nurses elect to work in other nursing fields. Finally, the mental health reform movement in North Carolina has prompted recommendations to close or consolidate the state’s existing psychiatric hospitals. This will likely further diminish the already too few number of nurses who might be interested in employment with the State.

As cited in Section IV of this report, a potentially important step forward was made when the Legislature approved sign-on bonuses for mental health nurses. This has long been a common recruitment tool in the private sector that for years has not been allowed in N.C. state government. The state must continue to explore additional options for recruiting and retaining key roles such as mental health nurses, based on practices that are commonly utilized by our competitors as well as innovative techniques of our own.

V. BASE PAY - LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS

Methodology

Public and private sector organizations rely upon salary surveys to ensure that they are making informed decisions about employee compensation in terms of cost-effectiveness, recruitment and retention. Sound compensation practices ultimately result in a workforce comprised of competent, skilled employees across multiple occupational areas. Their collective knowledge, skills and abilities directly relate to the accomplishment of the organization's mission and vision. Salary surveys are therefore critical in pricing jobs, diagnosing compensation problems, determining wage parity with market competitors, and in monitoring internal pay equity. Survey data is also essential to organizations in terms of analyzing pay trends, identifying effective pay practices, and establishing a systematic method for setting competitive pay ranges for job classes. This report on North Carolina's compensation practices conforms to these purposes for conducting salary and benefits surveys.

The methodology for analyzing data and identifying pay trends is equally important. The information presented in this report derives from multiple national and local surveys, and it reflects benchmark classes that were deliberately selected to represent each of the twelve occupational groups in the state's pay plan. The survey sample included 61 benchmark classes – a cross-section spanning ten major job families -- that represent nearly 1/3 of all employees subject to the State Personnel Act. After identifying the benchmark classes, appropriate labor markets were determined.

Current turnover and vacancy rate data for each class are included in the report.

Market data was collected from the following published sources:

- **William Mercer Human Resource Consulting – 2010/2011 US Compensation Planning Survey – A Study of Pay Increases, Incentive Compensation, and Emerging Practices.** More than 1,100 organizations provided data for the 2010/2011 US Compensation Planning Survey, representing pay practices of more than 12 million workers.
- **Watson Wyatt 2009/2010 Survey Report on Hospital and Healthcare Professionals, Nursing and Allied Services Personnel Compensation.** A comprehensive document with data from 1,301 organizations reporting on 756,761 incumbents in hundreds of positions.

- **Watson Wyatt 2009/2010 Survey Report on Technician and Skilled Trades Personnel Compensation.** A survey based on data from 862 organizations with 498,298 incumbents.
- **Watson Wyatt 2009/2010 Survey Report on Office Personnel Compensation.** A survey based on data from 981 organizations with 460,475 incumbents.
- **The Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust Employer Health Benefits 2008 Annual Survey**
- **Capital Associated Industries – 2010 North Carolina Wage & Salary Survey –** Wage and salary information from designated areas in North Carolina, with pacesetter organizations (600 or more employees) in an area including Wake, Durham, Orange and Alamance counties. Survey provides area-to-area compensation rates.
- **League of Municipalities Survey 2010** - A compilation of salary data for specific municipal jobs located throughout the state.
- **MAPS Group for the Institute of Government – County Salaries in North Carolina – 2010 - Salaries** and wage profiles by position and information about fringe benefits offered by North Carolina counties.
- **2006 Hay Benefits Report –** An analysis of benefits, perquisites and personnel policies for exempt employees in 760 industrial, financial and service organizations throughout the United States. Provides major findings and trends.
- **World at Work - Salary Budget Survey –** 3,272 member responses to a survey presented in both industry and sub-industry and regional categories identifying trends, structures and average salaries broken out in FLSA employment categories (non-exempt hourly non-union, non-exempt salaried, exempt salaried and officers/executives).
- **Southeastern Salary Conference, 2006 to 2009;** salary and benefits information gathered from surveys from fourteen southeastern states (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia.)
- **Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) 2006 Workplace Forecast – A Strategic Outlook –** Information based on a survey of human resource professionals and their views on the key issues in demographics, employment, international affairs, politics, society and science and technology that will have the greatest impact on the workplace in the next decade.
- **National Association of Colleges and Employers Salary Survey –** NACE compiles data from career planning and placement offices of colleges and universities across the US. This report consists of starting salary offers made to new graduates by employing organizations in business, industry, and government and by nonprofit and educational institutes.

- **Compdata Surveys – Compensation Data 2009 – Carolinas – Pay and Benefits Survey Results** – survey analysis, pay practices and benefit practices for 223 companies in North and South Carolina, covering 491 jobs in both states.

Professional survey methodology standards were used to collect and analyze available salary survey data or to conduct surveys to gather pertinent market information. Survey methodology recognizes the following concepts that have been defined for informational purposes:

- *Labor Market Rate* is the average rate of pay that competitors have reported through surveying in a classification similar to that found in state government.
- *Labor Market Pay Gap* is the relationship expressed in percentage terms between the state’s average salary for a benchmark class and the average wage reported for a relevant labor market for that class.
- *Turnover Rate* is a percentage reflecting all separations from employment for both voluntary and involuntary reasons compared to the total number of employees over a span of 1 year.
- *Vacancy Rate* is the percent of positions by classification that are vacant among the total number of positions covered by the State Personnel Act for any specific period of time.

Market Analysis

Average Salary Overall Comparison

For 2010, an analysis of salary survey data for the benchmark classes indicates state employees’ salaries overall trail their equivalent labor market by 3.02%. This was a 1.8% decline over the previous year’s analysis, but is still generally considered to be a very favorable competitive position for the state. Table 6 shows the average annual salary comparison between North Carolina’s benchmark class titles and the composite market averages for the past seven years. The percent difference should not be directly compared year-to-year because the labor market information available, classes sampled and the total number of classes for each year usually varies slightly.

Table 6: **OVERALL MARKET COMPARISON**

Year of Report	North Carolina Pay	Market Pay	% NC Trails Market
2011	48,926*	50,402**	-3.02%
2010	48,384*	49,127**	-1.21%
2009	48,711*	51,081**	-4.43%
2008	47,722*	49,660**	-4.06%
2007	45,597*	46,483**	-1.94%
2006	43,215*	46,543**	- 7.70 %
2005	41,787*	46,035**	-10.2 %

*Average annual salary for NC Benchmark classes only

**Composite market average for NC Benchmark survey comparisons (North Carolina and/or Southeast Regional job markets)

Survey Findings for Selected Benchmark Classes

Market data collected for the fifty-four (54) benchmark classes -- representing approximately one third of the state's workforce -- in this report were analyzed by staff in the Office of State Personnel and indicate that the average wage for 21 of the 54 (39%) classes trailed the market by at least 5% and 12 of the 54 (22%) trailed by at least 10% (compared to 19% and 13%, respectively, in 2009). This indicates a slight dip in North Carolina's competitive pay position, not surprising given that there have been no across-the-board pay increases for the past two years and no market or equity increases in the past year -- while conditions in the private sector have begun to improve. Table 6 lists selected classes that trail the market as shown under "Market Pay Gap". Data indicating turnover and vacancy rates for the period ending June 30, 2010 also have been included to give a more complete view of potential recruitment and retention issues for these classes. It is evident from the data that North Carolina was reasonably competitive in 2010 for many of the benchmark classes. See the Market Data Appendix for a complete list of benchmark classes surveyed including turnover and vacancy rates.

Average salaries and market averages are subject to constant change and influence, including the influence of any across-the-board legislative increase. Therefore, in years where they are granted, any legislative increase must be considered before market-based salary adjustment recommendations can be made.

Table 7: **SELECTED BENCHMARK CLASSES**

Class Title	NC Average	Market Rate	Market Pay Gap	Turnover Rate
Auditor	53,150	64,529	-21%	6.2%
Info & Communications Spec II	44,968	50,937	-13%	18.4%
Executive Assistant I	43,303	48,024	-11%	6.4%
Electrician II	38,664	44,647	-16%	6.8%
Professional Nurse	53,426	54,624	-2%	28.0%
Occupational Therapist I	64,437	69,804	-8%	24.2%
Social Worker III (MSW)	42,744	47,600	-11%	7.8%

Source: PMIS and BEACON

Note: The State's average turnover rate for all occupations in fiscal year 2009-2010 was determined to be **10.2%**

Comparison to Southeastern States

Table 8 shows average salaries for classified employees in North Carolina as compared with 13 other states in the Southeast region over the past four years. As illustrated here, North Carolina's average salary has led SE States in recent years.

Table 8: **COMPARISON TO SE STATES (CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES ONLY)**

	2007	2008	2009	2010
All SE States	35,559	37,032	37,511	unavailable
North Carolina	40,367	41,646	41,804	41,714
NC Differential	+11.9%	+11.1%	+11.4%	-----

Source: Southeastern Salary Conference. Data not available for 2010.

Comparison to Contiguous States

NC Average Pay Comparison to Contiguous States: A more relevant comparison may be North Carolina to her border states. A pay history comparison with three neighboring states reveals that North Carolina has generally led South Carolina and Tennessee in pay, and stayed relatively even with Georgia and Virginia (see Tables 9-12). North Carolina's average pay dipped slightly from 2009 to 2010, while Georgia and South Carolina saw a more significant decrease. This was attributed to a large number of retirements and unfilled vacancies, conditions that North Carolina may likely experience in 2011.

Table 9: **COMPARISON TO GEORGIA (CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES ONLY)**

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Georgia	38,277	40,297	40,297	36,920
North Carolina	40,367	41,646	41,804	41,714
NC Differential	+5.2%	+3.2%	+3.7%	+12.9%

Table 10: **COMPARISON TO SOUTH CAROLINA (CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES ONLY)**

	2007	2008	2009	2010
South Carolina	35,784	35,911	36,906	32,273
North Carolina	40,367	41,646	41,804	41,714
NC Differential	+11.4%	+13.8%	+13.3%	+29.3%

Table 11: **COMPARISON TO TENNESSEE (CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES ONLY)**

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Tennessee	36,366	36,188	35,945	38,443
North Carolina	40,367	41,646	41,804	41,714
NC Differential	+9.9%	+13.1%	+16.3%	+8.5%

Table 12: **COMPARISON TO VIRGINIA (CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES ONLY)**

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Virginia	41,297	42,937	42,953	41,941
North Carolina	40,367	41,646	41,804	41,714
NC Differential	-2.3%	-3.1%	-2.7%	-0.5%

NOTE: Virginia average includes the Washington, D.C. metro area, where employees receive generally higher pay than in other parts of the state.

Source, Tables 7-11 Southeastern Salary Conference – 2009; survey of contiguous states 2011

Comparison of NC Base Pay Increases to Local Municipalities

The State must compete for qualified candidates to fill vacant positions with private firms and other local government jurisdictions. In the most recent Fiscal Year, 69 NC counties provided cost of living increases with an average increase amount of 2.67%, while the state provided no increase. Also, 38% of N.C. counties also anticipated granting performance increases, which the state has not done for many years. (Source County Survey 2009 (MAPS Group))

Table 13 offers examples of a few classifications of interest that the state has in common with local municipalities. As illustrated here, the state is competitive in certain

areas while lagging in others (it is important to note also that most municipalities also make a contribution to employee 401k accounts).

Table 13: COMPARISON OF LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES (POPULATIONS OF 25,000 AND ABOVE – DATA AGED TO JANUARY 2010)

NC Class Title	Municipalities Average Pay	North Carolina Average Pay	NC Pay Differential
Public Safety Officer	42,428	37,420	-11.8%
Maintenance Mechanic IV	37,783	38,516	+1.2%
Housekeeper	25,967	23,902	-8.0%
Office Assistant IV	33,460	32,134	-4.0%
Engineer	68,837	62,085	-9.8%

Source: League of Municipalities Survey, PMIS and BEACON

Comparison of Pay Increases of State Employees and NC Teachers

The General Assembly grants legislative increases to teachers, as well as regular state employees. Table 13 illustrates a comparison of teacher pay increases to state employees. State employees have received smaller increases than teachers in eight of the nine years. Cumulatively, across-the-board teacher pay increases have outpaced state employee pay increases by about 11% since 2000. Additionally, teachers receive automatic annual step increases and, in certain counties, generous localized pay supplements.

Table 14: COMPARISON OF TEACHERS TO STATE EMPLOYEES INCREASES

Years	Teachers' Increase	State Employees' Increase	NC Average Teacher Pay	US Average Teacher Pay
2010-2011	0	0	Not yet published	Not yet published
2009-2010	0	0	Not yet published	Not yet published
2008-2009	3.0% (avg)	2.75% or \$1,100	48,648	54,319
2007-2008	5.0%	4.0%	47,633	52,308
2006-2007	8.0% (avg)	5.5%	46,137	50,816
2005-2006	2.24%	2.0% or \$850	43,922	49,109
2004-2005	2.5% (avg)	2.5% or \$1,000	43,348	47,750
2003-2004	1.81%	\$550 bonus (Leave)	43,211	46,752
2002-2003	1.84%	0 (Leave)	43,076	45,776
2001-2002	2.86%	1.9% (Average on \$625)	42,680	44,660
2000-2001	6.5%	4.2% & \$500 bonus	42,959	43,395
Total Base Increases	33.75%	22.85%	N/A	N/A

Sources: Legislative Report Page, NC DPI Facts & Figures and Annual Approved Budget Act

Table 15: COMPARISON OF TEACHER PAY TO NATIONAL AVERAGE

Years	NC Average Teacher Pay	US Average Teacher Pay	NC differential	Teacher's Increase
2010-2011	Not yet published	Not yet published	N/A	0
2009-2010	Not yet published	Not yet published	N/A	0
2008-2009	48,648	54,319	-11.7%	3.0% (avg)
2007-2008	47,633	52,308	-9.8%	5.0%
2006-2007	46,137	50,816	-10.1%	8.0% (avg)
2005-2006	43,922	49,109	-11.8%	2.24%
2004-2005	43,348	47,750	-9.2%	2.5% (avg)
2003-2004	43,211	46,752	-7.6%	1.81%
2002-2003	43,076	45,776	-5.9%	1.84%
2001-2002	42,680	44,660	-4.4%	2.86%
2000-2001	42,959	43,395	-1.0%	6.5%

Sources: NCES Digest of Education Statistics, NC DPI Facts & Figures

New Graduates Starting Pay Analysis

The State must compete with private companies and local governments for qualified candidates to fill vacancies. One measure of the State's ability to compete in the labor market is the ability to offer competitive starting salaries for college graduates that are being recruited and hired by competitors. Table 15 provides information on the reported national average starting pay offers made to graduating students in seven functional areas of interest. These are national averages for offers made to bachelor's degree candidates in Winter 2008-2009, so are somewhat dated and do not necessarily reflect the N.C. labor market (though N.C. entry salaries have not changed), but may give some indication where further analysis is warranted. North Carolina's class title and base minimum pay is compared.

Table 16: NEW GRADUATE'S STARTING PAY ANALYSIS – JANUARY 2009

NC Class Title	NACE Starting Salary	NC Minimum Hiring Rate (inc. SMR's)	Entry Pay Gap
Accountant Trainee (banded)	48,334	34,113	-29.4%
Personnel Analyst I, Trainee	44,144	30,298	-31.4%
Operations & Systems Specialist (banded)	58,419	52,000	-11.0%
Professional Nurse (banded)	46,655	37,700	-19.2%
SBI Agent, Trainee	42,750	36,743	-14.0%
Social Worker, Trainee	30,025	27,309	-9.9%
Artist Illustrator I	37,545	27,544	-26.6%

Source: National Association of Colleges and Employers, Winter 2009

It is critical that the state attract and retain high quality younger employees to its workforce. With national trends showing a wave of retirements about to occur, younger

employees will be more sought after in coming years than ever before. See analysis of turnover among 18-25 year old employees in the following section.

Additional Analysis

Turnover Rates and Cost

Turnover rates vary among industries, organizations, geographic locations, departments, occupations, and by employee characteristics such as age, education, and organizational tenure. For example, younger, newer, unskilled, and blue-collar employees tend to have higher turnover rates than their contrasting groups. For this reason, turnover should be calculated for various categories of interest, as well as for the organization as a whole. For example, an organization may not have a severe organization-wide turnover rate, but may have a severe departmental turnover rate or a high professional employee turnover rate, which requires appropriate action to alleviate. Source: Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM)

The cost of turnover is difficult to measure but is very important for organizations to understand. The cost to an organization for each position turnover has been estimated by the experts at anywhere from 50% to 250% of the departing employee's annual salary depending on the type of position being filled and the performance level of the departing employee. The Human Capital Institute places the average value of turnover at 150% though it must be stressed that turnover of top performers may be valued at an exponentially higher rate (though it would be inaccurate to assign a higher value given the artificial preponderance of "Very Good and "Outstanding" ratings in our current performance management system). There are many factors included in estimating the cost of turnover. Some obvious costs include advertising the vacancy; salaries of employment screening panels; and managers' time spent interviewing candidates. Other costs are not so easily quantified such as lost productivity – particularly during the time that a position is left vacant during recruitment -- or lost knowledge from the organization. Other costs include required onboarding, training, and higher rates of mistakes made by new hires. Though the costs may be hard to quantify, they are clearly considerable and should be monitored. The high cost of turnover presents a clear argument for agencies and universities to engage in rigorous workforce and succession planning.


Turnover is a measure of employee separations from an agency or university most often expressed as turnover rate. Two types of turnover are tracked: Total Turnover and Voluntary Turnover. Total turnover includes all separations for any reason. The total turnover rate is calculated by dividing the number of separations by the total number of employees at the beginning of a fiscal year. Voluntary turnover includes separations for reasons that the employee has control of such as resigning to take a job with another employer. Voluntary turnover rate is calculated by dividing the number of voluntary separations by the total number of employees at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Table 17: FIVE YEARS OF TURNOVER RATES – STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

	FY 2005-2006	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010
Voluntary T/O	7.3%	8.6%	8.6% *	5.6% *	5.6% *
Retirement T/O	2.5%	2.2%	2.2% *	1.8% *	2.2% *
Involuntary T/O	1.0%	1.4%	1.5% *	2.6% *	2.4% *
Total T/O	10.8%	12.2%	12.3% *	9.9% *	10.2% *

* NOTE: The continued transitioning of positions and employees from PMIS to the BEACON system in 2007 and 2008, along with the transitioning of many positions and employees to Career-banding – make the 2007-2009 data potentially questionable. Retirement turnover is also questionable for 2007-2010 because of inconsistent reporting in PMIS and BEACON. However, data appear to be relatively consistent with past years and economic trends.

Chart 4



Source: PMIS and BEACON


In FY 2009-2010, the State had a 5.6% voluntary turnover rate. Using the HCI turnover value of 150% cost of turnover, the cost to the state would be more than **\$322 million** (5.6% of state employees is approximately 5,139, multiplied by average state salary \$41,714, multiplied by 150%). Because the cost of replacing human capital is so high, we believe this underscores the need to closely monitor turnover, strive for competitive salaries, and maintain a positive work environment with high employee engagement levels. Simply put, uncompetitive salaries, poor working conditions and the low employee engagement that can come along with those conditions exacerbate turnover and needlessly cost the state hundreds of millions of dollars.

While the costs of turnover are astonishing, solutions do not have to be. The Corporate Leadership Council (CLC) has conducted extensive research to put a value on the factors that drive employee attraction and retention. While compensation is a key to employee commitment to an organization, it is important to note that the CLC cites development opportunities, future career opportunities and high quality management (among several others) as far more critical retention factors than pay. According to the Human Capital Institute (HCI), 40% of employees leave jobs because of managers. HCI also reports that 90% of managers say retention is about money, while 90% of employees say it is not. Coaching, feedback, growth, challenge and relationships are all more important factors. Turnover cannot be eliminated – and in fact turnover of employees who are not considered a “right fit” can ultimately provide cost-saving opportunities for organizations. But where retention is considered critical, it is important to pay attention to factors other than compensation.

While the retirement rate has remained relatively steady in recent years, it is widely recognized that the “baby boomer” generation will be leaving the workforce at a more accelerated rate in the next 3 to 10 years. This is especially critical in light of the fact that the state consistently

has trouble attracting and retaining younger employees entering the workforce. The average age of new hires in FY 2007-2008 was 37 years old, while only 3.8% of the state's current workforce consists of 18-25 year olds. Turnover rates among 18-25 year old workers is traditionally higher than the overall turnover rates for state government over the past seven years (source: PMIS and BEACON), though this trend lessened in 2008-2009, likely because of the economic downturn.


Chart 5



source: PMIS and BEACON

Meanwhile, the average age of N.C. state employees has generally increased over the past two decades – though holding steady at around 45-46 for the past few years -- further illustrating the impending aging workforce issues.

Chart 6



source: PMIS and BEACON

Use of Salary Adjustment Funding

One tool that has helped keep salaries competitive in the past is the Salary Adjustment Fund. The Salary Adjustment Fund is used to increase salaries in occupational fields, such as those listed in Table 4, where some salaries are significantly below the market. The primary funding mechanism, transferring legislative increase funds remaining after employees receive their legislative increase, is often inadequate to address occupational areas where salaries are below the market. Due to economic instability, no Salary Adjustment Fund moneys were allocated in each of the past three years. In 2007, \$17.6 million was allocated to the SAF for agency and university requests totaling \$24.4 million. Total needs were considerably higher in 2007, and increased in 2008. Projected retirements are expected to create significant vacancies in many occupational areas in the State's workforce over the coming years, including those that are critical to the delivery of services to citizens. The current budget situation makes the use of these funds for labor market revisions impracticable. However, many agencies may still face difficulty in filling critical vacancies without sufficient funds to maintain competitive recruitment.

VI. BENEFITS ANALYSIS

In 1992, the Government Performance Audit Commission [GPAC] recommended that . . .

...the State should offer full, flexible, and portable benefits; determine the most appropriate contribution method; and determine a contribution philosophy for each covered group. The State's employee benefits programs are fragmented and not cost-effective.

In the SHRM 2006 Workplace Forecast Survey, a comparison of "Very Important" job satisfaction aspects showed *Benefits* as being a close second to *Compensation/Pay* for employees at all ages. The survey also reflects the rise in health care costs as the number one key economic trend, and a rise in retiree benefit costs as the second highest economic trend.

Paid Time Off Analysis

Paid time off referred to here is employees' time off for which they continue to receive pay. Categories of Paid Time Off include Vacation Leave, Sick Leave, and Holiday pay. The contiguous states of South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia report similar responses to the figure shown for the southeastern states, and so, were not reflected separately. Recommendations follow.

Vacation

Southeastern states average 13.77 days of vacation leave based on 1-5 years of service. Similar to North Carolina the average accrual rate progressively increases to reflect the concurrent increases in years of service. Until 2010, North Carolina provided the lowest number of vacation days accrued for employees with 0-2 years of service

and was at the average for 3-14 years. Based on this and analysis of local government and private industry practices, the Office of State Personnel combined the 0-2 year and 2-5 year accrual rates, and raised all accrual rates slightly in order to even out the number of days per year that are earned. This should make N.C.'s vacation accrual rates more competitive and easier for prospective employees to understand.

Table 18: **VACATION LEAVE**

Years of State Service	North Carolina	SE States	Differential in Days
0 but less than 5 years	14.00	13.77	Negligible
5 but less than 10 years	17.00	16.81	Negligible
10 but less than 15 years	20.00	19.92	Negligible
15 but less than 20 years	23.00	22.27	+0.73
20 but less than 25 years	26.00	24.00	+2.00
25 years or greater	26.00	24.40	+1.60

2009 Southeastern States Benefits and Pay Practices Survey

Sick Leave

Southeastern states grant an average of 13.77 days per year sick leave for employees with up to 3 years of service. North Carolina is below the average for all southeastern states at 12 days per year of employee sick leave. Only two other states [Arkansas and Tennessee] among those surveyed grant the same number of sick leave days as North Carolina. Some other states [Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi] start employees with 12 days but increase the allotment with service time. The most frequently reported number of sick leave days granted per year among southeastern states is 15 days.

Table 19: **SICK LEAVE**

Sick Leave	North Carolina	SE States	Differential
Accrual	12 Days	13.77 Days	-1.77 Days

2009 Southeastern States Benefits and Pay Practices Survey

Holidays

North Carolina is competitive with the other southeastern states in recognized holidays. The total average for all southeastern states in the survey was 11.39 holidays. That is slightly greater than the 11 holidays normally granted state employees in North Carolina (note that the NC number varies year to year depending on whether 2 or 3 holiday days are granted around Christmas).

Table 20: **HOLIDAYS**

Holiday Leave	North Carolina	Southeastern States
Days per Year	11	11.58

2009 Southeastern States Benefits and Pay Practices Survey

Please see recommendations for increases to leave accrual rates at the end of this report.

Health Insurance

In 2006 the State launched a PPO option to address State Health Plan members' requests for greater affordability and choice in obtaining coverage. The PPO option was offered to all eligible State Health Plan members, along with the Comprehensive Major Medical Plan (indemnity plan), during an open enrollment period. The PPO became effective in October 2006. With a well-designed PPO choice, the State Health Plan anticipates significant cost savings to members by avoiding deductibles and co-insurance for doctor visits, and reducing premiums for all dependent coverage. Also, there is an Employee-Spouse tier with the PPO, an option which is not available with the Comprehensive Major Medical Plan. This is very positive progress in answering employees' requests for more affordable health care options. During the 2006 open enrollment period, approximately 330,000 State Health Plan members switched from the traditional indemnity plan to one of the PPO options. "The PPO will save North Carolina taxpayers more than \$25 million dollars from October 1, 2006 through October 1, 2007. Most State Health Plan PPO members and their families will also realize notable health care savings," said then Executive Administrator George C. Stokes.

In 2008, the traditional indemnity plan was phased out in favor of a more cost effective PPO plan, which has three options for coverage. According to the National Coalition on Health Care, the annual premium for an employer health plan covering a family of four averaged close to \$13,400 in 2009, with employees footing about 27% of the cost. In comparison, the State Health plan annual premiums for 2010 and 2011 are \$11,895 for a family of four with employees footing 41% of the cost. North Carolina continues to be one of only a small number of states providing full employee premium coverage. It is only one of five southeastern states offering this benefit.

According to the Kaiser/HRET 2008 health benefits survey, the average cost of premiums for single employee coverage was \$392 per month or \$4,704 per year, and the average cost of premiums for family coverage was \$1,057 per month or \$12,680 per year. Covered workers contributed 16% of the premium for single coverage and 27% for family coverage. On average, workers with single coverage contribute \$60 per month to the cost of their premiums and workers with family coverage contribute \$280 per month. Twenty percent of workers with single coverage and 7% of workers with family coverage work for an organization that pays 100% of the premium. In 2010, single coverage for N.C. state employees cost the state \$411 per month – only 4.8% more than the national average. However, the cost to employees for family coverage in N.C. (\$580) was more than double the national average. This is because the state contributes the same amount towards health coverage for both single employee and family coverage, and also does not require employees to pay a premium for single coverage – practices that are uncommon in the market and place an undue burden on employees with family coverage.

In 2006, the state's benefits programs improved somewhat with the addition of PPO options for employee health coverage. However, the State's traditional indemnity plan was eliminated in 2008, which lessened the options available for health coverage. In 2010 the State Health Plan began a Wellness Initiative, requiring employees to default to a lower-cost 70/30 copay health coverage option and attest to the fact that they were not tobacco users in order to maintain 80/20 coverage. The SHP estimated in 2009 that claims for tobacco related issues may accumulate to over \$137 million per year.

The information below is used to compare North Carolina's current standard PPO plan to other organizations.

Comparison to Southeastern States

10 of 14 southeastern states subsidize their employees' dependent care coverage. Only North Carolina, Alabama, Kentucky and Mississippi do not subsidize dependent care coverage. Amounts subsidized varied greatly by state and type of health plan employees selected. North Carolina contributes \$411 per month for Employee Only coverage but zero additional allowance is made for Dependent (Family) coverage.

Table 21: SURVEY OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR DEPENDENT CARE AND CHOICE OF PLAN

Survey Participants	Percent that Subsidizes Dependent Coverage
Southeastern States	71%

Source: 2009 Southeastern States Benefits and Pay Practices Survey

Comparison to Local Government Practices

In surveys, local governments report on choice of health plan, deductibles and employee and agency cost. The comparative results are in Table 22, and suggest that N.C. compares favorably in this area to its counties and municipalities.

Table 22: SURVEY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT'S HEALTH INSURANCE PRACTICES

Type of Agency	% of Agencies Offering Choice of Plans	Normal Deductible (if flat \$ amount reported)	Normal Co-pay (if flat \$ amount reported)	Average Annual Amount Employee Pays	Average Annual Amount Agency Pays
Municipalities	6.9%	\$626	no data	\$29	\$5,397
Counties	23.6%	\$644	\$22	\$148	\$5,981
State of North Carolina	NO *	\$600	\$25	\$0	\$4,930

*In 2010, N.C. offered only a PPO plan with two options for coverage. Some municipalities and counties offer more than one plan.

The above information applies to employee only coverage; NC data applies to the standard PPO plan.

Source: North Carolina League of Municipalities 2008 Survey of Municipal Fringe Benefits (biannual report -- 2010 not yet released) and County Salaries in North Carolina 2008

Supplemental Insurance Products (Post-Tax & Pre-Tax Plan)

In 1985, GS 58-31-60 was passed establishing an Employee Insurance Committee designed to review insurance products currently offered through payroll deduction to the State employees in the Employee Insurance Committee's Payroll Unit. These committees are responsible for selecting the type of insurance products that reflect the needs and desires of the employees in the Employee Insurance Committee's Payroll unit.

In the past, there were several attempts made by various committees to address establishing a statewide insurance committee similar to the statewide Flexible Benefits Program Advisory Committee and locating centralized administration in the Office of State Personnel or any other appropriate agency. In the report of the Senate Select Committee on State Employee Insurance Issues dated April 18, 1996, a draft bill with an act to amend the laws governing employee insurance committees was prepared. Legislation was passed to combine the 22 insurance committees within DHHS into one committee so those employees within the department could have the same post-tax supplemental products. This enables portability of benefits and reduced rates for employees. The legislation was accordingly passed and changes were implemented.

We are now facing a similar situation where employees cannot carry over some of their benefits to other agencies when they get transferred or hired by a different agency/university, as the two agencies/universities may have different benefits. Two important benefits, term life insurance and short-term disability, are often requested by agency Benefit Representatives to be made available to all employees. In 2005, a pre-tax Voluntary Term Life Plan was available to all State employees.

Statewide Flexible Benefits Program (NC Flex)

In 2005, NC Flex piloted an online enrollment program with participants from two agencies, two universities, and two community colleges. The pilot was a success in all participating organizations, with the entire enrollment process completed online, without any paperwork involved. Phase II of the online enrollment process has started by adding more community colleges, universities, and non-central payroll agencies. Currently there are over 161,000 participants, from the agencies, universities, and community colleges who have taken advantage of the pre-tax savings offered by the this program administered by the Office of State Personnel.

The State's Flexible Benefits Program now includes the following pre-tax plans:

- Health Care Flexible Spending Account allows for a pre-tax payroll deduction to place money in an account to pay for eligible health and dental care expenses not covered by insurance (note: employees may opt to use a Debit Convenience Card for eligible Spending Account expenses)
- Dependent Day Care Flexible Spending Account allows for a pre-tax payroll deduction to place money in an account to pay for day care expenses (note: employees may opt to use a Debit Convenience Card for eligible Spending Account expenses).
- Dental Plan has two options available, High Option and Low Option. Depending on the plan chosen, these options cover expenses for preventive, basic, major, and orthodontia.
- Vision Care Plan has two options, Plan 1 and Plan 2. Depending on the plan option chosen, these plans cover eye exams and materials such as eyeglass lenses, frames, and contact lenses.
- Voluntary Accidental Death & Dismemberment Insurance pays a benefit if a loss is suffered as the result of a covered accident, as well as a disabling injury. Starting in 2009, \$10,000 of this coverage was provided at no cost to employees.
- Voluntary Group Term Life Insurance provides new employees the option to purchase up to \$100,000 of term life insurance without providing evidence of insurability, when

first eligible. Employees may elect coverage in increments of \$10,000, with a minimum of \$20,000 and a maximum of \$500,000, not to exceed five times the base annual earnings.

- Cancer Insurance offers two plan options, High Option and Low Option, depending on the desired coverage and benefit paid. This plan also provides benefits for 29 other specified diseases, such as Muscular Dystrophy, Multiple Sclerosis, Tuberculosis, Sickle Cell Anemia and Cystic Fibrosis. Upon initial enrollment for new hires, no evidence of insurability is required.
- Critical Illness coverage provides optional benefit coverage for certain cancer, heart-related and other serious health conditions.

Retirement

The percent factor used by southeastern states to calculate retirement benefits ranges from 1.6% to 2.5% times Average Final Compensation. North Carolina's factor used to calculate pension benefits is 1.82%. Six southeastern states (Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Oklahoma and West Virginia) have a factor that is higher than North Carolina's.

In North Carolina, the 2009-2010 employer contribution on behalf of employees in the Teachers & State Employees Retirement System (TSERS) is 10.51%. This includes contributions to the retirement systems pension fund, death benefit trust fund, retiree health plan reserve and disability income plan. The state's contribution to the pension fund only is currently 4.93%.

Supplemental Retirement Programs

Besides the traditional retirement program, the State offers voluntary supplemental retirement programs (**a 401(k) plan, a 457(b) plan and a 403(b) plan.**) North Carolina does not match employee contributions. According to Mercer Consulting, 78% of public and private organizations offer an employer match that averages 4% of an employee's pay. The key driver in determining the value of a Deferred Contribution plan is the amount of an employer's contributions.

The following are the results reported for the 100 North Carolina County governments. A review of the past three years reveal that more than half of North Carolina's 100 counties have consistently made matching 401(k) contributions (see Table 23). Last year, 63% of the counties offered an employer match or contribution averaging 3.7%. North Carolina State Government provides no contribution to 401(k) except for law enforcement employees. Clearly, the State of North Carolina is behind market by not offering a match, which greatly affects the State's perception as being an employer of choice.

Table 23: FIVE-YEAR COMPARISON OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT 401(K) PLANS

Program Plan	Counties Contributing to 401(k) Programs 2006*	Counties Contributing to 401(k) Programs 2007*	Counties Contributing to 401(k) Programs 2008*	Counties Contributing to 401(k) Programs 2009*	Counties Contributing to 401(k) Programs 2010*
NC County 401(k) Contributions	49%	67%	62%	72%	63%

Source: County Survey 2010 (MAPS Group) – *only counties reporting data were used in calculation

About 79% of municipalities have 401(k) programs. Of these, 80% make a contribution to the program. For those counties contributing to 401(k) programs, the average contribution is 3.9% of salary. The most common contribution for both counties and municipalities is 5%.

Source: North Carolina League of Municipalities 2008 Survey of Municipal Fringe Benefits (biannual report) and County Salaries in North Carolina 2008

Half (50%) of the southeastern states provide a match to either their 457(b) Deferred Compensation plan or 401(k) supplemental retirement programs.

Table 24: **NUMBER OF SOUTHEASTERN STATES CONTRIBUTING FOR EMPLOYEES**

Program Plan	# of States that contribute
457(b) Deferred Compensation	5
401(k) Supplemental Retirement	2
Both 457(b) and 401(k)	0

Source: 2009 Southeastern States Benefits and Pay Practices Survey

Some states have established a **Partial Lump Sum Option Payment (PLOP)** for certain retirees and benefit recipients. The PLOP is an option at retirement that allows a recipient to initially receive a lump sum benefit payment along with a reduced monthly retirement allowance. The PLOP is a method in which a member, at the time of retirement, may elect to receive a partial lump sum payment amount and a reduced monthly allowance. The lump sum payment cannot be less than six times or more than thirty-six times the monthly amount that would be payable to the member under the plan of payment selected and shall not result in a monthly allowance that is less than fifty percent of that monthly amount. The total amount paid as a lump sum and a monthly benefit shall be the actuarial equivalent of the amount that would have been paid had the lump sum not been selected. As a lump sum distribution, the PLOP is fully taxable and is subject to division of property orders, if applicable.

VII. BASE PAY AND SALARY ADJUSTMENT FUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

- **Base Pay Increase:**

The state's budget situation for 2011 precludes recommending any across-the-board salary increase for state employees. Under more favorable economic conditions, in order to help keep state employees' salaries in line with market conditions, a modest cost-of-living increase as funds will allow – consistent with the consumer price index -- and an allocation to each agency and university to use to reward employees based on competencies and performance would be recommended, with additional flexibility given to agencies and universities to design their own performance rewards programs. This allocation would differ from the traditional legislative increases that provide the same increase for all employees, regardless of performance or competency level. Identical increases for all employees tend to over compensate poor performers and under compensate high performers, the very employees that the State can ill afford to lose to its competitors.

- **Salary Adjustment Fund:**

A legislatively mandated moratorium on labor market increases has kept market-based compensation work from occurring in the past couple of years. However, as market conditions improve, it will be important to plan funding for the Salary Adjustment Fund using a realistic projection of actual needs rather than relying on funds remaining from the Legislative Increase. With market movement currently sluggish at around 2.7% per year and with certain job classifications considered to be behind the market, it is recommended that in future years the legislature request the Office of State Personnel provide market-based data to support additional funding for the Salary Adjustment Fund each year.

It is also recommended that restrictive language be removed from the Base Budget Act that directs specific transactions that can be funded from the Salary Adjustment fund so that agencies can focus the money on their most critical needs that sometimes do not fit the restrictive Legislative language.

- **Additional Compensation Programs:**

Plan for expansion of the number of compensation programs available to State workers, such as Signing Bonuses, Performance Bonuses, Employee & Team Incentive Pay, etc. in order to match the variety of offerings by many of our competitors.

VIII. BENEFIT RECOMMENDATIONS

- Match a portion of employees' 401(k) contributions. State matching may be phased in by granting 1% in the current year and an additional 1% each of the next years to 5% total matching contribution by the State for non-law enforcement employees.
- Change the State Health Plan Year from July 1 - June 30 to January 1 - December 31, so that SPA employees can better plan their out-of-pocket expenses and their strategy for taking advantage of the NC Flex program as well as other benefit programs.
- In order to increase participation in and lower costs for the State Health Plan, implement a small monthly premium for Employee Only coverage and a higher subsidy for Employee/Children and Employee/Family coverage.
- Centralize coordination of supplemental benefits and consolidate supplemental benefit plan offerings in a menu approach for portability and cost savings. Allow employees to select plan products that meet their needs.
 1. Increase the Sick leave accrual rate by 2 days per annum, making North Carolina's benefits package more attractive and matching other southeastern states in sick leave benefits (see Table 25).
 2. Increase the number of holidays by one day in years where eleven are presently granted (see Table 26) in order to achieve consistency from year to year and with other southeastern states.

Table 25: **PROPOSED INCREASES TO SICK LEAVE ACCRUAL**

Current Days Granted Each Year	Additional Days Granted Each Year	Proposed Total Days Granted Each Year
12	2	14

Table 26: **PROPOSED INCREASES TO HOLIDAY LEAVE**

Current Days Granted Each Year	Additional Days Granted Each Year	Proposed Total Days Granted Each Year
11 in some years* 12 in some years	Add 1 day in years where only 11 days are granted	12

*Currently 11 Holidays when Christmas falls on Monday or Friday and 12 Holidays when Christmas falls on Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday

If the above recommendations are not implemented, it is recommended that the following be considered:

- Develop an employer supplemental benefit enhancement program providing a fixed amount of \$500 annually with employees having the option to apply towards:
 - a. dependent health coverage, or
 - b. NC Flex benefits package, or
 - c. 401(k) {457(b)} {403(b)} contributions, or
 - d. post-tax supplemental benefit plans.

this page intentionally left blank

Appendix

Market Data

- ◆ *History of Legislative Increases
1992-2010*
- ◆ *List of Benchmark Classes
and Labor Market Analysis*

History of Legislative Increases for NC State Employees 1992 - 2010

Year	Cost-of-Living Increase	Career Growth Increase	Bonus Increase
1992	\$522	0	0
1993	2%	0	1% bonus
1994	4%	0	1% bonus
1995	2%	0	0
1996	2.5%	2%	0
1997	2%	2%	0
1998	1%	2%	1% performance bonus
1999	1%	2%	\$125 performance bonus
2000	2.2%	2%	\$500 bonus
2001	\$625	0	0
2002	0	0	10 days bonus leave
2003	0	0	\$550 bonus plus 10 days bonus leave
2004	2.5% for salaries over \$40K; or \$1000 / yr for salaries under \$40K	0	0
2005	the greater of \$850 or 2.0%	0	5 days bonus leave
2006	5.5%	0	0
2007	4.0%	0	0
2008	the greater of \$1100 or 2.75%	0	0
2009	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0

Benchmark Classes Labor Market Data Summary

Class Titles	North Carolina Salary	Market Rate	Labor Market Pay Gap	Turnover Rate (FY 09-10)	Vacancy Rate (12-10)	EEs (12-10)
Administrative & Managerial						
Accountant (banded)	57,099	48,759	+14.6%	4.7%	9.4%	591
Accounting Manager (banded)	82,680	76,321	+7.7%	2.9%	8.5%	74
Accounting Technician (banded)	38,940	37,389	+4.0%	4.75%	7.7%	949
Administrative Secretary III	38,462	40,619	-5.6%	9.1%	16.7%	140
Admin Support Assoc (banded)	31,888	31,380	+1.6%	10.4%	13.7%	2597
Attorney III	87,369	86,361	+1.2%	4.4%	23.6%	128
Attorney (banded)	101,318	86,361	+14.8%	10.7%	9.7%	30
Executive Assistant I	43,303	48,024	-10.9%	6.4%	4.8%	44
Auditor (banded)	53,150	64,529	-21.4%	6.2%	12.7%	536
Office Assistant IV	32,134	31,380	+2.3%	8.5%	12.1%	1080
Paralegal II	42,949	50,137	-16.7%	7.6%	22.5%	47
Personnel Analyst II	56,431	54,535	+3.4%	7.6%	9.0%	64
Engineering & Architecture						
Engineer (banded)	62,085	64,799	-4.4%	3.7%	13.3%	1550
Human Services						
Social Worker II (BSW)	39,330	41,280	-5.0%	12.0%	7.4%	27
Social Worker III (MSW)	42,744	47,600	-11.4%	7.8%	10.1%	135
Rehabilitation Counselor I	38,996	36,854	+5.5%	34.2%	14.0%	223
Information & Education						
Artist Illustrator II	38,202	41,553	-8.8%	7.0%	7.3%	41
Information and Communication Spec II	44,968	50,937	-13.3%	18.4%	14.6%	52
Library Professional (banded)	50,776	47,877	+5.7%	26.7%	6.9%	31
Public Health Educator II	38,749	33,509	+12.9%	300.0%	0.0%	3
Information Technology						
Business & Technology Applications Analyst (banded)	68,749	61,083	+11.2%	4.0%	16.0%	981
Information Technology Manager (banded)	93,362	82,792	+11.3%	6.2%	11.6%	399
Networking Tech (banded)	49,701	47,595	+4.2%	5.1%	7.9%	141
Operations & Systems Specialist (banded)	84,883	72,746	+14.3%	3.3%	12.5%	318
Operations & Systems Technician (banded)	42,521	39,426	+7.3%	10.2%	5.0%	115

Class Titles	North Carolina Salary	Market Rate	Labor Market Pay Gap	Turnover Rate (FY 09-10)	Vacancy Rate (12-10)	EEs (12-10)
Institutional Services						
Building & Environmental Services Tech (banded)	24,883	23,501	+5.6%	11.0%	11.5%	2183
Cook II	26,846	24,458	+8.9%	8.4%	8.7%	107
Food Service Tech (banded)	24,013	24,458	-1.9%	25.2%	21.1%	115
Housekeeper	23,902	23,501	+1.7%	14.3%	15.4%	421
Law Enforcement & Public Safety						
Correctional Officer	29,575	30,363	-2.7%	14.8%	5.1%	9597
Public Safety Officer (banded)	37,420	39,240	-4.9%	12.6%	14.0%	312
SBI Agent II	46,612	49,435	-6.1%	3.5%	9.3%	55
Security Guard	26,069	29,028	-11.3%	90.5%	7.6%	93
Medical & Health						
Clinical Dietitian I	44,202	51,772	-17.1%	25.0%	4.2%	42
Health Care Tech I	25,917	25,779	+0.5%	17.1%	15.8%	3266
Medical Laboratory Technologist II	45,761	47,984	-4.9%	13.0%	21.3%	54
Nurse Supervisor (banded)	66,530	67,742	-1.8%	11.9%	17.4%	261
Occupational Therapist I	64,437	69,804	-8.3%	24.2%	19.5%	29
Pharmacist (banded)	99,233	106,261	-7.1%	5.7%	9.7%	112
Physical Therapist I	65,692	73,279	-11.5%	14.3%	70.0%	5
Physician Extender I	75,272	80,808	-7.4%	25.0%	100.0%	3
Licensed Practical Nurse (banded)	39,386	38,348	+2.6%	24.6%	13.6%	598
Professional Nurse (banded)	53,426	54,624	-2.2%	28.0%	17.5%	1309
Speech & Language Pathologist I	56,576	64,264	-13.6%	21.1%	23.8%	53
Natural Resources & Scientific						
Chemist II	51,429	52,844	-2.8%	2.9%	3.6%	27
Forester I	40,436	38,837	+4.0%	4.9%	4.8%	39
Park Superintendent (Law Enforcement Supv - banded) *	48,723	51,434	-5.6%	0.0%	6.5 %	40
Operations & Trades						
Electrician II	38,664	44,647	-15.5%	6.8%	4.5%	56
Facility Maintenance Technician – Mechanical (banded)	39,788	37,065	+6.8%	7.2%	7.5%	800
HVAC Mechanic	40,333	43,870	-8.8%	15.3%	7.5%	107
Maintenance Mechanic IV	38,516	37,065	+3.8%	11.0%	10.5%	288
Mechanic II	38,953	42,867	-10.0%	6.9%	2.9%	86
Vehicle/Equipment Repair Technician (banded)	38,806	42,867	-10.5%	7.5%	12.7%	601
Welder II	38,467	38,549	-0.2%	10.0%	25.00%	19