## HCM 13-13

DATE: December 6, 2013
TO: All Appointing Authorities
FROM: Lucinda Meltabarger, HCM Administrator

## SUBJECT: State of Oklahoma Total Remuneration Study

Attached please find the State of Oklahoma total remuneration study conducted by Kenning Consulting and Hay Group at the request of the Office of Management and Enterprise Services.

This information is a resource for policymakers and agencies to use for future employee compensation policy discussions.

Please note this information requires no action by agencies. It does not grant agencies additional authority to adjust compensation, nor does it directly recommend specific compensation levels for employees.

Any agency adjusting employee compensation prior to legislative action on this information will have done so independently and not due to any mandate imposed by law or any other entity.

Please address any questions to the OMES Human Capital Management Division at:
Jake Smith at (405) 521-6327 or jacob.smith@omes.ok.gov
Ron Wilson at (405) 522-0422 or ron.wilson@omes.ok.gov

## Attachment

State of Oklahoma
Total Remuneration Report for the Compensation Committee


## Why was the study done?

- While the State has gathered salary data on a regular basis, there has not been a total remuneration study for many years.
- When discussion occurs concerning the competitiveness of salaries and the need to be more competitive, questions are raised about whether there is a need to do anything as there is perception that the competitiveness of our benefits may offset salaries.
- "We don't know whether that is true or not as we have not studied the competitiveness of benefits and our total compensation"
- Several years of no general funding for across the board raises, coupled with increased turnover, has caused concerns to Executive and Legislative branch leadership, as well as the Employee Association, regarding compensation.
- This has led to an increase in the number of unclassified jobs and also requests for additional funds for various classifications during the budget process.
- "Is the squeaky wheel getting the oil"?


## How has the study been done?

Project planning, management and communication
Review and development of the State Compensation Philosophy
Definition of the constituency of the market to be surveyed and survey sources to utilize
Selection of benchmark positions to be surveyed
Definition of components of total remuneration to be surveyed
Selection of consultant to conduct the survey
Development of survey instrument and collection of data
Analysis of survey data
Preparation of a market analysis preliminary report by the survey consultants
Feedback from the State to the survey consultants
Preparation of a revised market analysis report
Remuneration strategy and planning session with HCM leadership
Preparation of today's presentation

## What are the key findings of the market analysis?

- Set out following page 5 is the Executive Summary section of the report from the survey consultants (Hay Group).
- Data identified as "Hay Group" represents in-State data from a number of sources:
- Custom Survey: data from selected organizations
- Hay Group: data from the Hay Group database of employers with employees in Oklahoma
- Oklahoma Hospital Association: healthcare specific jobs
- Quorum Survey: in State survey conducted for Oklahoma employers
- Bureau of Labor and Statistics (BLS): salary data for jobs in Oklahoma
- Data identified as National Compensation Association of State Governments (NCASG) represents data from selected comparator States:
- For Salary and Benefits: AR, CO, KS, MO, LA, NM
- For Salary only: TX
- For Benefits only: NE and TN
- Data is based on 141 benchmark positions representing 10,082 employees.

P50 represents the median of the market where 50\% of the market pays above this value and 50\% pays below
P75 represents the upper quartile of the market where $25 \%$ of the market pays above this value and $75 \%$ pays below
P25 represents the lower quartile of the market where $75 \%$ on the market pays above this value and 25\% pays below

## Executive summary results Base salary

## The table below reflects a summary of the base salary positioning against the Median (P50) and 25th Percentile (P25) of the two markets

- On average, the state's market position for base salaries is $21.7 \%$ below the Hay Group/Special Survey market Median while midpoints are $18.2 \%$ below the Median
- Compared to peer NCASG states, the market position improves to $6.4 \%$ below the market median for base salaries and $2.1 \%$ above the median for midpoints

|  | Oklahoma vs. <br> Hay Group P50 | Oklahoma vs. <br> NCASG P50 | Oklahoma vs. <br> Hay Group P25 | Oklahoma vs. <br> NCASG P25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Base <br> Salaries | $-21.7 \%$ | $-6.4 \%$ | $-9.5 \%$ | $+2.7 \%$ |
| Midpoint | $-18.2 \%$ | $+2.1 \%$ | $-6.3 \%$ | $+13.0 \%$ |

## Executive summary results Benefits

Below is the summary comparison of the State's benefits programs compared to the Hay Group and NCASG market

| Benefit Area | Oklahoma vs. <br> Hay Group Market | Oklahoma vs. <br> NCASG Market |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Benefits | P 75 | $>\mathrm{P} 75$ |
| Retirement | $>\mathrm{P} 75$ | P 75 |
| Healthcare | $>\mathrm{P} 75$ | $>\mathrm{P} 75$ |
| Disability | $>\mathrm{P} 75$ | P 75 |
| Death | $<\mathrm{P} 25$ | P 25 |
| Other | $<\mathrm{P} 25$ | $<\mathrm{P} 25$ |

- The State's current overall competitive market position is at or above the 75th percentile of both the Hay Group and States markets, driven by Oklahoma's strong retirement benefit and high employer subsidy of the State's "basic plan" benefits
- When the benefits program is considered on its own, independent of salary, Oklahoma's benefits are $29 \%$ above the Hay Group median and $32 \%$ above the NCASG median


## Executive summary results Total compensation

Below is the summary comparison of the State's aggregate total remuneration market competitiveness

| Component | Oklahoma vs. Market P50 |  | Oklahoma vs. Market P25 |  | Key Findings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hay Group | NCASG | Hay Group | NCASG |  |
| Base Salary | -21.7\% | -6.4\% | $-9.5 \%$ | +2.7\% | The majority of the State's occupational groups fall well below the Median of the market compared to the Hay Group survey but closer to NCASG peer group market |
| Benefits | +18.0\% | +24.3\% | +34.4\% | +40.7\% | When the impact of salary is considered on benefits, the competitiveness of the State's benefits program decreases slightly, however, Retirement and Health Care programs influence the overall market position, driven by high level of subsidy provided by the State for these benefits |
| Total Remuneration | -7.4\% | 0.0\% | +5.5\% | +11.8\% | The competitive benefits program enhances the total remuneration market position |

- The influence of the better benefits position does help to offset the low salary position in some cases; however, base salary generally carries more weight than benefits in determining the total remuneration position


## Executive summary results Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. HAY GROUP \& NCASG MARKETS - \$25,000 SALARY


## Executive summary results Total compensation

## STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. HAY GROUP \& NCASG MARKETS - $\$ 40,000$ SALARY



## Executive summary results Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. HAY GROUP \& NCASG MARKETS - $\$ 60,000$ SALARY


## Executive summary results Total compensation

## STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. HAY GROUP \& NCASG MARKETS - $\$ 70,000$ SALARY



## What are the key findings of the market analysis?

As can be seen from the charts on the previous pages, the total compensation for the State:

- Is at its most competitive at the lower levels of base salary; and
- The mix of salary and benefits is more weighted towards benefits than the market, particularly at the lower salary levels. For example, even though total compensation lags the P50 at the $\$ 40,000$ salary level by nearly $\$ 8,000$, the value of benefits is greater than the P50 of the market at that level.
As stated by the survey consultants, the current benefits plan is "a good plan for the 1980s" but will it attract and retain the workforce of "tomorrow?"
The chart on the following page shows that nearly $60 \%$ of employees in the Executive Branch have a base salary in the range of $\$ 25,000-\$ 45,000$.

- At the commencement of the study, we stated the study results would provide:
- A current assessment of the competitiveness of base salary, benefits and total remuneration. "It's not just about the amount, it's also about the mix."
- The basis upon which compensation decisions can be made on an integrated basis between the different components of total remuneration.
- The basis upon which "what if" scenarios can be developed and considered for future compensation decisions and the ability to do compensation planning for multiple years.
- Minimization of the "squeaky wheel gets the oil" compensation decisions.
- Through the education of key stakeholders on the process during the course of the study, the increased likelihood of buy-in to and buy-off of the study recommendations.


## Considerations for action

Taking into consideration the factors on the previous page and the market analysis, we have developed a multi year game plan for your consideration. In doing so, we have been "guided" by the following:

Any changes to salaries should be done taking into consideration factors such as time to fill, quantity and quality of potential hires and rates of turnover

- Given that approximately 32\% of the 33,325 Executive Branch employees are now in unclassified positions and there is little structure to the unclassified pay "plan," to what extent should there be plan design changes for these positions?
- To what extent should there be changes to the pay ranges (pay structure) as well as rates of pay?
- If consideration is given to managing back the level of competitiveness of above market benefits, this must be done in light of the overall level of total remuneration


## Considerations for action

Any changes to salary plans should take into consideration two key groups:

- "today's" workforce
- the workforce of the future

Any changes to benefits plans should take into consideration three key groups:

- "today's" workforce
- current retirees
- future retirees

Taking into consideration all these factors, set out on the following pages is a table showing recommendations for your consideration.
This plan is a multi-year plan as we recognize that "the current state" was not achieved "overnight" and a planned, multi-year change is more likely to be accepted than attempting to make all changes at one time.
The primary driver of these recommendations is to start on the path to "changing the mix" between salary and benefits.

## Considerations for action

| Salary |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Salary Structure | Move current pay bands 2-3\% movement with effect July 2014. Remove all salaries except Elected Officials and pay band structure authority out of statute and under the authority of HCM. | Development of market based, multiple occupational (not agency based) pay structures. This should alleviate the "flee to being unclassified" in order to have more competitive pay structures | Move pay structures in accordance with the targeted market policy position | Move pay structures in accordance with the targeted market policy position | Move pay structures in accordance with the targeted market policy position |
| Funds (overall) | Given the gap between the current pay practice and the market, we recommend a target of 3\% funding as a first step toward closing that gap. It should not be seen as an "across the board" movement. How this can be done is set out in the Pay Delivery component. | Funding to be determined based on implementation of new salary structures | Funding to be determined | Funding to be determined | Funding to be determined |
| Selected | Additional Targeted Funding for classifications in the following Occupational Groups: Law Enforcement, Corrections \& Juvenile Services, Nursing, and Social Services | To be determined in conjunction with the development of Occupational Based pay structures | To be determined based on market data and other factors such as recruitment, retention and turnover data | To be determined based on market data and other factors such as recruitment, retention and turnover data | To be determined based on market data and other factors such as recruitment, retention and turnover data |


| Salary |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Unclassified | Develop new definition of what is Unclassified (to be done as part of Merit System reform). Place a moratorium on new unclassified positions and Agency based unclassified salary studies. | Development and Implementation of Unclassified pay plans | Move pay structures in accordance with the targeted market policy position | Move pay structures in accordance with the targeted market policy position | Move pay structures in accordance with the targeted market policy position |
| Pay Delivery | Based on an assumption of 3\% funding. 2\% to all who meet standards for a statewide market adjustment. 1\% for targeted performance and equity adjustments. (Note: being 20\% behind market, this a start towards moving towards market). Separate funding for specific classifications in Occupational Groups listed above). <br> Longevity: Four Options: (1) Keep, (2) Gross up and terminate, (3) Grandfather and terminate for new employees,(4) change name to employee reward recognition program, criteria outside of tenure would be considered. |  |  |  |  |

Kenning Consulting

| Salary |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Pay Delivery (continued) | Design and implement an effective performance management process that will allow for strengthening the linkage between pay, performance and relativity to market. Continue the market/targeted based pay increases | Review performance based on the new performance management process. Focus will be on ensuring the performance management process is working well in order to avoid "what rating do I need to this amount of increase?" Continue market/targeted based pay increases | First full cycle of new pay for performance and market relativity program |  |  |

## Considerations for action



| Benefits |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 |  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Retirement Savings |  | Increase the Employee contribution by $0.375 \%$ for the current DB plan. Consider development of a new retirement plan for new employees. (Either a hybrid plan DB/DC plan or a DC plan only) | Increase the <br> Employee contribution by 0.375\% for the current DB plan. | Increase the <br> Employee contribution by 0.375\% for the current DB plan. | Increase the Employee contribution by 0.375\% for the current DB plan |
| Holidays and Vacation | No change | No change | No change | No change | No change |

## State of Oklahoma

Total Compensation Market Survey and Analysis Study


## Prepared by:

Cheryl Mikuls<br>Vice President<br>Hay Group
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## The State of Oklahoma (the "State") requested Hay Group to conduct a comprehensive compensation and benefits market survey and analysis

This total compensation analysis will enable the State to do the following:

- Compare the State's total compensation mix and levels with both public and private sector markets
- Understand the key drivers of the State's total remuneration market position
- Identify compensation and benefit market trends, focusing on salary administration and benefit program design




## Executive summary results Project overview

> The study included 172 benchmark positions (including 30 Agency Heads), representing approximately 11,500 State employees or $35 \%$ of total State employees

- 141 of the total benchmarks had sufficient market data for publication, covering 10,082 employees
Survey data will be shown based on two sources of market data collected and developed for the study:
- Hay Group: this market represents an average of several markets for pay specific to Oklahoma
- Custom Survey Oklahoma data (salary and benefits)
- Hay Group - data for employees and companies in Oklahoma (salary and benefits)
- Oklahoma Hospital Association (OHA) - healthcare specific jobs
- Quorum Survey - locally conducted survey for the State
- Bureau of Labor Statistics - (BLS) salary information for jobs in Oklahoma
- NCASG: this market is comprised of 9 comparator states
- AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM (salary \& benefits), TX (salary), NE and TN (benefits)





## Below is the summary comparison of the State's aggregate total remuneration market competitiveness

| Base Salary $-21.7 \%$ | $-6.4 \%$ | $-9.5 \%$ | $+2.7 \%$ | The majority of the State's occupational groups fall well <br> below the Median of the market compared to the Hay <br> Group survey but closer to NCASG peer group market <br> When the impact of salary is considered on benefits, the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| competitiveness of the State's benefits program decreases |  |  |  |  |
| slightly; however, Retirement and Health Care programs |  |  |  |  |
| influence the overall market position, driven by high level of |  |  |  |  |
| subsidy provided by the State for these benefits |  |  |  |  |

- The influence of the better benefits position does help to offset the low salary position in some cases; however, base salary generally carries more weight than benefits in determining the total remuneration position
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Market competitiveness Base salary

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

## Occupational groups versus Hay Group/Special Survey

- The following tables reflect the comparison of average pay for the benchmark positions in each of Oklahoma's occupational groups compared to the P50 and P25 of Hay Group's special survey and Oklahoma market
- Highlighted are the occupational groups for which actual pay or midpoint lags the market by more than $20 \%$

| Occupational Group | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { BMs } \end{aligned}$ | \# of EEs Overall | Avg Pay \% from InState P50 (Avg) | Midpoint \% from InState P50 (Avg) | Avg Pay \% from InState P25 (Avg) | Midpoint \% from InState P25 (Avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unclassified-Legal | 3 | 36 | -47\% |  | -37\% |  |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | 3 | 104 | -36\% | -37\% | -48\% | -49\% |
| Information Technology | 6 | 178 | -32\% | -35\% | -16\% | -22\% |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | 5 | 86 | -31\% | -31\% | -19\% | -18\% |
| Human Resources Management and Development | 5 | 182 | -31\% | -28\% | -23\% | -19\% |
| General Administrative | 20 | 2056 | -26\% | -23\% | -18\% | -15\% |
| Logistics and Property Management | 9 | 402 | -22\% | -26\% | -10\% | -14\% |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | 3 | 273 | -22\% | 0\% | -2\% | 24\% |
| Financial Management | 10 | 298 | -21\% | -25\% | -5\% | -13\% |
| Health Care Services and Administration | 16 | 246 | -19\% | -11\% | -3\% | 12\% |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | 7 | 140 | -18\% | -27\% | -5\% | -12\% |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

Occupational group versus Hay Group/Special Survey (continued)

| Occupational Group | \# of <br> BMs | \# of EEs Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { Avg Pay \% } \\ \text { from In- } \\ \text { State P50 } \\ \text { (Avg) } \end{gathered}$ | Midpoint \% from InState P50 (Avg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Avg Pay \% } \\ \text { from In- } \\ \text { State P25 } \\ \text { (Avg) } \end{gathered}$ | Midpoint \% from InState P25 (Avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Social Services | 9 | 2599 | -17\% | -2\% | 1\% | 20\% |
| Revenue and Taxation | 6 | 164 | -16\% | 7\% | 8\% | 38\% |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | 5 | 71 | -16\% |  | 7\% |  |
| Power Generation | 6 | 110 | -15\% | -4\% |  |  |
| Nursing Services | 6 | 903 | -15\% | -13\% | -4\% | -9\% |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | 9 | 632 | -15\% | -5\% | -2\% | 6\% |
| Corrections \& Custody | 6 | 714 | -13\% | 1\% | 1\% | 17\% |
| Transportation and Highway Construction and Maintenance | 6 | 903 | -1\% | -15\% |  |  |
| Law Enforcement | 16 | 1062 | 0\% | -20\% | 24\% | -8\% |
| Employment Services | 3 | 199 | 4\% | 14\% | 36\% | 49\% |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | 4 | 13 | 26\% | 17\% | 36\% | 26\% |
| Agricultural Services and Inspections | 4 | 96 |  |  |  |  |
| Historical Preservation | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | 3 | 50 |  |  |  |  |
| Unclassified-Agricultural | 1 | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Veterans Services | 2 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 174 | 11544 | -21.7\% | -18.2\% | -9.5\% | -6.3\% |

## Occupational group versus NCASG

- The following tables reflect the comparison of average pay for benchmark positions in each of Oklahoma's occupational groups compared to the P50 and P25 of the NCASG 7-state market
- Highlighted are the occupational groups for which actual pay or midpoint lags the market by more than 20\%


## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

## Occupational group versus NCASG (continued)

| Occupational Group | \# of <br> BMs |  | Avg Pay \% from NCASG <br> 7 States <br> Market P50 (Avg) | Midpoint \% from NCASG <br> 7 States <br> Market P50 (Avg) | Avg Pay \% from NCASG 7 States Market P25 (Avg) | Midpoint \% from NCASG 7 States Market P25 <br> (Avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | 7 | 140 | -6\% | -5\% | 0\% | -7\% |
| Corrections \& Custody | 6 | 714 | -6\% | 9\% | 4\% | 22\% |
| Financial Management | 10 | 298 | -3\% | -3\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | 3 | 273 | -2\% | 6\% | 8\% | 17\% |
| Transportation and Highway Construction and Maintenance | 6 | 903 | -2\% | 10\% |  |  |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | 3 | 104 | -1\% | -3\% | 5\% | 4\% |
| Revenue and Taxation | 6 | 164 | -1\% | 17\% | 2\% | 21\% |
| Logistics and Property Management | 9 | 402 | 0\% | -4\% | 3\% | -2\% |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | 3 | 50 | 0\% | -3\% | 9\% | 6\% |
| Nursing Services | 6 | 903 | 1\% | 2\% | 4\% | 6\% |
| Law Enforcement | 16 | 1062 | 1\% | 24\% | 9\% | 34\% |
| Unclassified-Legal | 3 | 36 | 6\% |  | 18\% |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | 16 | 246 | 7\% | 5\% | 20\% | 25\% |
| Veterans Services | 2 | 7 | 19\% | 38\% | 20\% | 39\% |
| Power Generation | 6 | 110 |  |  |  |  |
| Unclassified-Agricultural | 1 | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 174 | 11544 | -6.4\% | 2.1\% | 2.7\% | 13.0\% |


|  | Group Pay \% | Midpoint <br> from In- <br> Grade from In- | Avg Pay \% <br> from In- <br> fate P50 <br> (Avg) | Midpoint <br> State P50 from In- <br> (Avg) | State P25 <br> (Avg) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O, P | Managers/Directors | $-33 \%$ | $-33 \%$ | $-23 \%$ | $-23 \%$ |
| (Avg) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Grade level versus NCASG

- The following table reflects the comparison of average pay and midpoint for the benchmark positions in Oklahoma's classified grades compared to the P50 and P25 of the NCASG 7-state market
- Unclassified jobs are not reflected in this analysis
- The table summarizes the percent from market grouped by level of work performed

|  | Avg Pay \% <br> from In- <br> Grade | Midpoint <br> $\%$ from In- <br> State P50 <br> (Avg) | Avg Pay \% <br> from In- <br> (Avg) | Midpoint <br> State P25 from In- <br> (Avg) | State P25 <br> (Avg) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O, P | Managers/Directors | $-28 \%$ | $-27 \%$ | $-20 \%$ | $-19 \%$ |
| L, M, N | Managerial | $-8 \%$ | $-7 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| I, J, K | Professional/Supervisory | $-9 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| F, G, H | Senior Clerical | $-10 \%$ | $-8 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| C, D, E | Clerical | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

HayGroup ${ }^{\circ}$

|  |  | Avg Pay \% <br> from In- <br> \# of <br> State P50 <br> (Avg) | Midpoint <br> \% from In- <br> State P50 <br> (Avg) | Avg Pay \% <br> from In- <br> State P25 <br> (Avg) | Midpoint \% <br> from In- <br> State P25 <br> (Avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P | 1 | $-31 \%$ | $-34 \%$ | $-22 \%$ | $-26 \%$ |
| O | 3 | $-36 \%$ | $-32 \%$ | $-24 \%$ | $-20 \%$ |
| N | 6 | $-25 \%$ | $-27 \%$ | $-9 \%$ | $-12 \%$ |
| M | 10 | $-23 \%$ | $-23 \%$ | $-16 \%$ | $-13 \%$ |
| L | 10 | $-15 \%$ | $-15 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| K | 18 | $-26 \%$ | $-20 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| J | 21 | $-32 \%$ | $-28 \%$ | $-24 \%$ | $-20 \%$ |
| I | 14 | $-17 \%$ | $-15 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

## Grade level versus Hay Group/Special Survey (continued)

|  |  | Avg Pay \% <br> from In- <br> \# of <br> State P50 <br> (Avg) | Midpoint <br> \% from In- <br> State P50 <br> (Avg) | Avg Pay \% <br> from In- <br> State P25 <br> (Avg) | Midpoint \% <br> from In- <br> State P25 <br> (Avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H | 10 | $-18 \%$ | $-22 \%$ | $-9 \%$ | $-12 \%$ |
| G | 9 | $-7 \%$ | $-9 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| F | 9 | $-21 \%$ | $-19 \%$ | $-12 \%$ | $-11 \%$ |
| E | 7 | $-8 \%$ | $-11 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $-5 \%$ |
| D | 1 | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| C | 1 | $-3 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 2 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 1 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 9 . 3 \%}$ |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

## Grade level versus NCASG

- The following tables reflect the comparison of average pay for benchmark positions in each of Oklahoma's classified grades compared to the P50 and P25 of the NCASG 7state market
- Highlighted are the grades for which actual pay or midpoint lags the market by more than 20\%

| Grade | \# of <br> BMs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg Pay \% } \\ & \text { from NCASG } \\ & 7 \text { States } \\ & \text { Market P50 } \\ & \text { (Avg) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Midpoint \% } \\ \text { from NCASG } \\ 7 \text { States } \\ \text { Market P50 } \\ \text { (Avg) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Avg Pay \% from NCASG 7 <br> States Market <br> P25 (Avg) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Midpoint \% } \\ \text { from NCASG } 7 \\ \text { States Market } \\ \text { P25 } \\ \text { (Avg) } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P | 1 | -30\% | -33\% | -18\% | -21\% |
| 0 | 3 | -26\% | -20\% | -22\% | -16\% |
| N | 6 | -4\% | -2\% | 3\% | 5\% |
| M | 10 | -9\% | -10\% | -1\% | -3\% |
| L | 10 | -12\% | -10\% | 6\% | 7\% |
| K | 18 | -3\% | 1\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| J | 21 | -15\% | -7\% | -8\% | 1\% |
| I | 14 | -10\% | -3\% | -1\% | 7\% |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

## Grade level versus NCASG (continued)

| Grade | \# of <br> BMs | Avg Pay \% from NCASG 7 States Market P50 (Avg) | Midpoint \% from NCASG 7 States Market P50 (Avg) | Avg Pay \% from NCASG 7 States Market P25 (Avg) | Midpoint \% from NCASG 7 States Market P25 (Avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H | 10 | -7\% | -6\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| G | 9 | -10\% | -8\% | -3\% | -1\% |
| F | 9 | -11\% | -10\% | -4\% | -2\% |
| E | 7 | 4\% | 5\% | 8\% | 10\% |
| D | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| C | 1 | 2\% | -1\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| Average | 120 | -9.8\% | -6.4\% | -2.1\% | 1.8\% |

# Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group 

## HayGroup ${ }^{\circ}$

MEDIAN (P50)

## Listed on the following slides are the benchmark positions compared to market averages to determine overall levels of competitiveness by job

- The table is sorted by occupational group to reflect the benchmark jobs individually by group based on level of competitiveness against both markets


## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group
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## Benchmark competitiveness at P50

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of OK \# of EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { MP \% } \\ \text { from In- } \\ \text { State } \\ \text { Market } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | In- <br> State P50 | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG } 7 \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P50 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural Services and Inspections | Commissioner, Agriculture Dept | 1 |  | \$87.0 | \$126.5 |  |  | -23\% | 12\% |  | \$112.5 |
| Agricultural Services and Inspections | Agriculture Field Inspector | 41 | J | \$35.5 | \$38.8 |  |  | -10\% | -1\% |  | \$39.3 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Manager | 218 | K | \$36.6 | \$42.5 | -21\% | -8\% | -6\% | 9\% | \$46.0 | \$38.9 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Probation and Parole Officer | 9 | K | \$35.0 | \$42.5 | -8\% | 11\% | -4\% | 16\% | \$38.1 | \$36.5 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Officer | 456 | H | \$28.8 | \$31.9 | -7\% | 3\% | -5\% | 5\% | \$31.0 | \$30.4 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Industries Mgr | 16 | H | \$32.0 | \$31.9 |  |  | -17\% | -17\% |  | \$38.4 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Director, Corrections Dept | 1 |  | \$132.3 | \$156.1 |  |  | -3\% | 14\% |  | \$136.7 |
| Employment Services | Compliance Enforcement Officer | 30 | L | \$42.7 | \$46.7 | 4\% | 14\% |  |  | \$41.1 |  |
| Employment Services | Executive Director, Employment Security Commission | 1 |  | \$93.2 | \$126.5 |  |  | -10\% | 23\% |  | \$103.0 |
| Employment Services | Workforce Services Specialist | 168 | 1 | \$32.0 | \$35.3 |  |  | 1\% | 12\% |  | \$31.5 |
| Financial Management | Auditor | 65 | J | \$34.6 | \$38.8 | -46\% | -39\% | -27\% | -18\% | \$63.5 | \$47.4 |
| Financial Management | Financial Manager/Comptroller | 15 | 0 | \$59.8 | \$64.5 | -43\% | -39\% | -26\% | -20\% | \$105.4 | \$80.5 |
| Financial Management | Business Manager | 21 | L | \$45.2 | \$46.7 | -31\% | -29\% | -29\% | -27\% | \$65.4 | \$63.8 |
| Financial Management | Accountant | 91 | J | \$39.5 | \$38.8 | -25\% | -27\% | -4\% | -5\% | \$52.9 | \$41.1 |
| Financial Management | Commissioner, Banking Dept | 1 |  | \$151.9 | \$132.1 | -16\% | -27\% | 32\% | 15\% | \$181.8 | \$115.0 |
| Financial Management | Accounting Technician | 49 | G | \$27.7 | \$29.0 | -16\% | -12\% | -11\% | -7\% | \$33.0 | \$31.1 |
| Financial Management | Insurance/Benefits Accounts Specialist | 4 | H | \$35.4 | \$31.9 | -15\% | -23\% |  |  | \$41.6 |  |
| Financial Management | Director, Accountancy Board | 1 |  | \$133.9 | \$141.9 | -15\% | -10\% | 6\% | 12\% | \$157.3 | \$126.5 |
| Financial Management | Certified Public Accountant | 38 |  | \$65.2 | n/a | -6\% |  |  |  | \$69.3 |  |
| Financial Management | Revenue Administrator II | 13 |  | \$57.9 | n/a | 18\% |  |  |  | \$49.1 |  |


| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | Sof <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | $\begin{gathered} \text { MP \% } \\ \text { from In- } \\ \text { State } \\ \text { Market } \end{gathered}$ | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{gathered} \text { MP \% } \\ \text { from } \\ \text { NCASG } \\ \text { Market } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P50 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG } 7 \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P550 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Administrative | Administrative Programs Officer | 227 | J | \$36.8 | \$38.8 | -43\% | -40\% |  |  | \$65.1 |  |
| General Administrative | Public Information Officer | 11 | J | \$39.4 | \$38.8 | -42\% | -42\% |  |  | \$67.5 |  |
| General Administrative | Legal Secretary | 10 | H | \$30.8 | \$31.9 | -36\% | -34\% |  |  | \$48.2 |  |
| General Administrative | Public Information Manager | 10 | M | \$49.1 | \$51.8 | -35\% | -32\% |  |  | \$75.7 |  |
| General Administrative | Secretary | 53 | H | \$29.4 | \$31.9 | -25\% | -19\% | 10\% | 19\% | \$39.2 | \$26.8 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician III | 895 | F | \$25.5 | \$26.4 | -23\% | -21\% |  |  | \$33.3 |  |
| General Administrative | Graphic Artist | 12 | I | \$34.6 | \$35.3 | -17\% | -15\% | 4\% | 6\% | \$41.7 | \$33.2 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician II | 116 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 | -17\% | -18\% |  |  | \$29.3 |  |
| General Administrative | Librarian | 6 | L | \$41.6 | \$46.7 | -14\% | -4\% | 3\% | 16\% | \$48.7 | \$40.4 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Assistant | 511 | I | \$33.1 | \$35.3 | -12\% | -6\% |  |  | \$37.5 |  |
| General Administrative | Library Technician | 14 | F | \$26.5 | \$26.4 | -10\% | -11\% | 1\% | 0\% | \$29.6 | \$26.3 |
| General Administrative | Customer Service Representative | 76 | E | \$23.9 | \$24.0 | -10\% | -10\% |  |  | \$26.7 |  |
| General Administrative | Customer Assistance Representative | 51 | G | \$28.6 | \$29.0 | -4\% | -3\% |  |  | \$29.9 |  |
| General Administrative | Executive Director, Arts Council | 1 |  | \$63.7 | \$95.0 |  |  | -40\% | -10\% |  | \$106.0 |
| General Administrative | Director, OMES | 1 |  | \$108.0 | \$190.9 |  |  | -21\% | 39\% |  | \$137.2 |
| General Administrative | Secretary of State | 1 |  | \$90.0 | \$126.5 |  |  | -19\% | 14\% |  | \$111.4 |
| General Administrative | Director, Commerce Dept | 1 |  | \$112.5 | \$119.8 |  |  | -14\% | -8\% |  | \$130.4 |
| General Administrative | Director, Libraries Dept | 1 |  | \$85.9 | \$95.0 |  |  | 1\% | 12\% |  | \$85.0 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Hearing Officer | 13 | M | \$51.7 | \$51.8 |  |  | 9\% | 9\% |  | \$47.6 |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Safety Consultant | 16 | J | \$39.7 | \$38.8 | -45\% | -46\% |  |  | \$72.1 |  |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Fire Prevention \& Security Ofc | 39 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 | -12\% | -14\% | -1\% | -3\% | \$27.7 | \$24.6 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

MEDIAN (P50)

## Benchmark competitiveness at P50 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { State of } \\ \text { OK } \\ \text { Current } \\ \text { MP } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg Pay } \\ & \text { \% from } \\ & \text { In-State } \\ & \text { Market } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MP \% } \\ & \text { from In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { Market } \end{aligned}$ | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P50 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG 7 } \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P50 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Specl | 38 | J | \$40.9 | \$38.8 | -38\% | -41\% | -13\% | -17\% | \$65.7 | \$46.9 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environ/Chemical Lab Scientist | 13 | K | \$41.1 | \$42.5 | -32\% | -29\% |  |  | \$60.1 |  |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Manager | 33 | 0 | \$63.0 | \$64.5 | -26\% | -25\% |  |  | \$85.6 |  |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Director, Wildlife Conservation Commission | 1 |  | \$122.0 | \$119.8 |  |  | -7\% | -9\% |  | \$131.4 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Executive Director, Environmental Quality Dept | 1 |  | \$123.0 | \$126.5 |  |  | -5\% | -2\% |  | \$129.0 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Executive Secretary, Dentistry Board | 1 |  | \$75.7 | \$109.0 | -56\% | -36\% |  |  | \$170.9 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Executive Secretary, Pharmacy Board | 1 |  | \$109.1 | \$161.0 | -32\% | 0\% |  |  | \$161.0 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Pharmacist II | 9 |  | \$82.2 | n/a | -23\% |  | -13\% |  | \$106.4 | \$95.0 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Chief Medical Examiner, Medical Examiners Offfice | 1 |  | \$225.0 | \$256.2 | -12\% | 0\% |  |  | \$256.2 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Recreation Therapist | 11 | 1 | \$33.2 | \$35.3 | -12\% | -6\% | -3\% | 3\% | \$37.7 | \$34.4 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Psychological Clinician | 42 | M | \$43.9 | \$51.8 | -10\% | 6\% |  |  | \$48.9 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Pharmacy Technician | 19 | F | \$25.7 | \$26.4 | -9\% | -7\% | -7\% | -5\% | \$28.4 | \$27.7 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Therapeutic/Medical Aide | 23 | E | \$28.5 | \$24.0 | -8\% | -23\% |  |  | \$30.9 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Speech-Language Pathologist | 25 | L | \$58.4 | \$46.7 | -6\% | -25\% | 2\% | -18\% | \$62.3 | \$57.3 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Commissioner of Health | 1 |  | \$194.2 | \$170.0 | -3\% | -15\% | 18\% | 3\% | \$200.9 | \$165.0 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Child Development Specialist | 11 | K | \$42.7 | \$42.5 | -2\% | -3\% |  |  | \$43.7 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Dental Care Assistant | 24 | G | \$29.2 | \$29.0 | -2\% | -2\% | 6\% | 6\% | \$29.7 | \$27.5 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Executive Secretary, Speech Pathology \& Audiology | 1 |  | \$51.4 | \$63.5 |  |  | -10\% | 11\% |  | \$57.3 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Medical Advisor, Medical Licensure Board | 1 |  | \$114.0 | \$95.0 |  |  | 14\% | -5\% |  | \$100.0 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Commissioner, Mental Health Dept | 1 |  | \$133.5 | \$144.4 |  |  | 21\% | 31\% |  | \$110.2 |
| Historical Preservation | Historical Facility Manager | 5 | J | \$32.1 | \$38.8 |  |  | -25\% | -9\% |  | \$42.9 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Programs Manager | 19 | N | \$54.9 | \$57.6 | -38\% | -35\% | -20\% | -16\% | \$88.4 | \$68.6 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Training Specialist | 23 | J | \$36.5 | \$38.8 | -35\% | -31\% | -11\% | -6\% | \$55.9 | \$41.2 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist IV | 66 | K | \$41.7 | \$42.5 | -31\% | -29\% | 2\% | 3\% | \$60.2 | \$41.0 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist III | 52 | J | \$37.0 | \$38.8 | -25\% | -21\% |  |  | \$49.3 |  |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Assistant | 22 | G | \$28.1 | \$29.0 | -16\% | -13\% | -12\% | -9\% | \$33.3 | \$32.0 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

MEDIAN (P50)
Benchmark competitiveness at P50 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG <br> Market | MP \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | In- <br> State <br> P50 | NCASG 7 States P50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Information Technology | Information System Services Coordinator | 28 | K | \$33.7 | \$42.5 | -53\% | -41\% |  |  | \$71.9 |  |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist II | 20 | K | \$43.1 | \$42.5 | -36\% | -37\% | -7\% | -8\% | \$67.0 | \$46.2 |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist IV | 39 | M | \$54.6 | \$51.8 | -31\% | -35\% | -21\% | -25\% | \$79.2 | \$68.7 |
| Information Technology | Info System Operating System Specialist | 15 | M | \$51.9 | \$51.8 | -29\% | -29\% | -9\% | -9\% | \$73.3 | \$57.1 |
| Information Technology | Project Manager | 58 |  | \$67.0 | n/a | -27\% |  |  |  | \$92.1 |  |
| Information Technology | HelpDesk Technician | 18 |  | \$39.1 | n/a | -14\% |  |  |  | \$45.3 |  |
| Information Technology | Project Manager | 3 |  | \$92.6 | n/a | 1\% |  |  |  | \$92.1 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Chaplain | 16 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | -30\% | -15\% | -28\% | -12\% | \$45.6 | \$44.0 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Occupational Therapist | 11 |  | \$53.5 | n/a | -24\% |  | -14\% |  | \$70.9 | \$62.5 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Direct Care Specialist | 359 | F | \$24.5 | \$26.4 | -9\% | -2\% |  |  | \$26.8 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Consumer Recovery Specialist | 31 |  | \$20.8 | n/a | -8\% |  |  |  | \$22.6 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Food Service Manager | 21 | 1 | \$37.4 | \$35.3 | -6\% | -12\% | -17\% | -22\% | \$39.9 | \$45.2 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Food Service Specialist | 110 | E | \$21.3 | \$24.0 | -1\% | 11\% | -2\% | 10\% | \$21.5 | \$21.8 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Linen and Clothing Specialist | 19 | D | \$21.6 | \$21.8 | 4\% | 4\% |  |  | \$20.9 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Youth Guidance Specialist | 43 | F | \$25.8 | \$26.4 |  |  | -24\% | -23\% |  | \$34.0 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 3 | J | \$39.6 | \$38.8 | 25\% | 23\% |  |  | \$31.6 |  |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 8 | 1 | \$40.1 | \$35.3 | 27\% | 12\% |  |  | \$31.6 |  |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Executive Director, Public Employee's Retirement System | 1 |  | \$116.5 | \$119.8 |  |  | -41\% | -39\% |  | \$196.1 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Pres \& CEO, CompSource Okla | 1 |  | \$116.5 | \$119.8 |  |  | 7\% | 10\% |  | \$108.6 |
| Law Enforcement | Police Officer | 16 | F | \$23.1 | \$26.4 | -43\% | -35\% |  |  | \$40.6 |  |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Communications Specl | 16 | G | \$29.9 | \$29.0 | 5\% | 2\% |  |  | \$28.4 |  |
| Law Enforcement | Criminalist | 41 |  | \$62.3 | n/a | 36\% |  | 22\% |  | \$45.7 | \$50.9 |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Highway Patrol Officer III | 602 |  | \$55.4 | n/a |  |  | -14\% |  |  | \$64.4 |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Highway Patrol Manager | 32 |  | \$69.7 | n/a |  |  | -11\% |  |  | \$78.6 |
| Law Enforcement | Commissioner, Public Safety Dept | 1 |  | \$111.1 | \$156.1 |  |  | -7\% | 31\% |  | \$119.3 |
| Law Enforcement | Warden | 18 |  | \$68.3 | n/a |  |  | 2\% |  |  | \$67.0 |
| Law Enforcement | Driver's License Examiner | 108 | G | \$34.0 | \$29.0 |  |  | 13\% | -4\% |  | \$30.2 |
| Law Enforcement | Communications Officer | 11 |  | \$47.9 | n/a |  |  | 44\% |  |  | \$33.3 |


| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay <br> \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | MP \% from In- <br> State <br> Market | Avg Pay \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | In- <br> State <br> P50 | NCASG 7 <br> States P50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Officer | 17 | I | \$35.8 | \$35.3 | -46\% | -47\% |  |  | \$66.1 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Contracting \& Acquisitions Agent | 19 | 1 | \$36.5 | \$35.3 | -27\% | -29\% |  |  | \$49.7 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Administrator | 32 | L | \$44.2 | \$46.7 | -23\% | -18\% |  |  | \$57.2 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Equipment Operator | 17 | F | \$28.5 | \$26.4 | -20\% | -26\% |  |  | \$35.8 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Technician | 92 | G | \$28.0 | \$29.0 | -20\% | -18\% | -5\% | -1\% | \$35.2 | \$29.4 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Fleet Specialist | 56 | H | \$35.7 | \$31.9 | -19\% | -28\% | 3\% | -8\% | \$44.1 | \$34.7 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Specialist | 39 | E | \$25.4 | \$24.0 | -11\% | -16\% |  |  | \$28.5 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Housekeeping/Custodial Worker | 122 | C | \$20.9 | \$20.2 | -3\% | -6\% | 2\% | -1\% | \$21.5 | \$20.5 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Welder | 8 | H | \$39.9 | \$31.9 | -3\% | -22\% |  |  | \$41.1 |  |
| Nursing Services | Nursing Manager | 9 | N | \$58.2 | \$57.6 | -32\% | -32\% | -1\% | -3\% | \$85.1 | \$59.1 |
| Nursing Services | Registered Nurse | 232 | K | \$47.2 | \$42.5 | -13\% | -21\% | -5\% | -14\% | \$54.1 | \$49.5 |
| Nursing Services | Executive Director, Nursing Board | 1 |  | \$91.4 | \$104.4 | -12\% | 0\% |  |  | \$104.4 |  |
| Nursing Services | Licensed Practical Nurse | 193 | 1 | \$36.7 | \$35.3 | -1\% | -5\% | 5\% | 1\% | \$37.1 | \$35.2 |
| Nursing Services | Patient Care Assistant | 323 | E | \$25.2 | \$24.0 | 5\% | -1\% | 15\% | 10\% | \$24.1 | \$21.8 |
| Nursing Services | Health Care Management Nurse | 145 | N | \$45.3 | \$57.6 |  |  | -1\% | 25\% |  | \$46.0 |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | Oil and Gas Field Inspector | 10 | J | \$39.9 | \$38.8 |  |  | -3\% | -6\% |  | \$41.2 |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | Motor Carrier Enforcement Ofcr | 29 | K | \$43.7 | \$42.5 |  |  | 4\% | 1\% |  | \$42.2 |
| Power Generation | General Manager, Grand River Dam Authority | 1 |  | \$225.0 | \$266.0 | -15\% | 0\% |  |  | \$266.0 |  |
| Power Generation | Power Plant Maintenance Tech | 50 | M | \$57.1 | \$51.8 | -14\% | -22\% |  |  | \$66.6 |  |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineering Manager | 77 | P | \$76.2 | \$72.8 | -31\% | -34\% | -30\% | -33\% | \$110.1 | \$109.3 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Engineer | 30 | N | \$63.6 | \$57.6 | -28\% | -35\% | 8\% | -3\% | \$88.6 | \$59.2 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineer Intern | 12 | K | \$46.5 | \$42.5 | -27\% | -33\% | -6\% | -14\% | \$63.4 | \$49.5 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Division Engineer | 7 |  | \$109.8 | n/a | -8\% |  |  |  | \$118.7 |  |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Land Surveyor | 12 | N | \$61.5 | \$57.6 | 13\% | 5\% | 0\% | -6\% | \$54.6 | \$61.5 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Executive Dir, Professional Engineers/Land Surveyors | 1 |  | \$75.4 | \$107.6 |  |  | -34\% | -6\% |  | \$114.8 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Secretary to the Commissioners, Land Office | 1 |  | \$130.0 | \$119.8 |  |  | 46\% | 35\% |  | \$89.0 |


| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | $\begin{gathered} \text { State of } \\ \text { OK Avg } \\ \text { Pay } \end{gathered}$ | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | MP \% from In- <br> State Market | Avg Pay <br> \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | In- <br> State <br> P50 | NCASG 7 <br> States P50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Vocational Rehabilitation Spec | 32 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | -22\% | 0\% | -21\% | 0\% | \$42.6 | \$42.3 |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Disability Determination Specl | 85 | K | \$44.4 | \$42.5 |  |  | 18\% | 13\% |  | \$37.5 |
| Revenue and Taxation | Taxpayer Services Representative | 75 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | -16\% | 7\% |  |  | \$39.5 |  |
| Revenue and Taxation | Revenue Compliance Examiner | 25 | G | \$23.9 | \$29.0 |  |  | -40\% | -27\% |  | \$39.9 |
| Revenue and Taxation | Administrator, Tax Commission | 1 |  | \$123.1 | \$144.4 |  |  | 14\% | 34\% |  | \$108.0 |
| Social Services | Social Services Specialist | 1166 | 1 | \$30.0 | \$35.3 | -27\% | -14\% | -6\% | 11\% | \$41.3 | \$31.9 |
| Social Services | Case Manager | 226 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | -16\% | 3\% |  |  | \$37.7 |  |
| Social Services | Child Welfare Specialist | 663 | J | \$34.1 | \$38.8 | -13\% | -1\% | -14\% | -2\% | \$39.1 | \$39.7 |
| Social Services | Child Support Specialist | 186 | 1 | \$28.6 | \$35.3 | -13\% | 8\% | -15\% | 5\% | \$32.7 | \$33.7 |
| Social Services | Child Care Licensing Specl | 76 | 1 | \$29.8 | \$35.3 |  |  | -36\% | -24\% |  | \$46.3 |
| Social Services | Social Services Inspector | 59 | K | \$35.5 | \$42.5 |  |  | -7\% | 12\% |  | \$38.0 |
| Transportation and Highway Construction and Maintenance | Transportation Manager | 54 | M | \$57.7 | \$51.8 | -7\% | -16\% |  |  | \$61.9 |  |
| Transportation and Highway Construction and Maintenance | Transportation Equipment Opr | 396 | G | \$36.4 | \$29.0 | 11\% | -12\% |  |  | \$32.8 |  |
| Transportation and Highway Construction and Maintenance | Director, Transportation Dept | 1 |  | \$139.0 | \$156.1 |  |  | -2\% | 10\% |  | \$141.3 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Wildlife Biologist | 26 |  | \$39.3 | n/a | -16\% |  | -3\% |  | \$46.5 | \$40.4 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Ranger | 24 | H | \$30.9 | \$31.9 |  |  | -20\% | -17\% |  | \$38.6 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Director, Tourism \& Recreation Dept | 1 |  | \$86.3 | \$126.5 |  |  | -18\% | 20\% |  | \$105.3 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Manager | 10 | L | \$37.9 | \$46.7 |  |  | -17\% | 3\% |  | \$45.4 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Naturalist | 10 | J | \$29.8 | \$38.8 |  |  | -12\% | 15\% |  | \$33.9 |
| Unclassified-Legal | Attorney IV | 14 |  | \$69.3 | n/a | -54\% |  |  |  | \$149.3 |  |
| Unclassified-Legal | Attorney II | 10 |  | \$61.2 | n/a | -46\% |  | 6\% |  | \$114.3 | \$57.9 |
| Unclassified-Legal | Attorney I | 12 |  | \$51.7 | n/a | -34\% |  |  |  | \$77.9 |  |
| Veterans Services | Director, Veterans Affairs | 1 |  | \$125.0 | \$144.4 |  |  | 19\% | 38\% |  | \$105.0 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

## 25TH PERCENTILE (P25)

Benchmark competitiveness at P25

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { NCASG } 7 \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P25 } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural Services and Inspections | Commissioner, Agriculture Dept | 1 |  | \$87.0 | \$126.5 |  |  | -15\% | 23\% |  | \$102.5 |
| Agricultural Services and Inspections | Agriculture Field Inspector | 41 | J | \$35.5 | \$38.8 |  |  | -5\% | 4\% |  | \$37.2 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Manager | 218 | K | \$36.6 | \$42.5 | -7\% | 8\% | -2\% | 13\% | \$39.4 | \$37.4 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Probation and Parole Officer | 9 | K | \$35.0 | \$42.5 | 5\% | 27\% | -1\% | 20\% | \$33.4 | \$35.4 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Officer | 456 | H | \$28.8 | \$31.9 | 7\% | 18\% | -1\% | 9\% | \$27.0 | \$29.2 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Director, Corrections Dept | 1 |  | \$132.3 | \$156.1 |  |  | 8\% | 27\% |  | \$122.5 |
| Employment Services | Compliance Enforcement Officer | 30 | L | \$42.7 | \$46.7 | 36\% | 49\% |  |  | \$31.3 |  |
| Employment Services | Executive Director, Employment Security Commission | 1 |  | \$93.2 | \$126.5 |  |  | 1\% | 37\% |  | \$92.3 |
| Employment Services | Workforce Services Specialist | 168 | 1 | \$32.0 | \$35.3 |  |  | 4\% | 15\% |  | \$30.8 |
| Financial Management | Auditor | 65 | J | \$34.6 | \$38.8 | -41\% | -34\% | -17\% | -7\% | \$58.5 | \$41.6 |
| Financial Management | Business Manager | 21 | L | \$45.2 | \$46.7 | -30\% | -27\% |  |  | \$64.4 | n/a |
| Financial Management | Financial Manager/Comptroller | 15 | 0 | \$59.8 | \$64.5 | -27\% | -21\% | -22\% | -16\% | \$81.8 | \$76.7 |
| Financial Management | Accountant | 91 | J | \$39.5 | \$38.8 | -19\% | -20\% | -2\% | -3\% | \$48.7 | \$40.1 |
| Financial Management | Accounting Technician | 49 | G | \$27.7 | \$29.0 | -11\% | -7\% | 0\% | 5\% | \$31.1 | \$27.5 |
| Financial Management | Director, Accountancy Board | 1 |  | \$133.9 | \$141.9 | -4\% | 2\% | 12\% | 19\% | \$139.4 | \$119.1 |
| Financial Management | Certified Public Accountant | 38 |  | \$65.2 | n/a | 6\% |  |  |  | \$61.6 |  |
| Financial Management | Commissioner, Banking Dept | 1 |  | \$151.9 | \$132.1 | 10\% | -5\% | 44\% | 26\% | \$138.5 | \$105.2 |
| Financial Management | Revenue Administrator II | 13 |  | \$57.9 | n/a | 128\% |  |  |  | \$25.4 |  |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

## 25TH PERCENTILE (P25)

## Benchmark competitiveness at P25 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of OK \# of EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay $\%$ from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG 7 } \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P25 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Administrative | Public Information Officer | 11 | J | \$39.4 | \$38.8 | -38\% | -39\% |  |  | \$63.3 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Programs Officer | 227 | J | \$36.8 | \$38.8 | -34\% | -30\% |  |  | \$55.9 |  |
| General Administrative | Legal Secretary | 10 | H | \$30.8 | \$31.9 | -29\% | -26\% |  |  | \$43.2 |  |
| General Administrative | Public Information Manager | 10 | M | \$49.1 | \$51.8 | -27\% | -23\% |  |  | \$67.0 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician III | 895 | F | \$25.5 | \$26.4 | -20\% | -17\% |  |  | \$31.8 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Assistant | 511 | 1 | \$33.1 | \$35.3 | -19\% | -13\% |  |  | \$40.6 |  |
| General Administrative | Secretary | 53 | H | \$29.4 | \$31.9 | -16\% | -9\% | 11\% | 20\% | \$35.2 | \$26.5 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician II | 116 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 | -16\% | -17\% |  |  | \$28.9 |  |
| General Administrative | Customer Service Representative | 76 | E | \$23.9 | \$24.0 | -3\% | -3\% |  |  | \$24.7 |  |
| General Administrative | Librarian | 6 | L | \$41.6 | \$46.7 | -2\% | 10\% | 16\% | 30\% | \$42.3 | \$36.0 |
| General Administrative | Graphic Artist | 12 | 1 | \$34.6 | \$35.3 | -1\% | 1\% | 13\% | 15\% | \$35.1 | \$30.6 |
| General Administrative | Customer Assistance Representative | 51 | G | \$28.6 | \$29.0 | 6\% | 8\% |  |  | \$26.9 |  |
| General Administrative | Library Technician | 14 | F | \$26.5 | \$26.4 | 8\% | 7\% | 2\% | 1\% | \$24.6 | \$26.1 |
| General Administrative | Executive Director, Arts Council | 1 |  | \$63.7 | \$95.0 |  |  | -37\% | -5\% |  | \$100.5 |
| General Administrative | Director, OMES | 1 |  | \$108.0 | \$190.9 |  |  | -7\% | 64\% |  | \$116.5 |
| General Administrative | Secretary of State | 1 |  | \$90.0 | \$126.5 |  |  | -2\% | 38\% |  | \$91.4 |
| General Administrative | Director, Commerce Dept | 1 |  | \$112.5 | \$119.8 |  |  | -1\% | 6\% |  | \$113.1 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Hearing Officer | 13 | M | \$51.7 | \$51.8 |  |  | 21\% | 22\% |  | \$42.7 |
| General Administrative | Director, Libraries Dept | 1 |  | \$85.9 | \$95.0 |  |  | 21\% | 34\% |  | \$70.7 |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Safety Consultant | 16 | J | \$39.7 | \$38.8 | -48\% | -49\% |  |  | \$76.1 |  |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Fire Prevention \& Security Ofc | 39 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 |  |  | 5\% | 4\% |  | \$23.2 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

25TH PERCENTILE (P25)

## Benchmark competitiveness at P25 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of <br> OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay <br> \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | MP \% <br> from <br> NCASG <br> Market | In- <br> State <br> P25 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Specl | 38 | J | \$40.9 | \$38.8 | -29\% | -33\% | 8\% | 3\% | \$57.7 | \$37.8 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Manager | 33 | 0 | \$63.0 | \$64.5 | -21\% | -19\% |  |  | \$79.3 |  |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environ/Chemical Lab Scientist | 13 | K | \$41.1 | \$42.5 | 0\% | 3\% |  |  | \$41.1 |  |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Director, Wildlife Conservation Commission | 1 |  | \$122.0 | \$119.8 |  |  | 9\% | 7\% |  | \$111.8 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Executive Director, Environmental Quality Dept | 1 |  | \$123.0 | \$126.5 |  |  | 17\% | 20\% |  | \$105.0 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Executive Secretary, Pharmacy Board | 1 |  | \$109.1 | \$161.0 | -29\% | 5\% |  |  | \$153.7 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Pharmacist II | 9 |  | \$82.2 | n/a | -17\% |  | -12\% |  | \$98.9 | \$93.8 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Therapeutic/Medical Aide | 23 | E | \$28.5 | \$24.0 | -1\% | -16\% |  |  | \$28.7 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Pharmacy Technician | 19 | F | \$25.7 | \$26.4 | 4\% | 7\% | 8\% | 11\% | \$24.7 | \$23.8 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Speech-Language Pathologist | 25 | L | \$58.4 | \$46.7 | 5\% | -16\% | 10\% | -12\% | \$55.5 | \$53.2 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Recreation Therapist | 11 | 1 | \$33.2 | \$35.3 | 7\% | 14\% | 5\% | 12\% | \$31.1 | \$31.7 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Chief Medical Examiner, Medical Examiners Office | 1 |  | \$225.0 | \$256.2 | 8\% | 23\% |  |  | \$209.1 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Psychological Clinician | 42 | M | \$43.9 | \$51.8 | 12\% | 32\% |  |  | \$39.2 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Dental Care Assistant | 24 | G | \$29.2 | \$29.0 | 16\% | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% | \$25.3 | \$26.0 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Child Development Specialist | 11 | K | \$42.7 | \$42.5 | 33\% | 32\% |  |  | \$32.2 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Executive Secretary, Speech Pathology \& Audiology | 1 |  | \$51.4 | \$63.5 |  |  | -3\% | 19\% |  | \$53.2 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Commissioner, Mental Health Dept | 1 |  | \$133.5 | \$144.4 |  |  | 37\% | 48\% |  | \$97.4 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Commissioner of Health | 1 |  | \$194.2 | \$170.0 |  |  | 53\% | 34\% |  | \$126.9 |
| Historical Preservation | Historical Facility Manager | 5 | J | \$32.1 | \$38.8 |  |  | -22\% | -5\% |  | \$41.1 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Programs Manager | 19 | N | \$54.9 | \$57.6 | -34\% | -30\% | -16\% | -12\% | \$82.7 | \$65.7 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist IV | 66 | K | \$41.7 | \$42.5 | -24\% | -23\% | 6\% | 8\% | \$55.1 | \$39.2 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist III | 52 | J | \$37.0 | \$38.8 | -20\% | -16\% |  |  | \$46.5 |  |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Training Specialist | 23 | J | \$36.5 | \$38.8 | -12\% | -6\% | -10\% | -5\% | \$41.3 | \$40.8 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Assistant | 22 | G | \$28.1 | \$29.0 | -8\% | -5\% | -1\% | 2\% | \$30.6 | \$28.4 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

25TH PERCENTILE (P25)
Benchmark competitiveness at P25 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of OK \# of EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG 7 } \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P25 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist II | 20 | K | \$43.1 | \$42.5 | -23\% | -24\% | 3\% | 2\% | \$55.8 | \$41.7 |
| Information Technology | Info System Operating System Specialist | 15 | M | \$51.9 | \$51.8 | -19\% | -20\% | -1\% | -1\% | \$64.4 | \$52.3 |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist IV | 39 | M | \$54.6 | \$51.8 | -18\% | -22\% | -16\% | -20\% | \$66.5 | \$65.1 |
| Information Technology | Project Manager | 58 |  | \$67.0 | n/a | -17\% |  |  |  | \$81.0 |  |
| Information Technology | HelpDesk Technician | 18 |  | \$39.1 | n/a | 10\% |  |  |  | \$35.6 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Chaplain | 16 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | -20\% | -3\% | -17\% | 1\% | \$39.9 | \$38.5 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Occupational Therapist | 11 |  | \$53.5 | n/a | -7\% |  | -6\% |  | \$57.8 | \$57.2 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Linen and Clothing Specialist | 19 | D | \$21.6 | \$21.8 | 2\% | 3\% |  |  | \$21.2 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Food Service Specialist | 110 | E | \$21.3 | \$24.0 | 3\% | 15\% | 1\% | 13\% | \$20.8 | \$21.2 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Consumer Recovery Specialist | 31 |  | \$20.8 | n/a | 6\% |  |  |  | \$19.6 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Food Service Manager | 21 | I | \$37.4 | \$35.3 | 21\% | 14\% | 2\% | -3\% | \$31.0 | \$36.6 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Admin | Youth Guidance Specialist | 43 | F | \$25.8 | \$26.4 |  |  | -17\% | -16\% |  | \$31.2 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 3 | J | \$39.6 | \$38.8 | 35\% | 32\% |  |  | \$29.4 |  |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 8 | 1 | \$40.1 | \$35.3 | 37\% | 20\% |  |  | \$29.4 |  |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Executive Director, Public Employee's Retirement System | 1 |  | \$116.5 | \$119.8 |  |  | -33\% | -32\% |  | \$175.0 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Pres \& CEO, CompSource Okla | 1 |  | \$116.5 | \$119.8 |  |  | 20\% | 23\% |  | \$97.5 |
| Law Enforcement | Police Officer | 16 | F | \$23.1 | \$26.4 | -32\% | -23\% |  |  | \$34.1 |  |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Communications Specl | 16 | G | \$29.9 | \$29.0 | 14\% | 11\% |  |  | \$26.3 |  |
| Law Enforcement | Criminalist | 41 |  | \$62.3 | n /a | 88\% |  | 31\% |  | \$33.0 | \$47.5 |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Highway Patrol Officer III | 602 |  | \$55.4 | n/a |  |  | -10\% |  |  | \$61.5 |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Highway Patrol Manager | 32 |  | \$69.7 | n/a |  |  | 2\% |  |  | \$68.5 |
| Law Enforcement | Commissioner, Public Safety Dept | 1 |  | \$111.1 | \$156.1 |  |  | 2\% | 44\% |  | \$108.6 |
| Law Enforcement | Warden | 18 |  | \$68.3 | n/a |  |  | 4\% |  |  | \$65.6 |
| Law Enforcement | Driver's License Examiner | 108 | G | \$34.0 | \$29.0 |  |  | 17\% | 0\% |  | \$29.1 |
| Law Enforcement | Communications Officer | 11 |  | \$47.9 | n/a |  |  | 50\% |  |  | \$31.8 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by occupational group

## 25TH PERCENTILE (P25)

## Benchmark competitiveness at P25 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | Sof OK \# of EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | In- <br> State <br> P25 | NCASG 7 States P25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Officer | 17 | 1 | \$35.8 | \$35.3 | -26\% | -27\% |  |  | \$48.7 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Contracting \& Acquisitions Agent | 19 | I | \$36.5 | \$35.3 | -18\% | -20\% |  |  | \$44.4 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Fleet Specialist | 56 | H | \$35.7 | \$31.9 | -15\% | -24\% | 7\% | -5\% | \$42.1 | \$33.5 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Technician | 92 | G | \$28.0 | \$29.0 | -12\% | -9\% | -3\% | 1\% | \$32.0 | \$28.8 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Equipment Operator | 17 | F | \$28.5 | \$26.4 | -12\% | -19\% |  |  | \$32.4 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Administrator | 32 | L | \$44.2 | \$46.7 | -6\% | 0\% |  |  | \$46.9 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Specialist | 39 | E | \$25.4 | \$24.0 | -2\% | -8\% |  |  | \$25.9 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Housekeeping/Custodial Worker | 122 | C | \$20.9 | \$20.2 | 5\% | 2\% | 4\% | 0\% | \$19.8 | \$20.1 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Welder | 8 | H | \$39.9 | \$31.9 | 17\% | -6\% |  |  | \$34.0 |  |
| Nursing Services | Nursing Manager | 9 | N | \$58.2 | \$57.6 | -17\% | -18\% | 0\% | -1\% | \$69.9 | \$57.9 |
| Nursing Services | Registered Nurse | 232 | K | \$47.2 | \$42.5 | -4\% | -14\% | 1\% | -9\% | \$49.4 | \$46.6 |
| Nursing Services | Licensed Practical Nurse | 193 | I | \$36.7 | \$35.3 | 8\% | 4\% | 11\% | 7\% | \$34.0 | \$33.0 |
| Nursing Services | Patient Care Assistant | 323 | E | \$25.2 | \$24.0 | 16\% | 10\% | 20\% | 14\% | \$21.8 | \$21.0 |
| Nursing Services | Health Care Management Nurse | 145 | N | \$45.3 | \$57.6 |  |  | 0\% | 26\% |  | \$45.5 |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | Oil and Gas Field Inspector | 10 | J | \$39.9 | \$38.8 |  |  | 9\% | 6\% |  | \$36.6 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineering Manager | 77 | P | \$76.2 | \$72.8 | -22\% | -26\% | -18\% | -21\% | \$98.1 | \$92.7 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineer Intern | 12 | K | \$46.5 | \$42.5 | -15\% | -22\% | -5\% | -14\% | \$54.6 | \$49.2 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Engineer | 30 | N | \$63.6 | \$57.6 | -12\% | -21\% | 26\% | 14\% | \$72.5 | \$50.5 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Division Engineer | 7 |  | \$109.8 | n/a | -3\% |  |  |  | \$113.3 |  |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Land Surveyor | 12 | N | \$61.5 | \$57.6 | 69\% | 58\% | 13\% | 6\% | \$36.4 | \$54.5 |


| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | $\begin{gathered} \text { State of } \\ \text { OK Avg } \\ \text { Pay } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay $\%$ from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P25 } \end{aligned}$ | NCASG 7 <br> States <br> P25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Vocational Rehabilitation Spec | 32 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | -2\% | 24\% | -8\% | 17\% | \$34.2 | \$36.4 |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Disability Determination Specl | 85 | K | \$44.4 | \$42.5 |  |  | 23\% | 18\% |  | \$36.0 |
| Revenue and Taxation | Taxpayer Services Representative | 75 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | 8\% | 38\% |  |  | \$30.8 |  |
| Revenue and Taxation | Revenue Compliance Examiner | 25 | G | \$23.9 | \$29.0 |  |  | -33\% | -19\% |  | \$35.7 |
| Revenue and Taxation | Administrator, Tax Commission | 1 |  | \$123.1 | \$144.4 |  |  | 14\% | 34\% |  | \$107.8 |
| Social Services | Social Services Specialist | 1166 | 1 | \$30.0 | \$35.3 | -7\% | 10\% | -3\% | 14\% | \$32.1 | \$31.0 |
| Social Services | Case Manager | 226 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | 0\% | 23\% |  |  | \$31.7 |  |
| Social Services | Child Support Specialist | 186 | 1 | \$28.6 | \$35.3 | 3\% | 27\% | -9\% | 13\% | \$27.7 | \$31.3 |
| Social Services | Child Welfare Specialist | 663 | J | \$34.1 | \$38.8 | 5\% | 20\% | -12\% | 0\% | \$32.4 | \$39.0 |
| Social Services | Child Care Licensing Specl | 76 | 1 | \$29.8 | \$35.3 |  |  | -24\% | -10\% |  | \$39.3 |
| Social Services | Social Services Inspector | 59 | K | \$35.5 | \$42.5 |  |  | -1\% | 19\% |  | \$35.7 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Wildlife Biologist | 26 |  | \$39.3 | n/a | 7\% |  | 8\% |  | \$36.7 | \$36.4 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Ranger | 24 | H | \$30.9 | \$31.9 |  |  | -14\% | -11\% |  | \$35.9 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Manager | 10 | L | \$37.9 | \$46.7 |  |  | -9\% | 13\% |  | \$41.4 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Naturalist | 10 | J | \$29.8 | \$38.8 |  |  | -5\% | 23\% |  | \$31.6 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Director, Tourism \& Recreation Dept | 1 |  | \$86.3 | \$126.5 |  |  | -3\% | 42\% |  | \$89.2 |
| Unclassified-Legal | Attorney IV | 14 |  | \$69.3 | n /a | -43\% |  |  |  | \$122.5 |  |
| Unclassified-Legal | Attorney II | 10 |  | \$61.2 | n/a | -37\% |  | 18\% |  | \$97.2 | \$52.0 |
| Unclassified-Legal | Attorney I | 12 |  | \$51.7 | n/a | -24\% |  |  |  | \$67.7 |  |
| Veterans Services | Director, Veterans Affairs | 1 |  | \$125.0 | \$144.4 |  |  | 20\% | 39\% |  | \$103.9 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

```
MEDIAN (P50)
```


## Benchmark competitiveness at P50

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay <br> \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay <br> \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | In- <br> State <br> P50 | NCASG 7 States P50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineering Manager | 77 | P | \$76.2 | \$72.8 | -31\% | -34\% | -30\% | -33\% | \$110.1 | \$109.3 |
| Financial Management | Financial Manager/Comptroller | 15 | 0 | \$59.8 | \$64.5 | -43\% | -39\% | -26\% | -20\% | \$105.4 | \$80.5 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Manager | 33 | 0 | \$63.0 | \$64.5 | -26\% | -25\% |  |  | \$85.6 |  |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Programs Manager | 19 | N | \$54.9 | \$57.6 | -38\% | -35\% | -20\% | -16\% | \$88.4 | \$68.6 |
| Nursing Services | Nursing Manager | 9 | N | \$58.2 | \$57.6 | -32\% | -32\% | -1\% | -3\% | \$85.1 | \$59.1 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Engineer | 30 | N | \$63.6 | \$57.6 | -28\% | -35\% | 8\% | -3\% | \$88.6 | \$59.2 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Land Surveyor | 12 | N | \$61.5 | \$57.6 | 13\% | 5\% | 0\% | -6\% | \$54.6 | \$61.5 |
| Nursing Services | Health Care Management Nurse | 145 | N | \$45.3 | \$57.6 |  |  | -1\% | 25\% |  | \$46.0 |
| General Administrative | Public Information Manager | 10 | M | \$49.1 | \$51.8 | -35\% | -32\% |  |  | \$75.7 |  |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist IV | 39 | M | \$54.6 | \$51.8 | -31\% | -35\% | -21\% | -25\% | \$79.2 | \$68.7 |
| Information Technology | Info System Operating System Specialist | 15 | M | \$51.9 | \$51.8 | -29\% | -29\% | -9\% | -9\% | \$73.3 | \$57.1 |
| Power Generation | Power Plant Maintenance Tech | 50 | M | \$57.1 | \$51.8 | -14\% | -22\% |  |  | \$66.6 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Psychological Clinician | 42 | M | \$43.9 | \$51.8 | -10\% | 6\% |  |  | \$48.9 |  |
| Transportation and Highway Construction and Maintenance | Transportation Manager | 54 | M | \$57.7 | \$51.8 | -7\% | -16\% |  |  | \$61.9 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Hearing Officer | 13 | M | \$51.7 | \$51.8 |  |  | 9\% | 9\% |  | \$47.6 |
| Financial Management | Business Manager | 21 | L | \$45.2 | \$46.7 | -31\% | -29\% | -29\% | -27\% | \$65.4 | \$63.8 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Administrator | 32 | L | \$44.2 | \$46.7 | -23\% | -18\% |  |  | \$57.2 |  |
| General Administrative | Librarian | 6 | L | \$41.6 | \$46.7 | -14\% | -4\% | 3\% | 16\% | \$48.7 | \$40.4 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Speech-Language Pathologist | 25 | L | \$58.4 | \$46.7 | -6\% | -25\% | 2\% | -18\% | \$62.3 | \$57.3 |
| Employment Services | Compliance Enforcement Officer | 30 | L | \$42.7 | \$46.7 | 4\% | 14\% |  |  | \$41.1 |  |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Manager | 10 | L | \$37.9 | \$46.7 |  |  | -17\% | 3\% |  | \$45.4 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

MEDIAN (P50)

## Benchmark competitiveness at P50 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P50 } \end{aligned}$ | NCASG 7 States P50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Information Technology | Information System Services Coordinator | 28 | K | \$33.7 | \$42.5 | -53\% | -41\% |  |  | \$71.9 |  |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist II | 20 | K | \$43.1 | \$42.5 | -36\% | -37\% | -7\% | -8\% | \$67.0 | \$46.2 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environ/Chemical Lab Scientist | 13 | K | \$41.1 | \$42.5 | -32\% | -29\% |  |  | \$60.1 |  |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist IV | 66 | K | \$41.7 | \$42.5 | -31\% | -29\% | 2\% | 3\% | \$60.2 | \$41.0 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineer Intern | 12 | K | \$46.5 | \$42.5 | -27\% | -33\% | -6\% | -14\% | \$63.4 | \$49.5 |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Vocational Rehabilitation Spec | 32 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | -22\% | 0\% | -21\% | 0\% | \$42.6 | \$42.3 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Manager | 218 | K | \$36.6 | \$42.5 | -21\% | -8\% | -6\% | 9\% | \$46.0 | \$38.9 |
| Revenue and Taxation | Taxpayer Services Representative | 75 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | -16\% | 7\% |  |  | \$39.5 |  |
| Nursing Services | Registered Nurse | 232 | K | \$47.2 | \$42.5 | -13\% | -21\% | -5\% | -14\% | \$54.1 | \$49.5 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Probation and Parole Officer | 9 | K | \$35.0 | \$42.5 | -8\% | 11\% | -4\% | 16\% | \$38.1 | \$36.5 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Child Development Specialist | 11 | K | \$42.7 | \$42.5 | -2\% | -3\% |  |  | \$43.7 |  |
| Social Services | Social Services Inspector | 59 | K | \$35.5 | \$42.5 |  |  | -7\% | 12\% |  | \$38.0 |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | Motor Carrier Enforcement Ofcr | 29 | K | \$43.7 | \$42.5 |  |  | 4\% | 1\% |  | \$42.2 |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Disability Determination Specl | 85 | K | \$44.4 | \$42.5 |  |  | 18\% | 13\% |  | \$37.5 |
| Financial Management | Auditor | 65 | J | \$34.6 | \$38.8 | -46\% | -39\% | -27\% | -18\% | \$63.5 | \$47.4 |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Safety Consultant | 16 | J | \$39.7 | \$38.8 | -45\% | -46\% |  |  | \$72.1 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Programs Officer | 227 | J | \$36.8 | \$38.8 | -43\% | -40\% |  |  | \$65.1 |  |
| General Administrative | Public Information Officer | 11 | J | \$39.4 | \$38.8 | -42\% | -42\% |  |  | \$67.5 |  |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Specl | 38 | J | \$40.9 | \$38.8 | -38\% | -41\% | -13\% | -17\% | \$65.7 | \$46.9 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Training Specialist | 23 | J | \$36.5 | \$38.8 | -35\% | -31\% | -11\% | -6\% | \$55.9 | \$41.2 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Chaplain | 16 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | -30\% | -15\% | -28\% | -12\% | \$45.6 | \$44.0 |
| Financial Management | Accountant | 91 | J | \$39.5 | \$38.8 | -25\% | -27\% | -4\% | -5\% | \$52.9 | \$41.1 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist III | 52 | J | \$37.0 | \$38.8 | -25\% | -21\% |  |  | \$49.3 |  |
| Social Services | Case Manager | 226 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | -16\% | 3\% |  |  | \$37.7 |  |
| Social Services | Child Welfare Specialist | 663 | J | \$34.1 | \$38.8 | -13\% | -1\% | -14\% | -2\% | \$39.1 | \$39.7 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 3 | J | \$39.6 | \$38.8 | 25\% | 23\% |  |  | \$31.6 |  |
| Historical Preservation | Historical Facility Manager | 5 | J | \$32.1 | \$38.8 |  |  | -25\% | -9\% |  | \$42.9 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Naturalist | 10 | J | \$29.8 | \$38.8 |  |  | -12\% | 15\% |  | \$33.9 |
| Agricultural Services and Inspections | Agriculture Field Inspector | 41 | J | \$35.5 | \$38.8 |  |  | -10\% | -1\% |  | \$39.3 |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | Oil and Gas Field Inspector | 10 | J | \$39.9 | \$38.8 |  |  | -3\% | -6\% |  | \$41.2 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

## MEDIAN (P50)

## Benchmark competitiveness at P50 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of OK \# of EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P50 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG } 7 \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P50 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Officer | 17 | 1 | \$35.8 | \$35.3 | -46\% | -47\% |  |  | \$66.1 |  |
| Social Services | Social Services Specialist | 1166 | 1 | \$30.0 | \$35.3 | -27\% | -14\% | -6\% | 11\% | \$41.3 | \$31.9 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Contracting \& Acquisitions Agent | 19 | 1 | \$36.5 | \$35.3 | -27\% | -29\% |  |  | \$49.7 |  |
| General Administrative | Graphic Artist | 12 | 1 | \$34.6 | \$35.3 | -17\% | -15\% | 4\% | 6\% | \$41.7 | \$33.2 |
| Social Services | Child Support Specialist | 186 | 1 | \$28.6 | \$35.3 | -13\% | 8\% | -15\% | 5\% | \$32.7 | \$33.7 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Assistant | 511 | 1 | \$33.1 | \$35.3 | -12\% | -6\% |  |  | \$37.5 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Recreation Therapist | 11 | 1 | \$33.2 | \$35.3 | -12\% | -6\% | -3\% | 3\% | \$37.7 | \$34.4 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Food Service Manager | 21 | 1 | \$37.4 | \$35.3 | -6\% | -12\% | -17\% | -22\% | \$39.9 | \$45.2 |
| Nursing Services | Licensed Practical Nurse | 193 | 1 | \$36.7 | \$35.3 | -1\% | -5\% | 5\% | 1\% | \$37.1 | \$35.2 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 8 | 1 | \$40.1 | \$35.3 | 27\% | 12\% |  |  | \$31.6 |  |
| Social Services | Child Care Licensing Specl | 76 | I | \$29.8 | \$35.3 |  |  | -36\% | -24\% |  | \$46.3 |
| Employment Services | Workforce Services Specialist | 168 | I | \$32.0 | \$35.3 |  |  | 1\% | 12\% |  | \$31.5 |
| General Administrative | Legal Secretary | 10 | H | \$30.8 | \$31.9 | -36\% | -34\% |  |  | \$48.2 |  |
| General Administrative | Secretary | 53 | H | \$29.4 | \$31.9 | -25\% | -19\% | 10\% | 19\% | \$39.2 | \$26.8 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Fleet Specialist | 56 | H | \$35.7 | \$31.9 | -19\% | -28\% | 3\% | -8\% | \$44.1 | \$34.7 |
| Financial Management | Insurance/Benefits Accounts Specialist | 4 | H | \$35.4 | \$31.9 | -15\% | -23\% |  |  | \$41.6 |  |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Officer | 456 | H | \$28.8 | \$31.9 | -7\% | 3\% | -5\% | 5\% | \$31.0 | \$30.4 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Welder | 8 | H | \$39.9 | \$31.9 | -3\% | -22\% |  |  | \$41.1 |  |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Ranger | 24 | H | \$30.9 | \$31.9 |  |  | -20\% | -17\% |  | \$38.6 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Industries Mgr | 16 | H | \$32.0 | \$31.9 |  |  | -17\% | -17\% |  | \$38.4 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

MEDIAN (P50)
Benchmark competitiveness at P50 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay <br> \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | MP \% from In- <br> State <br> Market | Avg Pay <br> \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P50 } \end{aligned}$ | NCASG 7 States P50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Technician | 92 | G | \$28.0 | \$29.0 | -20\% | -18\% | -5\% | -1\% | \$35.2 | \$29.4 |
| Financial Management | Accounting Technician | 49 | G | \$27.7 | \$29.0 | -16\% | -12\% | -11\% | -7\% | \$33.0 | \$31.1 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Assistant | 22 | G | \$28.1 | \$29.0 | -16\% | -13\% | -12\% | -9\% | \$33.3 | \$32.0 |
| General Administrative | Customer Assistance Representative | 51 | G | \$28.6 | \$29.0 | -4\% | -3\% |  |  | \$29.9 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Dental Care Assistant | 24 | G | \$29.2 | \$29.0 | -2\% | -2\% | 6\% | 6\% | \$29.7 | \$27.5 |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Communications Specl | 16 | G | \$29.9 | \$29.0 | 5\% | 2\% |  |  | \$28.4 |  |
| Transportation and Highway Construction and Maintenance | Transportation Equipment Opr | 396 | G | \$36.4 | \$29.0 | 11\% | -12\% |  |  | \$32.8 |  |
| Revenue and Taxation | Revenue Compliance Examiner | 25 | G | \$23.9 | \$29.0 |  |  | -40\% | -27\% |  | \$39.9 |
| Law Enforcement | Driver's License Examiner | 108 | G | \$34.0 | \$29.0 |  |  | 13\% | -4\% |  | \$30.2 |
| Law Enforcement | Police Officer | 16 | F | \$23.1 | \$26.4 | -43\% | -35\% |  |  | \$40.6 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician III | 895 | F | \$25.5 | \$26.4 | -23\% | -21\% |  |  | \$33.3 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Equipment Operator | 17 | F | \$28.5 | \$26.4 | -20\% | -26\% |  |  | \$35.8 |  |
| General Administrative | Library Technician | 14 | F | \$26.5 | \$26.4 | -10\% | -11\% | 1\% | 0\% | \$29.6 | \$26.3 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Pharmacy Technician | 19 | F | \$25.7 | \$26.4 | -9\% | -7\% | -7\% | -5\% | \$28.4 | \$27.7 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Direct Care Specialist | 359 | F | \$24.5 | \$26.4 | -9\% | -2\% |  |  | \$26.8 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Youth Guidance Specialist | 43 | F | \$25.8 | \$26.4 |  |  | -24\% | -23\% |  | \$34.0 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician II | 116 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 | -17\% | -18\% |  |  | \$29.3 |  |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Fire Prevention \& Security Ofc | 39 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 | -12\% | -14\% | -1\% | -3\% | \$27.7 | \$24.6 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Specialist | 39 | E | \$25.4 | \$24.0 | -11\% | -16\% |  |  | \$28.5 |  |
| General Administrative | Customer Service Representative | 76 | E | \$23.9 | \$24.0 | -10\% | -10\% |  |  | \$26.7 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Therapeutic/Medical Aide | 23 | E | \$28.5 | \$24.0 | -8\% | -23\% |  |  | \$30.9 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Food Service Specialist | 110 | E | \$21.3 | \$24.0 | -1\% | 11\% | -2\% | 10\% | \$21.5 | \$21.8 |
| Nursing Services | Patient Care Assistant | 323 | E | \$25.2 | \$24.0 | 5\% | -1\% | 15\% | 10\% | \$24.1 | \$21.8 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Linen and Clothing Specialist | 19 | D | \$21.6 | \$21.8 | 4\% | 4\% |  |  | \$20.9 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Housekeeping/Custodial Worker | 122 | C | \$20.9 | \$20.2 | -3\% | -6\% | 2\% | -1\% | \$21.5 | \$20.5 |


| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay $\%$ from <br> In-State <br> Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | In- <br> State <br> P25 | NCASG 7 States P25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineering Manager | 77 | P | \$76.2 | \$72.8 | -22\% | -26\% | -18\% | -21\% | \$98.1 | \$92.7 |
| Financial Management | Financial Manager/Comptroller | 15 | 0 | \$59.8 | \$64.5 | -27\% | -21\% | -22\% | -16\% | \$81.8 | \$76.7 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Manager | 33 | 0 | \$63.0 | \$64.5 | -21\% | -19\% |  |  | \$79.3 |  |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Programs Manager | 19 | N | \$54.9 | \$57.6 | -34\% | -30\% | -16\% | -12\% | \$82.7 | \$65.7 |
| Nursing Services | Nursing Manager | 9 | N | \$58.2 | \$57.6 | -17\% | -18\% | 0\% | -1\% | \$69.9 | \$57.9 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Engineer | 30 | N | \$63.6 | \$57.6 | -12\% | -21\% | 26\% | 14\% | \$72.5 | \$50.5 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Professional Land Surveyor | 12 | N | \$61.5 | \$57.6 | 69\% | 58\% | 13\% | 6\% | \$36.4 | \$54.5 |
| Nursing Services | Health Care Management Nurse | 145 | N | \$45.3 | \$57.6 |  |  | 0\% | 26\% |  | \$45.5 |
| General Administrative | Public Information Manager | 10 | M | \$49.1 | \$51.8 | -27\% | -23\% |  |  | \$67.0 |  |
| Information Technology | Info System Operating System Specialist | 15 | M | \$51.9 | \$51.8 | -19\% | -20\% | -1\% | -1\% | \$64.4 | \$52.3 |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist IV | 39 | M | \$54.6 | \$51.8 | -18\% | -22\% | -16\% | -20\% | \$66.5 | \$65.1 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Psychological Clinician | 42 | M | \$43.9 | \$51.8 | 12\% | 32\% |  |  | \$39.2 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Hearing Officer | 13 | M | \$51.7 | \$51.8 |  |  | 21\% | 22\% |  | \$42.7 |
| Financial Management | Business Manager | 21 | L | \$45.2 | \$46.7 | -30\% | -27\% |  |  | \$64.4 | n/a |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Administrator | 32 | L | \$44.2 | \$46.7 | -6\% | 0\% |  |  | \$46.9 |  |
| General Administrative | Librarian | 6 | L | \$41.6 | \$46.7 | -2\% | 10\% | 16\% | 30\% | \$42.3 | \$36.0 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Speech-Language Pathologist | 25 | L | \$58.4 | \$46.7 | 5\% | -16\% | 10\% | -12\% | \$55.5 | \$53.2 |
| Employment Services | Compliance Enforcement Officer | 30 | L | \$42.7 | \$46.7 | 36\% | 49\% |  |  | \$31.3 |  |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Manager | 10 | L | \$37.9 | \$46.7 |  |  | -9\% | 13\% |  | \$41.4 |


| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | MP \% from In State Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG <br> Market | MP \% from <br> NCASG <br> Market | InState P25 | NCASG 7 States P25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist IV | 66 | K | \$41.7 | \$42.5 | -24\% | -23\% | 6\% | 8\% | \$55.1 | \$39.2 |
| Information Technology | Information System Application Specialist II | 20 | K | \$43.1 | \$42.5 | -23\% | -24\% | 3\% | 2\% | \$55.8 | \$41.7 |
| Professional Engineering and Land Surveyors | Engineer Intern | 12 | K | \$46.5 | \$42.5 | -15\% | -22\% | -5\% | -14\% | \$54.6 | \$49.2 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Manager | 218 | K | \$36.6 | \$42.5 | -7\% | 8\% | -2\% | 13\% | \$39.4 | \$37.4 |
| Nursing Services | Registered Nurse | 232 | K | \$47.2 | \$42.5 | -4\% | -14\% | 1\% | -9\% | \$49.4 | \$46.6 |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Vocational Rehabilitation Spec | 32 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | -2\% | 24\% | -8\% | 17\% | \$34.2 | \$36.4 |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environ/Chemical Lab Scientist | 13 | K | \$41.1 | \$42.5 | 0\% | 3\% |  |  | \$41.1 |  |
| Corrections \& Custody | Probation and Parole Officer | 9 | K | \$35.0 | \$42.5 | 5\% | 27\% | -1\% | 20\% | \$33.4 | \$35.4 |
| Revenue and Taxation | Taxpayer Services Representative | 75 | K | \$33.4 | \$42.5 | 8\% | 38\% |  |  | \$30.8 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Child Development Specialist | 11 | K | \$42.7 | \$42.5 | 33\% | 32\% |  |  | \$32.2 |  |
| Social Services | Social Services Inspector | 59 | K | \$35.5 | \$42.5 |  |  | -1\% | 19\% |  | \$35.7 |
| Rehabilitation and Vocational Services | Disability Determination Specl | 85 | K | \$44.4 | \$42.5 |  |  | 23\% | 18\% |  | \$36.0 |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Safety Consultant | 16 | J | \$39.7 | \$38.8 | -48\% | -49\% |  |  | \$76.1 |  |
| Financial Management | Auditor | 65 | J | \$34.6 | \$38.8 | -41\% | -34\% | -17\% | -7\% | \$58.5 | \$41.6 |
| General Administrative | Public Information Officer | 11 | J | \$39.4 | \$38.8 | -38\% | -39\% |  |  | \$63.3 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Programs Officer | 227 | J | \$36.8 | \$38.8 | -34\% | -30\% |  |  | \$55.9 |  |
| General Sciences and Environmental Services | Environmental Programs Specl | 38 | J | \$40.9 | \$38.8 | -29\% | -33\% | 8\% | 3\% | \$57.7 | \$37.8 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Management Specialist III | 52 | J | \$37.0 | \$38.8 | -20\% | -16\% |  |  | \$46.5 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Chaplain | 16 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | -20\% | -3\% | -17\% | 1\% | \$39.9 | \$38.5 |
| Financial Management | Accountant | 91 | J | \$39.5 | \$38.8 | -19\% | -20\% | -2\% | -3\% | \$48.7 | \$40.1 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Training Specialist | 23 | J | \$36.5 | \$38.8 | -12\% | -6\% | -10\% | -5\% | \$41.3 | \$40.8 |
| Social Services | Case Manager | 226 | J | \$31.8 | \$38.8 | 0\% | 23\% |  |  | \$31.7 |  |
| Social Services | Child Welfare Specialist | 663 | J | \$34.1 | \$38.8 | 5\% | 20\% | -12\% | 0\% | \$32.4 | \$39.0 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 3 | J | \$39.6 | \$38.8 | 35\% | 32\% |  |  | \$29.4 |  |
| Historical Preservation | Historical Facility Manager | 5 | J | \$32.1 | \$38.8 |  |  | -22\% | -5\% |  | \$41.1 |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Naturalist | 10 | J | \$29.8 | \$38.8 |  |  | -5\% | 23\% |  | \$31.6 |
| Agricultural Services and Inspections | Agriculture Field Inspector | 41 | J | \$35.5 | \$38.8 |  |  | -5\% | 4\% |  | \$37.2 |
| Oil, Gas, Transportation and Utility Regulation | Oil and Gas Field Inspector | 10 | J | \$39.9 | \$38.8 |  |  | 9\% | 6\% |  | \$36.6 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

## 25TH PERCENTILE (P25)

## Benchmark competitiveness at P25 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of OK \# of EEs | Grade | State of OK Avg Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay \% from <br> In-State <br> Market | $\begin{gathered} \text { MP \% } \\ \text { from In- } \\ \text { State } \\ \text { Market } \end{gathered}$ | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { P25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG 7 } \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P25 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Officer | 17 | I | \$35.8 | \$35.3 | -26\% | -27\% |  |  | \$48.7 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Assistant | 511 | I | \$33.1 | \$35.3 | -19\% | -13\% |  |  | \$40.6 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Contracting \& Acquisitions Agent | 19 | 1 | \$36.5 | \$35.3 | -18\% | -20\% |  |  | \$44.4 |  |
| Social Services | Social Services Specialist | 1166 | 1 | \$30.0 | \$35.3 | -7\% | 10\% | -3\% | 14\% | \$32.1 | \$31.0 |
| General Administrative | Graphic Artist | 12 | I | \$34.6 | \$35.3 | -1\% | 1\% | 13\% | 15\% | \$35.1 | \$30.6 |
| Social Services | Child Support Specialist | 186 | I | \$28.6 | \$35.3 | 3\% | 27\% | -9\% | 13\% | \$27.7 | \$31.3 |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Recreation Therapist | 11 | I | \$33.2 | \$35.3 | 7\% | 14\% | 5\% | 12\% | \$31.1 | \$31.7 |
| Nursing Services | Licensed Practical Nurse | 193 | I | \$36.7 | \$35.3 | 8\% | 4\% | 11\% | 7\% | \$34.0 | \$33.0 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Food Service Manager | 21 | 1 | \$37.4 | \$35.3 | 21\% | 14\% | 2\% | -3\% | \$31.0 | \$36.6 |
| Insurance and Benefits Administration | Member Services Representative | 8 | I | \$40.1 | \$35.3 | 37\% | 20\% |  |  | \$29.4 |  |
| Social Services | Child Care Licensing Specl | 76 | I | \$29.8 | \$35.3 |  |  | -24\% | -10\% |  | \$39.3 |
| Employment Services | Workforce Services Specialist | 168 | 1 | \$32.0 | \$35.3 |  |  | 4\% | 15\% |  | \$30.8 |
| General Administrative | Legal Secretary | 10 | H | \$30.8 | \$31.9 | -29\% | -26\% |  |  | \$43.2 |  |
| General Administrative | Secretary | 53 | H | \$29.4 | \$31.9 | -16\% | -9\% | 11\% | 20\% | \$35.2 | \$26.5 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Fleet Specialist | 56 | H | \$35.7 | \$31.9 | -15\% | -24\% | 7\% | -5\% | \$42.1 | \$33.5 |
| Corrections \& Custody | Correctional Security Officer | 456 | H | \$28.8 | \$31.9 | 7\% | 18\% | -1\% | 9\% | \$27.0 | \$29.2 |
| Logistics and Property Management | Welder | 8 | H | \$39.9 | \$31.9 | 17\% | -6\% |  |  | \$34.0 |  |
| Travel, Tourism and Recreation | Park Ranger | 24 | H | \$30.9 | \$31.9 |  |  | -14\% | -11\% |  | \$35.9 |

## Market competitiveness Base salary by Grade level

25TH PERCENTILE (P25)
Benchmark competitiveness at P25 cont'd

| State of OK Occupational Group | Benchmark Position | S of <br> OK <br> \# of <br> EEs | Grade | State of <br> OK Avg <br> Pay | State of OK Current MP | Avg Pay $\%$ from In-State Market | MP \% from InState Market | Avg Pay \% from NCASG Market | MP \% from NCASG Market | $\begin{gathered} \text { In- } \\ \text { State } \\ \text { P25 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NCASG 7 } \\ \text { States } \\ \text { P25 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Logistics and Property Management | Construction/Maintenance Technician | 92 | G | \$28.0 | \$29.0 | -12\% | -9\% | -3\% | 1\% | \$32.0 | \$28.8 |
| Financial Management | Accounting Technician | 49 | G | \$27.7 | \$29.0 | -11\% | -7\% | 0\% | 5\% | \$31.1 | \$27.5 |
| Human Resources Management and Development | Human Resources Assistant | 22 | G | \$28.1 | \$29.0 | -8\% | -5\% | -1\% | 2\% | \$30.6 | \$28.4 |
| General Administrative | Customer Assistance Representative | 51 | G | \$28.6 | \$29.0 | 6\% | 8\% |  |  | \$26.9 |  |
| Law Enforcement | Law Enf Communications Specl | 16 | G | \$29.9 | \$29.0 | 14\% | 11\% |  |  | \$26.3 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Dental Care Assistant | 24 | G | \$29.2 | \$29.0 | 16\% | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% | \$25.3 | \$26.0 |
| Revenue and Taxation | Revenue Compliance Examiner | 25 | G | \$23.9 | \$29.0 |  |  | -33\% | -19\% |  | \$35.7 |
| Law Enforcement | Driver's License Examiner | 108 | G | \$34.0 | \$29.0 |  |  | 17\% | 0\% |  | \$29.1 |
| Law Enforcement | Police Officer | 16 | F | \$23.1 | \$26.4 | -32\% | -23\% |  |  | \$34.1 |  |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician III | 895 | F | \$25.5 | \$26.4 | -20\% | -17\% |  |  | \$31.8 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Equipment Operator | 17 | F | \$28.5 | \$26.4 | -12\% | -19\% |  |  | \$32.4 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Pharmacy Technician | 19 | F | \$25.7 | \$26.4 | 4\% | 7\% | 8\% | 11\% | \$24.7 | \$23.8 |
| General Administrative | Library Technician | 14 | F | \$26.5 | \$26.4 | 8\% | 7\% | 2\% | 1\% | \$24.6 | \$26.1 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Youth Guidance Specialist | 43 | F | \$25.8 | \$26.4 |  |  | -17\% | -16\% |  | \$31.2 |
| General Administrative | Administrative Technician II | 116 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 | -16\% | -17\% |  |  | \$28.9 |  |
| General Administrative | Customer Service Representative | 76 | E | \$23.9 | \$24.0 | -3\% | -3\% |  |  | \$24.7 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Materiel Management Specialist | 39 | E | \$25.4 | \$24.0 | -2\% | -8\% |  |  | \$25.9 |  |
| Health Care Services and Administration | Therapeutic/Medical Aide | 23 | E | \$28.5 | \$24.0 | -1\% | -16\% |  |  | \$28.7 |  |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Food Service Specialist | 110 | E | \$21.3 | \$24.0 | 3\% | 15\% | 1\% | 13\% | \$20.8 | \$21.2 |
| Nursing Services | Patient Care Assistant | 323 | E | \$25.2 | \$24.0 | 16\% | 10\% | 20\% | 14\% | \$21.8 | \$21.0 |
| General Safety, Security Inspections and Investigations | Fire Prevention \& Security Ofc | 39 | E | \$24.3 | \$24.0 |  |  | 5\% | 4\% |  | \$23.2 |
| Institutional and Nutritional Services and Administration | Linen and Clothing Specialist | 19 | D | \$21.6 | \$21.8 | 2\% | 3\% |  |  | \$21.2 |  |
| Logistics and Property Management | Housekeeping/Custodial Worker | 122 | C | \$20.9 | \$20.2 | 5\% | 2\% | 4\% | 0\% | \$19.8 | \$20.1 |

## Salary administration questionnaire results

## Additional data were collected from custom survey participants to analyze salary administration practices and market trends. The following is a summary of results as submitted by custom survey participants. <br> Detailed results are provided in the appendix

- $86 \%$ of the respondents use an overall structure/policy for salary administration
- $50 \%$ of those use market data only to determine the salary levels
- Another popular method is a point factor system in combination with market data, which accounts for $36 \%$ of the survey group
- The width of salary ranges is $35 \%$ to $50 \%$ for the majority of respondents, with only $14 \%$ of the respondents using ranges wider than $50 \%$
- $50 \%$ of the participants reported adjusting their salary structures every year
- The median structure increase for participating organizations was $2.9 \%$ in 2012 and 2.5\% in 2013
- The median planned salary structure increase for 2014 is $3.0 \%$, reflecting market movement similar to a national picture
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Market competitiveness Benefits

## Market competitiveness Total benefits

- In order for compensation decisions to be taken based on the competitiveness of total compensation, Hay Group conducted additional analysis of the competitiveness of the benefits program offered by the State of Oklahoma
- This analysis is based on the benefits program information provided by Oklahoma for its current 2013 benefits program
- Hay Group used two comparator markets for the benefits analysis
- Hay Group Market - Oklahoma organizations contained in our 2013 benefits database and gathered through the custom survey conducted in August of 2013
- NCASG States Market - Select States from the NCASG survey, including Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Tennessee
- The following pages summarize the State's competitive position relative to both markets. Please refer to the appendix for a listing of the market comparator groups and a description of the benefits valuation methodology
- It is important to note that this analysis compares the value of benefits for someone hired today by the State to a new hire in the market. This ensures an apples to apples comparison, that does not consider the impact of grandfathered or frozen benefits




## Market competitiveness Total benefits
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## Market competitiveness Total benefits


HayGroup ${ }^{\circ}$

NCASG Market



# Market competitiveness Total benefits 

## STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET

## Key Findings

| Total <br> Benefits | $>\mathrm{P} 75$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Retirement | P 75 |
| Health Care | $>\mathrm{P} 75$ |
| Disability <br> (Includes <br> Sick Leave) | P 75 |
| Death | P 25 |
| Other | $<\mathrm{P} 25$ |
| Paid Leave | Above Market |

Market position of health care and retirement weigh heavily in overall benefit program competitiveness

Low relative employee contributions to the retirement system combined with a higher pension benefit multiplier ( $2 \%$ vs. $1.7 \%$ in the market) puts the State above prevalent market practice among comparator States, where nearly $90 \%$ of the market continues to provide some type of DB plan
Market position relative to other States is driven by the current high level of subsidy employees receive toward health care premiums for both single and family coverage. The current Benefit Allowance provides nearly $100 \%$ subsidy of the core benefits
The State provides sick leave, short term disability, long term disability, and disability retirement benefits, which together generates an above market program relative to other States. Sick leave is prevalent in the States; however, employer paid STD and LTD are not

The State's flat dollar benefit of $\$ 20,000$ is P25. Flat dollar benefits are prevalent; however, higher limits and salary based benefits are increasing in prevalence, with a median benefit which provides up to $\$ 50,000$ in coverage

Limited offerings by Oklahoma is below the market median
The vacation schedule (annual leave) is slightly above typical State practice, with maximum annual accruals of 21 to 24 days compared with Oklahoma's 25 days

## Market competitiveness Retirement


Hay Group Market


## Market competitiveness Retirement


NCASG Market


## Market competitiveness Basic Plan Benefits

- Oklahoma provides a monthly benefit allowance to employees depending on their coverage tier:
$\square$
$\square$
- Employees use the monthly benefit allowance to purchase "basic plan" benefits, which includes medical, dental, disability and death benefits. For purposes of this analysis, vision was also included in the core benefits, although it is an optional benefit
- For purposes of market analysis, the employee and family tiers are valued
- Hay Group valued the most prevalent plan options - HealthChoice High medical, HealthChoice Dental, VSP vision, Basic Life only, and Disability



## Market competitiveness Health Care

HEALTH CARE BENEFITS VALLE*
Hay Group Market


## Market competitiveness Health Care



## HayGroup ${ }^{\circ}$
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## Market competitiveness Health Care

- The State's most prevalent plans are the HealthChoice High medical plan, the HealthChoice Dental plan and the Vision Service Plan vision plan
- Oklahoma offers multiple medical, dental and vision plans to its employees, but for purposes of this market analysis only the most prevalent plans were valued
- As stated previously, the State's monthly benefit allowance provides for $100 \%$ employer paid employee only and family coverage for medical, dental and vision coverage. This factors greatly into the State's overall health care plan value. The table below outlines the median employer contribution for medical, dental and vision coverage in each of the comparator markets:



## Market competitiveness Health Care

- When compared to the median of both markets, Oklahoma's plan design varies based on plan provision; however, in total is slightly below the median of both markets:

| In network deductible - Single | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 475$ | $\$ 500$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In network deductible - Family | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 1,500$ |
| OOP Maximum - Single | $\$ 2,400$ | $\$ 1,525$ | $\$ 2,800$ |
| OOP Maximum - Family | $\$ 4,500$ | $\$ 3,500$ | $\$ 8,400$ |
| Coinsurance Percentage | $85 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $80 \%$ |

- Oklahoma's dental plan design is above typical market practice when compared to both markets. The State maintains a $\$ 25$ deductible, $100 \%$ coverage for preventive care, $85 \%$ coverage of basic services and $60 \%$ coverage of major services. The annual nonorthodontia maximum is $\$ 2,500$ and the lifetime orthodontia maximum is $\$ 2,500$
- The market median deductible is $\$ 50$
- Coinsurance schedule is $100 \%$ for preventive, $80 \%$ for basic and $50 \%$ for major services
- Annual and lifetime orthodontia maximums are \$1,500 each



## Market competitiveness Disability


Hay Group Market


## Market competitiveness Disability


NCASG Market


# Market competitiveness Disability 

- The State's disability program is comprised of a salary continuation plan or sick leave, employer paid short term and long disability, and a disability retirement provision through OPERS
- Salary continuation provides benefits at full pay based on accumulation of days (15 days per year) with no maximum accumulation. Sick leave is utilized more compared to the other disability benefits, so it carries more weight in the overall program value
- The OK market is split between those that provide salary continuance plan only and those that provide both a salary continuance plan and an employer paid STD plan
- The States market typically provides salary continuance plan only, with STD coverage typically provided on an employee paid basis
- Oklahoma places no limit on the number of sick days an employee can accumulate, which is in line with the prevalent States market practice
- Oklahoma's short term disability (STD) benefit has a 30 day waiting period and pays a $60 \%$ benefit up to a $\$ 2,500$ monthly maximum for 150 days. The waiting period is longer than prevalent OK market practice, but better aligned with States, as sick leave is more prevalent in the States market



## Market competitiveness Death



EMPLOYER PAID DEATH BENEFITS VALUES



## Market competitiveness Other benefits

- The State provides health care and dependent care spending accounts to its employees. Limited tuition reimbursement creates minimal value for the State in this category
- Due to the low level of employer paid benefits in this category, the State is below the 25th percentile of the market in comparison to the OK market, where offerings include telecommuting and transportation assistance and higher education reimbursement levels
- Because other States do not typically provide benefits in this category, Oklahoma compares slightly more favorably to the States market, coming in at the 25th percentile of the States market


## Market competitiveness Holiday \& Vacation

- Oklahoma's service based annual leave compares favorably to both markets. The table below outlines the annual accrual provided to employees at various years of service:

| Years of Service | OK Market | NCASG Market | State of Oklahoma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 to 1 years | 13 | 13 | 15 |
| 2 to 5 years | 16 | 15 | 15 |
| 6 to 10 years | 20 | 19 | 18 |
| 11 to 20 years | 21 | 22 | 20 |
| More than 20 years | 26 | 23 | 25 |

- The median number of fixed holidays is 9 in the OK market and 11 in the State market. Oklahoma provides 11 fixed holidays
- Oklahoma employees accrue more annual leave at shorter service levels when compared to both market and have a higher maximum accrual than the States market
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## Total compensation

}

## Below is the summary comparison of the State's aggregate total remuneration market competitiveness

| Base Salary | $-21.7 \%$ | $-6.4 \%$ | $-9.5 \%$ | $+2.7 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benefits | $+18.0 \%$ | $+24.3 \%$ | $+34.4 \%$ | $+40.7 \%$ |

Total $-7.4 \% \quad 0.0 \% \quad+5.5 \% \quad+11.8 \%$

The majority of the State's occupational groups fall well below the Median of the market compared to the Hay Group survey but closer to NCASG peer group market

When the impact of salary is considered on benefits, the competitiveness of the State's benefits program decreases slightly; however, Retirement and Health Care programs influence the overall market position, driven by high level of subsidy provided by the State for these benefits

The competitive benefits program enhances the total remuneration market position

- The influence of the better benefits position does help to offset the low salary position in some cases; however, base salary generally carries more weight than benefits in determining the total remuneration position


## Market competitiveness Total compensation

Below is the summary comparison of the State's total remuneration market competitiveness by salary increment compared to the Hay Group Market. These figures are used in the total compensation charts on the following slides:

| Salary Data |  |  |  |  | Total Benefits |  |  |  |  | Total Remuneration |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OK | Hay Group Market |  | OK Vs. Market |  | OK | Hay Group Market |  | OK Vs. Market |  | OK | Hay Group Market |  | OK Vs. Market |  |
| Salary Level | P25 | P50 | P25 | P50 |  | P25 | P50 | P25 | P50 |  | P25 | P50 | P25 | P50 |
| \$20,000 | \$20,343 | \$21,627 | -2\% | -8\% | \$23,771 | \$17,321 | \$20,450 | 37\% | 16\% | \$43,771 | \$37,664 | \$42,077 | 16\% | 4\% |
| \$25,000 | \$27,056 | \$29,506 | -8\% | -15\% | \$25,317 | \$18,843 | \$22,061 | 34\% | 15\% | \$50,317 | \$45,899 | \$51,567 | 10\% | -2\% |
| \$30,000 | \$31,328 | \$35,471 | -4\% | -15\% | \$26,862 | \$19,923 | \$23,110 | 35\% | 16\% | \$56,862 | \$51,252 | \$58,580 | 11\% | -3\% |
| \$35,000 | \$39,961 | \$46,963 | -12\% | -25\% | \$28,408 | \$22,262 | \$25,271 | 28\% | 12\% | \$63,408 | \$62,223 | \$72,234 | 2\% | -12\% |
| \$40,000 | \$44,579 | \$51,672 | -10\% | -23\% | \$29,954 | \$23,206 | \$26,132 | 29\% | 15\% | \$69,954 | \$67,785 | \$77,803 | 3\% | -10\% |
| \$50,000 | \$60,045 | \$68,563 | -17\% | -27\% | \$33,045 | \$26,445 | \$29,096 | 25\% | 14\% | \$83,045 | \$86,490 | \$97,659 | -4\% | -15\% |
| \$60,000 | \$61,231 | \$74,473 | -2\% | -19\% | \$36,136 | \$27,437 | \$30,207 | 32\% | 20\% | \$96,136 | \$88,667 | \$104,680 | 8\% | -8\% |
| \$70,000 | \$80,196 | \$90,501 | -13\% | -23\% | \$39,227 | \$29,808 | \$33,713 | 32\% | 16\% | \$109,227 | \$110,003 | \$124,214 | -1\% | -12\% |
| \$120,000 | \$135,451 | \$145,659 | -11\% | -18\% | \$53,783 | \$37,825 | \$44,384 | 42\% | 21\% | \$173,783 | \$173,276 | \$190,043 | 0\% | -9\% |

## Market competitiveness Total compensation

Below is the summary comparison of the State's total remuneration market competitiveness by salary increment compared to the NCASG Market. These figures are used in the total compensation charts on the following slides:

| Salary Data |  |  |  |  | Total Benefits |  |  |  |  | Total Remuneration |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OK Salary | States Market |  | OK Vs. Market |  | OK | States Market |  | OK Vs. Market |  | OK | States Market |  | OK Vs. Market |  |
| Level | P25 | P50 | P25 | P50 |  | P25 | P50 | P25 | P50 |  | P25 | P50 | P25 | P50 |
| \$20,000 | \$20,647 | \$21,112 | -3\% | -5\% | \$23,771 | \$16,625 | \$17,793 | 43\% | 34\% | \$43,771 | \$37,272 | \$38,905 | 17\% | 13\% |
| \$25,000 | \$26,828 | \$29,069 | -7\% | -14\% | \$25,317 | \$18,343 | \$19,535 | 38\% | 30\% | \$50,317 | \$45,171 | \$48,604 | 11\% | 4\% |
| \$30,000 | \$31,840 | \$34,559 | -6\% | -13\% | \$26,862 | \$19,397 | \$20,907 | 38\% | 28\% | \$56,862 | \$51,237 | \$55,466 | 11\% | 3\% |
| \$35,000 | \$35,570 | \$38,287 | -2\% | -9\% | \$28,408 | \$20,093 | \$21,862 | 41\% | 30\% | \$63,408 | \$55,663 | \$60,149 | 14\% | 5\% |
| \$40,000 | \$38,648 | \$42,841 | 3\% | -7\% | \$29,954 | \$20,944 | \$23,028 | 43\% | 30\% | \$69,954 | \$59,592 | \$65,869 | 17\% | 6\% |
| \$50,000 | \$51,338 | \$55,284 | -3\% | -10\% | \$33,045 | \$23,270 | \$26,215 | 42\% | 26\% | \$83,045 | \$74,607 | \$81,499 | 11\% | 2\% |
| \$60,000 | \$61,585 | \$66,562 | -3\% | -10\% | \$36,136 | \$25,439 | \$29,103 | 42\% | 24\% | \$96,136 | \$87,023 | \$95,665 | 10\% | 0\% |
| \$70,000 | \$75,605 | \$92,403 | -7\% | -24\% | \$39,227 | \$30,561 | \$35,720 | 28\% | 10\% | \$109,227 | \$106,166 | \$128,123 | 3\% | -15\% |
| \$90,000 | \$89,217 | \$103,436 | 1\% | -13\% | \$45,410 | \$32,596 | \$38,391 | 39\% | 18\% | \$135,410 | \$121,814 | \$141,827 | 11\% | -5\% |
| \$120,000 | \$114,855 | \$123,388 | 4\% | -3\% | \$53,783 | \$35,658 | \$42,602 | 51\% | 26\% | \$173,783 | \$150,513 | \$165,990 | 15\% | 5\% |




## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. HAY GROUP MARKET (Oklahoma) - \$30,000 SALARY


## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. HAY GROUP MARKET (Oklahoma) - \$35,000 SALARY






# Market competitiveness Total compensation 

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. HAY GROUP MARKET (Oklahoma) - \$70,000 SALARY

Total Compensation Comparison - \$70,000



## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF Oklahoma VS. NCASG MARKET - \$25,000 SALARY


## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$30,000 SALARY


## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$35,000 SALARY


## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$40,000 SALARY


## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$50,000 SALARY



## Market competitiveness Total compensation

## STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$60,000 SALARY




Median Pay Mix


## Market competitiveness <br> Total compensation

## STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$70,000 SALARY




## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$90,000 SALARY



## Market competitiveness Total compensation

STATE OF OKLAHOMA VS. NCASG MARKET - \$120,000 SALARY



Appendices

Salary administration questionnaire Survey results

## Salary administration questionnaire results

## Salary administration

Number of employees

| 32,940 | 4,769 | 3,324 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 305 | 837 | 228 |

## Fiscal year start date

| January 1st | July 1st | Other* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $43 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $7 \%$ |

*Other includes: October 1st

## Salary administration questionnaire results

## $86 \%$ of respondents use an overall structure/policy to administer salaries

How is the level of compensation determined?

| State of <br> Oklahoma | Point Factor <br> System Only | Market Data Only | Combination of <br> Point Factor and <br> Market Data | Other* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Combination of point <br> factor and market data | $7 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $7 \%$ |

*Other includes: Cost-of-living and revenue earning

## Salary administration questionnaire results

## How often do you adjust your salary structure?

$-\quad 50 \%$
*Other factors include: As needed; depends on legislature approval; when salary
increases are given, then salary structure is adjusted

If you use a structure/policy to administer salaries, what is the range width of your current structure?

*Within the Other group, the Average range width is $40 \%$ and the Median range width is $45 \%$
The range width of State of Oklahoma's current structure is $67 \%$

## Salary administration questionnaire results

Percent of salary structure increase in 2011:

| State of <br> Oklahoma | Average <br> Including <br> Zeros | Median <br> Including <br> Zeros | Average <br> Excluding <br> Zeros* | Median <br> Excluding <br> Zeros* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |

*Average and Median Excluding Zeros: Excludes participations reporting structure freeze in 2011

40\% reported 0\% structure movement in 2011

Percent of salary structure increase in 2012:


[^0]

## Salary administration questionnaire results

## Respondents providing general increases, cost-of-living increases, and performance-based increases:

General Increases


Cost-of-Living Increases


Performance-Based Increases



## Salary administration questionnaire results

Percent of general, cost-of-living, and merit Increases in 2013


Percent of actual or planned general, cost-of-living, and merit increases in 2014


- $86 \%$ of respondents give general, cost-of-living and/or performance-based increases annually
- 14\% provided "Other" responses, including: provide increases when promotions occur; generally, do not provide increases


## Salary administration questionnaire results

## Lump sum payments

- $43 \%$ of companies use lump sum payments in lieu of salary increases


## Longevity pay prevalence

- $13 \%$ of participants reported that they provide longevity pay

Total longevity payment in 2012


## List of custom survey participants

- Bar-S Foods
- Cameron International
- Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma
- City of Oklahoma City
- Devon Energy
- Dolese Bros. Co.
- Integris Health
- Oklahoma County
- Oklahoma Publishing
- Oklahoma State University
- St. John Health System
- Southwest Oklahoma State University
- Tinker Federal Credit Union
- Tulsa County
- Tulsa Public Schools
- University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
- University of Oklahoma



## Hay Group Organizations - Oklahoma Participants (Compensation Survey) cont'd

- Gordmans Stores
- Halcon Resources
- Hallmark Cards
- HCA Healthcare -- Edmond Regional Medical Center
- HCA Healthcare -- OU Medical Center
- HCSC -- Blue Cross Blue Shield of OK
- Health Net
- Heineken USA
- Helzberg Diamonds
- Hershey Foods
- HighMount Exploration \& Production
- Hilti - US
- Holcim Group Support
- Home Depot
- Honeywell -- Specialty Materials
- Hot Topic
- Humana Care Plan
- J.Crew
- Japan Tobacco -- JT International USA
- Jcpenney
- Kimberly-Clark
- Knowledge Universe
- Kohl's
- Lego Systems
- Lehigh Hanson -- Building Products
- Lehigh Hanson -- South Region
- Limited Stores
- Lowe's
- Macy's
- MetLife
- Michaels Stores -- Michaels Stores
- Michelin North America
- Molnlycke Health Care
- Moog
- Nestle USA
- Novo Nordisk
- Office Depot


## Hay Group Organizations - Oklahoma Participants (Compensation Survey) cont'd

- OfficeMax
- Owens-Illinois
- Payless ShoeSource
- PETCO
- PetSmart
- Pier 1 Imports
- Ply Gem Siding Group
- Praxair
- PVH Corp - Bass
- PVH Corp - Izod
- PVH Corp -- Tommy Hilfiger
- PVH Corp -- Van Heusen
- Ralph Lauren
- Ralph Lauren - Outlets
- Ralph Lauren - Polo Ralph Lauren
- Ross Stores
- Saint-Gobain - Ceramics
- Saks Saks -- Saks Fifth Avenue
- Sears Holdings -- Kmart
- Sears Holdings -- Sears, Roebuck
- Smith \& Wesson
- Sodexo - Sodexo
- Solvay - Rhodia
- Sonoco Products
- SSM -- St. Anthony Hospital
- SSM Healthcare
- Stage Stores - Stage
- Stage Stores - Steeles
- Staples
- SuperValu -- Farm Fresh
- Talbots
- Target
- TJX
- TJX Companies, The -- Marshalls
- Toys R Us
- Tronox
- Tyson Foods
- UHS -- Cedar Ridge



## NCASG States (Compensation \& Benefits Survey)

- State of Arkansas
- State of Colorado
- State of Kansas
- State of Louisiana
- State of Missouri
- State of Nebraska (benefits only)
- State of New Mexico
- State of Tennessee (benefits only)
- State of Texas (compensation only)

Hay Benefit Valuation Comparison (BVC) methodology

## Hay Benefit Valuation Comparison methodology

- Hay Group utilizes a proprietary actuarial valuation methodology to evaluate benefit plans in terms of the cash equivalence of the benefits
- In establishing a program's overall market competitiveness the Hay Benefit Valuation model uses "standard cost assumptions", instead of a company's specific costs, which eliminates the impact of such cost variables as demographics, geography, funding method, or purchasing power, etc.
- The utilization of "standard or common cost assumptions" provides a uniform quantitative evaluation method which produces values based solely on the level of the benefit provided
- The valuation model places a relative value on each specific feature of a benefit program. The value for each plan is then compiled to produce an overall program value appropriate for market comparison. In general, the more generous a particular feature is the higher the relative value



# Hay Benefit Valuation Comparison methodology - internal equity 

- Internal equity is the inter-relationship between reward opportunities within an organization. Many benefit plans (death benefits, disability, retirement, etc.) have features or benefit levels that are related to salary. Internal equity is achieved in a benefit program when the relationships between the benefit level and the employee salary are consistent within each employee population (Note: While benefit program differences can often be found between employee classes, most organizations provide consistent policies within a class)
- Organizations that wish to achieve internal equity within a benefit plan typically establish benefit levels that are based on uniform salary multiples (i.e., death benefits of one times salary or disability income replacement level of $60 \%$ of salary)
- In order to observe the internal equity of an employee benefits program, benefit values are typically illustrated at several salary levels. For this review of benefits, values are shown for salaries from $\$ 20,000$ to $\$ 100,000$


[^0]:    *20\% reported 0\% structure movement in 2012

