August 8, 2019

TO: Appointing Authorities, Personnel Officers and Unions Representing State Employees

FROM: Casey Osterkamp, Director

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2021 Pay Plan Recommendations

Attached, please find a copy of the Personnel Advisory Board’s Pay Plan Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2021 as provided to Governor Parson on August 7, 2019.

The Personnel Advisory Board is pleased to provide the pay plan recommendations for Fiscal Year 2021. The proposal includes fundamental elements of compensation which we hope will provide equitable and competitive compensation for State employees.

The Personnel Advisory Board’s focus is on promoting a comprehensive compensation strategy that supports the recruitment and retention of a quality State workforce. This translates into a plan that is competitive with the labor market, provides modern career paths, and recognizes the contributions of State employees who perform above and beyond.

If necessary, the Board and/or Division of Personnel staff are available to provide additional information regarding these pay plan recommendations.

Attachment
In 2019, CBIZ Human Capital Services (“CBIZ”) was engaged by the State of Missouri (“State”) to update a comprehensive compensation study, including a review of current compensation practices, an update of the compensation plan, and a benefits analysis. In order to assist the State in implementing a compensation system that considers both market and internal factors, CBIZ matched the State’s positions to positions in the market, developed a proposed salary structure, and calculated the cost of implementing the recommendations. In addition to evaluating base salaries at the State, CBIZ assessed total cash compensation and competitive benefits levels.

The CBIZ study found that 6,760 employees whose job titles were included in the study are paid below the recommended new range minimum for their job class.

The Governor’s FY2020 budget recommendations were an important first step in moving compensation for Missouri state employees toward market competitiveness. The Governor’s FY2020 budget recommendations would bring most employees included in the study to the market minimum for their job classifications. It is important to note that a cap of 15% was applied for potential market-based increases. In addition, the Department of Corrections received a separate, department-specific pay increase which may or may not have moved Department employees to their respective market minimums. The Board supports continuing to move employees toward the market minimum rates for their particular job class.

In 2019, a contract was awarded to assist the State in developing a best-in-class reward for performance model. The Board continues to support the concept of reward for performance. It is the Board’s understanding that Division of Personnel staff, working closely with contract staff, will be working to formulate more specific, concrete recommendations for moving forward in this direction.

In 2019, the State engaged a consultant to help modernize its classification system by developing more flexible career paths and compensation structures. This approach, combined with the above initiatives, will improve
recruitment and retention efforts.

**The Impact of Pay Compression**

Within-grade increases had historically been used to move successful tenured staff through their pay ranges to promote separation between their pay and the pay of new employees. The lack of any Statewide within-grade (WIG) increases over the past 19 years has created a situation in which employees with as much as 19 years of experience are paid within the same salary percentile as those employees who only recently joined the organization. Approximately 36 percent of Missouri State employees are at or below the 20th percentile of their pay range. This situation, where the pay rates of a large group of employees are virtually the same and clustered toward the bottom of the range, is known as low-end pay compression. The September 2018 conversion of pay for employees within the Uniform Classification and Pay (UCP) System to stepless pay ranges had the effect of understating the impact of historic low-end pay compression. In many cases, job titles previously assigned to different pay ranges have now been consolidated into fewer, broader pay ranges.

The chart below illustrates the distribution of employees within the UCP System across their assigned pay ranges.

In order to illustrate this concept more specifically, the following charts provide more detail related to job classes and employees assigned to pay Range 04 in the UCP System. Range 04 is one of the more commonly used ranges within the UCP System and represents a broad spectrum of work areas. The following analysis of this pay range is provided for clarification only and the focus on this range is not suggesting that it is any worse than other ranges within the UCP System.
The chart below lists those UCP job classes that are currently assigned to Range 04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC TEACHER I</td>
<td>FOOD SERVICE MGR I</td>
<td>PROBATION &amp; PAROLE ASST I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTANT I</td>
<td>GEOGRAPHIC INFO SYS TECH I</td>
<td>PROBATION &amp; PAROLE ASST II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING GENERALIST I</td>
<td>GRAIN INSPECTOR III</td>
<td>PROBATION &amp; PAROLE OFCR I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDICTION COUNSELOR I</td>
<td>GRAIN REGULATORY AUDITOR I</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH DATA TECH II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADLT PROT &amp; CMTY WKR I</td>
<td>HABILITATION SPECIALIST I</td>
<td>PUBLIC INFORMATION SPEC I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST I</td>
<td>HEALTH EDUCATOR I</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY PROG REP I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE MARKET REPORTER</td>
<td>HEALTH INFORMATION TECH II</td>
<td>REAL ESTATE EDUCATION SPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL HEALTH OFFICER</td>
<td>HEALTH PROGRAM REP I</td>
<td>REAL ESTATE EXAMINER I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET ANALYST I</td>
<td>HEAVY EQUIPMENT OPERATOR</td>
<td>RECREATION OFCR I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING CONSTRUCTION WKR II</td>
<td>HUMAN RELATIONS TECH</td>
<td>REFRIGERATION MECHANIC I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUYER I</td>
<td>HVAC INSTRUMENT CONTROLS TECH</td>
<td>REIMBURSEMENT OFFICER I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPENTER</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIST I</td>
<td>RESEARCH ANALYST I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE FACILITY SPEC I</td>
<td>INSP SUPV (PROF REGISTRATION)</td>
<td>RISK MANAGEMENT TECH II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD SUPPORT SPECIALIST</td>
<td>INST ACTIVITY COOR</td>
<td>SECURITY AIDE I PSY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S SERVICE WORKER I</td>
<td>INSURANCE FINANCIAL ANALYST I</td>
<td>SEED ANALYST II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIMS SPECIALIST I</td>
<td>INSURANCE PRODUCT ANALYST I</td>
<td>SHEET METAL WORKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL CASEWORK ASST I</td>
<td>INTERPRETIVE RESOURCE SPEC I</td>
<td>SPECIAL EDUC TEACHER I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL CASEWORK ASST II</td>
<td>INVESTIGATOR I</td>
<td>SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHLGY AST I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY DEV REP I</td>
<td>LABORATORY SUPPORT SPV</td>
<td>TECHNICAL ASSISTANT III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER OPER II</td>
<td>LIBRARIAN I</td>
<td>TELECOMMUN TECH I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSUMER SERVICES SPEC I</td>
<td>LOCAL ASSISTANCE REP I (TAX COMM)</td>
<td>TOURIST CENTER SPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTIONS SPECIALIST I</td>
<td>LOCKSMITH</td>
<td>TRACTOR TRAILER DRIVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTIONS CASE MANAGER I</td>
<td>LOTTERY INSIDE SALES REP II</td>
<td>UTILITY MANAGEMENT ANALYST I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTIONS CLASSIF ASST</td>
<td>LPN II</td>
<td>VETERANS SERVICE OFCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTIONS OFCR I</td>
<td>MAINT WKR III (PARK/HS)</td>
<td>VOCATIONAL ENTER SPV II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTIONS OFCR II</td>
<td>MANUFACTURED HSNG INSPI</td>
<td>VOCATIONAL TEACHER I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTIONS RECORDS OFFICER II</td>
<td>MARKETING SPECIALIST I</td>
<td>WAGE &amp; HOUR INVESTIGATOR I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTAL HYGIENIST</td>
<td>MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIST I</td>
<td>WEIGHTS &amp; MEASURES INSPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC DEV INCENTIVE SPEC I</td>
<td>MIL FUNERAL HNRS AREA COOR</td>
<td>WORKERS' COMP TECH SUPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICIAN</td>
<td>MILITARY SECURITY OFFICER I</td>
<td>WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SPEC I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONICS TECH II</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE MECHANIC</td>
<td>YOUTH SPECIALIST II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGENCY MGMT OFFICER I</td>
<td>NUTRITIONIST I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY SPEC I</td>
<td>PAINTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV PUBLIC HEALTH SPEC I</td>
<td>PARK OPERATIONS &amp; PLNG SPEC I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SPEC I</td>
<td>PARK/HISTORIC SITE SPEC I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE I</td>
<td>PERSONNEL ANALYST I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY SUPPORT ELIGIBILITY SPC</td>
<td>PLUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEED &amp; SEED INSPECTOR I</td>
<td>POWER PLANT MECHANIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE &amp; SAFETY SPEC</td>
<td>PRINTING/MAIL TECHNICIAN IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further examining the distribution of salaries for employees assigned to Range 04, the chart below shows the number of employees assigned to each salary level of Range 04.

Of the 9,487 employees assigned to UCP Range 04 as of May 31, 2019, approximately 61% were paid on the lower end of the pay range, with 5,778 of the 9,487 employees being paid at or below $1,308 per semi-monthly pay period. For these 5,778 employees 20.40% of the range is being utilized.

The chart below shows the impact of compression by showing the years of service of all the employees paid at or below the 20th percentile of Range 04. Despite years of service ranging from less than one year to 28 years, all of these employees are paid below the 20th percentile of the range.

No Statewide WIG salary advancement has been appropriated since July 1, 2000. The only WIG increase for employees hired after that date may have been a customary two-step increase for successfully completing their probationary period, or an occasional targeted WIG increase for specific job classifications like
Corrections Officers. Thus, we may have proficient and trained employees with many years of service with the State who receive the exact same salary as co-workers with less than a year of service. Typically, as employees acquire experience and proficiency in their jobs, they are more valuable to the organization than when they were first hired. This value should be reflected in salaries. Unfortunately, this practice is not always the case for the State of Missouri.

This situation leads to morale issues as employees may feel under-valued and under-appreciated. Employees can easily feel that their job commitment, knowledge and experience remain unrecognized from a compensation perspective. The most recently hired employees are, or soon will be, making exactly the same salary even though some may lack the same level of experience.

This situation threatens Missouri’s ability to retain its best employees. Employees can see that they have little hope of progressing salary-wise and, as the economy improves, many may seek to leave State employment for better paying jobs. Many State employees have salaries near the bottom of their assigned pay range. If the State does not appropriate within-grade salary advancements, those salaries will remain near the bottom.

The following chart shows the trend in total turnover, voluntary turnover and retirement for the State of Missouri over the past several years:

As the chart above indicates, turnover has steadily increased over the last several years.
This situation may also impact the State’s ability to effectively recruit new employees. Applicants may see the history of the lack of increases and decide that working for the State of Missouri will lead to reduced cumulative earnings throughout their careers. The State may experience problems in filling positions, may be forced to fill positions with candidates who possess marginal qualifications, or even worse, be forced to reduce the minimum qualifications for job classes in order to be fully staffed. Examples of classes in which minimum qualifications have been reduced in the last several years include:

- Claims Examiner
- Claims Specialist I, II, and III
- Claims Specialist Supervisor
- Contributions Examiner
- Contributions Specialist I, II, and III
- Contributions Specialist Supervisor
- Electronics Technician I and II
- Habilitation Specialist I and II
- Habilitation Specialist Supervisor
- Habilitation Program Manager
- Health Program Representative I, II, III
- Information Technologist I, II, III, and IV
- Program Specialist Trainee
- Program Specialist I and II
- Program Coordinator (MH)(HSS)
- Public Safety Program Representative I and II
- Public Safety Program Specialist

### Within-Grade Salary Advancements

No Statewide WIG salary advancement has been granted to Missouri employees since July 1, 2000. As previously mentioned, approximately 36 percent of Missouri State employees within the UCP system remain at or below the 20th percentile of their pay range. The low-end pay compression now experienced by Missouri State government is the result of this lack of consistent WIG salary advancements. General Structure Adjustments alone perpetuate low-end pay compression.

The Board is recommending a two-tiered WIG approach for FY 2021. It is hoped that this approach will take moderate, yet meaningful, steps to address low-end pay compression. From an employee perspective, the most significant compression issues are felt by employees who have been with the State for a number of years but may not have received a WIG increase beyond their initial end of probation increase.

The Board is recommending a 1 percent WIG increase for all employees. Further, for those employees with at least seven years of State service, the Board is recommending an additional 1 percent increase. This approach strives to balance costs with the need to address low-end pay compression.
General Structure Adjustment

An important compensation component relates to the ability to maintain the overall competitiveness of the pay plan. This is primarily accomplished through the use of the General Structure Adjustment (GSA). The GSA is often described as a “cost of living” adjustment. While the cost of living is a factor in determining the amount of the GSA, the adjustment should not be considered solely as a cost of living increase. The primary purpose of the GSA is to maintain the competitiveness of the pay plan relative to other employers.

Historically, the GSA has involved an adjustment to the pay grids themselves. Virtually all employees benefit from this type of increase. Only temporary and seasonal workers are not automatically included. Their increases, if any, have been determined by each agency.

The recommended GSA adjustment is an average of four consistent indicators. These indicators include: the Consumer Price Index (CPI), the Employment Cost Index (ECI), the World at Work Salary Budget Survey and Personal Income (PI) data for the State of Missouri. The following table represents the most current data from these indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Structure Adjustment Economic Indicators</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer Price Index (CPI-U)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Urban Region Consumers (Midwest)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase for month ending May 2019 over May 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Cost Index (ECI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest (West North Central) Region for Private Industry Workers Wages and Salaries (excludes Benefits)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase for quarter ending March 2019 over March 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World at Work Salary Budget Increases</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Average for 2018 for Non-Exempt Salaried Workers</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Income (PI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Missouri</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Personal Income for quarter ending March 2019 over March 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average of the Indicators Listed (Rounded to the nearest tenth)</strong></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the current indicators as presented in the above table, the Board recommends a 2.7 percent increase in the GSA.

As shown in the following charts, the average salary of UCP employees has not kept pace recently with the average of these economic indicators, nor with any of these economic indicators separately.
The State continues to experience high turnover rates and difficulty in recruiting critical staff. In addition, to advocating for further implementation of market-based salary increases, the Board supports agencies having the flexibility to pay employees within the limits of established pay grades (ranges). As state agencies use this flexibility to address specific recruitment and retention challenges, the Board strongly encourages the continued use of positive, equitable pay practices to recruit and retain top talent while enhancing morale and promoting productivity. The Department of Mental Health raised the following job titles for consideration due to agency-specific recruitment and retention challenges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHIATRIC TECHNICIAN I (CBIZ GRADE 3)</td>
<td>PSYCHIATRIC TECHNICIAN II (CBIZ GRADE 4)</td>
<td>PSYCHIATRIC TECHNICIAN III (CBIZ GRADE 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY AIDE I (PSYCHIATRIC) (CBIZ GRADE 4)</td>
<td>SECURITY AIDE II (PSYCHIATRIC) (CBIZ GRADE 5)</td>
<td>SECURITY AIDE III (PSYCHIATRIC) (CBIZ GRADE 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL ASSISTANT I (CBIZ GRADE 3)</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL ASSISTANT II (CBIZ GRADE 4)</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL ASSISTANT III (CBIZ GRADE 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD SERVICE HELPER I (CBIZ GRADE 1)</td>
<td>FOOD SERVICE HELPER II (CBIZ GRADE 1)</td>
<td>LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE I (CBIZ GRADE 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE II (CBIZ GRADE 6)</td>
<td>LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE III (CBIZ GRADE 7)</td>
<td>COUNSELOR IN TRAINING (CBIZ GRADE 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSED PROFESSIONAL COUNSELOR I (CBIZ GRADE 7)</td>
<td>LICENSED PROFESSIONAL COUNSELOR II (CBIZ GRADE 7)</td>
<td>CLINICAL SOCIAL WORK SUPERVISOR (CBIZ GRADE 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSED CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKER (CBIZ GRADE 7)</td>
<td>CLINICAL SOCIAL WORK SPECIALIST (CBIZ GRADE 8)</td>
<td>LICENSED BEHAVIOR ANALYST (CBIZ GRADE 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGIST I (CBIZ GRADE 9)</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGIST II (CBIZ GRADE 10)</td>
<td>REGISTERED NURSE (CBIZ GRADE 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTERED NURSE SENIOR (CBIZ GRADE 9)</td>
<td>REGISTERED NURSE- CLIN OPERS (CBIZ GRADE 9)</td>
<td>REGISTERED NURSE SUPERVISOR (CBIZ GRADE 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTERED NURSE MANAGER (CBIZ GRADE BB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are the proposed CBIZ Salary Grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17,888</td>
<td>$22,360</td>
<td>$26,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20,035</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$30,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$22,439</td>
<td>$28,048</td>
<td>$33,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,805</td>
<td>$32,256</td>
<td>$38,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$29,675</td>
<td>$37,094</td>
<td>$44,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$34,126</td>
<td>$42,658</td>
<td>$51,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$38,476</td>
<td>$49,057</td>
<td>$59,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$46,171</td>
<td>$58,868</td>
<td>$71,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$55,405</td>
<td>$70,642</td>
<td>$85,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$66,486</td>
<td>$84,770</td>
<td>$103,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$78,249</td>
<td>$101,724</td>
<td>$125,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$93,899</td>
<td>$122,069</td>
<td>$150,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$117,374</td>
<td>$152,586</td>
<td>$187,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$143,949</td>
<td>$190,733</td>
<td>$237,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$176,604</td>
<td>$238,416</td>
<td>$300,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>$44,151</td>
<td>$70,642</td>
<td>$97,132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNIFORM CLASSIFICATION & PAY SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Plan Element</th>
<th>General Revenue</th>
<th>Non-General Revenue</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Personal Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Grade Increase, Traditional</td>
<td>$8,100,966</td>
<td>$6,875,861</td>
<td>$14,976,827</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-Grade Increase, 7 Plus Years of Service</td>
<td>$4,617,550</td>
<td>$3,805,127</td>
<td>$8,422,677</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Structure Adjustment (2.7%)</td>
<td>$21,672,607</td>
<td>$18,024,285</td>
<td>$39,696,892</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UCP System Agencies, Salary Only</td>
<td>$34,591,123</td>
<td>$28,505,073</td>
<td>$63,096,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (36.35%)</td>
<td>$12,573,873</td>
<td>$10,361,594</td>
<td>$22,935,467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UCP System Agencies, Salary plus Benefits</td>
<td>$47,164,997</td>
<td>$38,866,667</td>
<td>$86,031,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-UCP SYSTEM AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Plan Element</th>
<th>General Revenue</th>
<th>Non-General Revenue</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Personal Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Grade Increase, Traditional</td>
<td>$3,145,592</td>
<td>$5,597,889</td>
<td>$8,743,481</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-Grade Increase, 7 Plus Years of Service</td>
<td>$1,792,988</td>
<td>$3,190,803</td>
<td>$4,983,790</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Structure Adjustment (2.7%)</td>
<td>$8,493,099</td>
<td>$15,114,328</td>
<td>$23,607,427</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-UCP System Agencies, Salary Only</td>
<td>$13,431,679</td>
<td>$23,903,029</td>
<td>$37,334,706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (36.35%)</td>
<td>$4,602,415</td>
<td>$8,005,751</td>
<td>$12,571,166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-UCP System Agencies, Salary plus Benefits</td>
<td>$18,034,094</td>
<td>$32,591,781</td>
<td>$50,905,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALL AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Plan Element</th>
<th>General Revenue</th>
<th>Non-General Revenue</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Personal Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Grade Increase, Traditional</td>
<td>$11,246,558</td>
<td>$12,273,560</td>
<td>$23,520,118</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-Grade Increase, 7 Plus Years of Service</td>
<td>$6,410,536</td>
<td>$6,995,929</td>
<td>$13,406,467</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Structure Adjustment (2.7%)</td>
<td>$30,365,706</td>
<td>$33,136,813</td>
<td>$63,504,319</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Agencies, Salary Only</td>
<td>$48,022,802</td>
<td>$52,408,102</td>
<td>$100,430,904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (36.35%)</td>
<td>$17,456,289</td>
<td>$19,050,345</td>
<td>$36,506,634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Agencies, Salary plus Benefits</td>
<td>$65,479,091</td>
<td>$71,458,447</td>
<td>$136,937,538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>