

MEMORANDUM

June 7, 2007

To: Education Committee

From: Elaine Bonner-Tompkins, Senior Legislative Analyst *EBT*  
Office of Legislative Oversight

Subject: **Worksession on OLO Report 2007-7, *Linking Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Workforce Data to Council Decision-Making***

This packet provides information to assist the ED Committee to develop recommendations to the MFP Committee for Council action on using MCPS and other agency workforce data for Council decision-making.

On April 10, 2007, the Council received and released Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) Report 2007-7, *Linking Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Workforce Data to Council Decision-Making*. The Council's stated goals in designing this project were to improve the Council's familiarity with MCPS' Staff Statistical Profile and develop recommendations for the Council's use of workforce data. On April 16, the Management and Fiscal Policy (MFP) Committee was briefed on this report; on April 20, the Education Committee was briefed.

The following MCPS staff members are scheduled to participate in this worksession:

- Ms Susanne DeGraba, Chief Financial Officer
- Ms. Susan Marks, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources
- Dr. Marshall Spatz, Director, Department of Management, Budget and Planning

This packet is organized into five parts:

- Part A presents the project background and purpose;
- Part B presents project findings and recommendations from OLO;
- Part C describes MCPS' response to OLO's findings and recommendations;
- Part D presents additional recommendations offered by Councilmembers; and
- Part E offers suggested questions for the Council's annual review of workforce data.

## **A. Project background and purpose**

Each year, the Council requests workforce data from each County and bi-County agency to help review recommended compensation adjustments. Together, five sets of workforce data from County Government, Montgomery College, M-NCPPC, WSSC and MCPS comprise the Personnel Management Review. Towards this end, MCPS submits its Staff Statistical Profile (SSP) to the Council. The SSP contains 1 to 10 years of data on a range of workforce variables for the MCPS workforce overall and for selected positions that include principals and teachers.

The purpose of this OLO assignment was to assist the Council to make greater use of the workforce data that MCPS provides. Specifically, the Council tasked OLO with: (1) becoming conversant with the data contained in the Staff Statistical Profile; and (2) recommending how the Council can use these data. In assigning this project, the Council indicated an expectation that OLO's findings and recommendations with respect to MCPS' workforce data might apply to the workforce data submissions from the other County and bi-County agencies.

## **B. Project Findings and Recommendations**

OLO's review of the MCPS Staff Statistical Profile and the workforce planning literature led to three findings:

**Finding #1: The Staff Statistical Profile provides important data about the MCPS workforce. However, the current format and contents of the SSP are not conducive to an efficient review.** The SSP offers considerable information on the size and characteristics of the MCPS workforce. However, the usefulness of the SSP to the Council is limited due to its length and absence of an executive summary.

**Finding #2: The literature on strategic workforce planning suggests that benefits emerge from reviewing workforce data within the context of workforce performance targets.** The meaningful analysis of data on variables such as workforce skills and demographics requires information about what an organization is trying to accomplish. Elected officials and others outside an agency can use the workforce goals and performance data generated by workforce planning to improve their understanding of both management and funding decisions.

**Finding #3: In its current form, the Staff Statistical Profile does not provide context for the Council to understand MCPS' progress on the agency's workforce goals or the cost-effectiveness of workforce strategies.** The Council has never asked MCPS or the other agencies to submit data on workforce targets or the impact of workforce strategies on workforce trends as part of the *Personnel Management Review*. However, as the Council considers requests for changes in staffing and compensation, understanding an agency's progress on its workforce goals can inform Council decision-making.

Based on these three findings, OLO offers two recommendations for Council action:

**Recommendation #1: Request that MCPS reorganize and provide explanatory text to the workforce data presented in future submissions to the Personnel Management Review.** The Council should request that MCPS reorganize and provide an executive summary in its future submissions of workforce data to the *Personnel Management Review*. The approach taken by OLO in Chapter III of the report to condense the 2006 SSP from over 70 tables to 17 tables provides an example of how this might be done (see © 7).

**Recommendation #2: Request that MCPS provide context for the Council's review of the workforce data submitted for inclusion in the Personnel Management Review.** In order to react to information about the MCPS workforce, the Council needs to understand how MCPS' current workforce compares to the school system's overall workforce needs, both now and in the future. In reviewing annual budget requests, the Council should examine whether MCPS' proposals align with the agency's current and long term workforce goals. OLO recommends that some of the performance targets already tracked by MCPS' Office of Human Resources with its Family of Measures could provide some of the context needed for the Council's review of workforce data.

### **C. MCPS' Response to Project Findings and Recommendations**

Dr. Weast's April 11<sup>th</sup> letter, attached on © 5, offers MCPS' responses to this project's findings and recommendations. Regarding Recommendation #1, the Superintendent suggests that "rather than commissioning a new report, the County Council may wish to review its needs across all agencies before asking MCPS to prepare an additional report." Regarding Recommendation #2, "MCPS agrees that the review of workforce data needs to include a review of goals and accomplishments" and suggests that the *Annual Report on Our Call to Action* accomplishes this in part. Additionally the letter suggests that "even more can be accomplished through discussion with the County Council" and additional workforce worksessions.

On April 16<sup>th</sup> during the MFP Committee briefing, Mrs. Praisner stated that she did not intend to have the Council request a new workforce report from MCPS. However, she noted that as MCPS responds to the insights offered by the Baldrige review committee to improve their data-driven decision-making, the Council's desire for additional workforce data will likely be addressed.

### **D. Additional Recommendations Offered by Councilmembers**

After the release of the report, Councilmembers offered two additional recommendations for Council consideration:

- Mrs. Praisner recommended that the Council request from MCPS comparison compensation data in future submissions to the PMR. In particular, Mrs. Praisner desires common compensation data by school systems in the State of Maryland and the metropolitan Washington region that includes the cost of salaries, benefits, days worked, leave granted, and other elements of “total” compensation. Montgomery County Government provides wage and salary comparability data to the Council in its PMR submission. Excerpts of this data from the 2006 PMR begin on © 23.
- Ms. Trachtenberg recommended that the Council request additional workforce data from MCPS for specific MCEA and SEIU represented positions beyond teachers and paraeducators. In particular, Ms. Trachtenberg is interested in understanding the number and demographics of MCPS’ school-based counselors.

### **E. Suggested Questions Related to the Council’s Review of Workforce Data**

In assigning this project to OLO, the Council indicated that the findings and recommendations on making greater use of MCPS’ workforce data in decision-making might also apply to other County-funded agencies. This section outlines some suggested questions for the Council to pose to agency staff during future worksessions to improve the Council’s understanding of: (1) the strategic workforce goals of each agency; (2) their progress in meeting those goals; and (3) the costs and cost-effectiveness of workforce strategies employed to reach workforce goals.

1. What are the agency’s current and projected workforce gaps? What strategies are being used to address workforce gaps? What are the costs of the strategies employed? How does new funding compare to the on-going costs to continue these strategies? What progress has been made or is anticipated?
2. Has the agency identified hiring and employee retention objectives? What strategies are being used to reach these objectives? What are the costs of these strategies? What progress has been made or is anticipated?
3. Has the agency identified diversity objectives? What strategies are being used to achieve diversity objectives? What are the costs of these strategies? What progress has been made or is anticipated?

As the Council considers using the questions above to link workforce data to Council budget decision-making and oversight, the Council may also want to hold additional worksessions to review PMR data beyond the April MFP worksessions focused on compensation. These additional worksessions, combined with the reorganization of PMR data, could enhance the Council’s opportunity to understand, discuss, and constructively use agency workforce data.

ATTACHMENTS	BEGINS AT:
Executive Summary of OLO Report 2007-7	© 1
Comments from the Superintendent of Schools, 4/11/07	© 5
Chapter III: MCPS Workforce Data	© 7
Wage and Salary Comparability Data from 2006 Personnel Management Review	© 23

**LINKING MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
WORKFORCE DATA TO COUNCIL DECISION-MAKING**

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT REPORT 2007-7

APRIL 10, 2007

**THE ASSIGNMENT**

Each year, in response to the County Council's request for workforce data, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) submits its Staff Statistical Profile (SSP). The SSP contains one to ten years of data on a range of workforce variables, including personnel demographics, staff experience, average salary, staff turnover, and retirement eligibility. The SSP provides data for the entire MCPS workforce and for selected positions, e.g., administrators, principals, teachers, and paraeducators.

The other County and bi-County agencies (County Government, Montgomery College, M-NCPPC, and WSSC) submit similar reports of workforce data to the Council. Together, these five sets of workforce data comprise the *Personnel Management Review*, which becomes part of the Council's annual budget review of the agencies' recommended compensation adjustments.

The purpose of this Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) assignment is to assist the Council to make greater use of the workforce data that MCPS provides annually. Specifically, this project tasks OLO with becoming conversant with the data contained in MCPS' Staff Statistical Profile and recommending how the Council can use these data during budget worksessions and/or related oversight activities. In assigning this project, the Council indicated an expectation that OLO's recommendations with respect to MCPS' workforce data might apply to the workforce data submissions from all agencies.

**STRATEGIC WORKFORCE PLANNING**

The process known as "strategic workforce planning" offers a framework for understanding the potential uses of workforce data. While it primarily addresses the internal needs of agency managers to improve programming and outcomes, elected officials and others outside an agency can use the data generated by workforce planning to improve their understanding of management and funding decisions. The four steps of the workforce planning process and the data that each step generates are:

- Step 1:** Assess the current workforce by collecting and analyzing data on workforce demographics, skills and competencies, turnover, and salaries.
- Step 2:** Identify current and projected workforce gaps by generating data on current and projected workforce demand and supply by position, skill, and/or competency.
- Step 3:** Identify and implement strategies to narrow workforce gaps by generating data on the size and cost of workforce strategies and performance measures.
- Step 4:** Assess the effectiveness of strategies by comparing trends to targets and generating data on program efficacy, cost-effectiveness, and workforce goal attainment.

**MCPS' INTERNAL USES OF WORKFORCE DATA**

MCPS staff report using workforce data in a number of ways. Examples of MCPS' internal uses include:

- Monitoring progress on workforce diversity, recruitment, teacher qualifications, and turnover;
- Informing contract negotiations with bargaining units;
- Identifying job categories for mandatory training;
- Developing projections related to the Capital Improvements Program; and
- Tracking progress on Goal 4 of the MCPS Strategic Plan to "create a positive work environment in a self-renewing organization."

---

---

## Findings from Staff Statistical Profile

---

---

### MCPS' STAFF STATISTICAL PROFILE (SSP)

The Staff Statistical Profile presents a significant amount of data that can answer questions about the current MCPS workforce and its changes in recent years. The 2006 edition of the SSP includes over 70 tables and graphs that present data on MCPS' workforce overall, by bargaining unit, and by selected positions, e.g., administrators, principals, other professionals, teachers, and support services personnel. OLO sorted the contents of the Staff Statistical Profile into four data categories:

1. **Demographics** that describe trends in gender, race/ethnicity, age, and residency.
2. **Staff Qualifications** that track degrees, certifications, and years of experience by position.
3. **Turnover and Eligibility for Retirement** that describe the length of tenure by position, the rates and reasons for turnover, and eligibility for retirement within the next 5 to 25 years.
4. **Salaries** that describe salary schedule placement and average salaries by bargaining unit.

To enhance the usefulness of the data shared with the Council, OLO combined data from multiple tables, and calculated changes in number and percent where trend data were provided. Highlights of the information contained in the 2006 edition of the SSP follow.

#### DEMOGRAPHICS

- In FY06, MCPS had 21,277 employees - 73.9 percent were female and 26.1 percent were male.
- In FY06, the MCPS workforce was 67.6 percent White, 18.7 percent African American, 7.6 percent Hispanic, 5.7 percent Asian American, and 0.3 percent American Indian.
- Nearly three-quarters (73.7%) of MCPS staff live in Montgomery County. Eight percent of MCPS staff reside in Frederick County, six percent live in Prince George's County, and four percent reside in Howard County; only 4.2 percent live outside of the state.

**Residency of MCPS Staff, FY06**

Place of Residence	Percent
Montgomery County	73.7%
Frederick County	8.1%
Prince George's County	5.8%
Howard County	4.1%
Other Maryland Counties	4.1%
Other State/District of Columbia	4.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

- The percent of administrators and other professionals with at least a Master's degree or equivalent was relatively steady from FY03 to FY06, ranging between 95 to 99 percent.
- From FY03 to FY05, the percent of principals, assistant principals, and student support specialists with an Advanced Professional Certificate decreased from 92 to 90 percent.
- From FY03 to FY05, approximately 80 percent of all new teachers held a Standard or Advanced Professional Certificate.

## Findings from Staff Statistical Profile

### TURNOVER AND ELIGIBILITY FOR RETIREMENT

- Among administrators, eligibility for retirement varies by position. Nearly 55 percent of all principals can retire within the next 10 years compared to 31 percent of assistant principals.
- In FY05, total turnover was 8.6 percent for teachers and 8.9 percent for support services personnel. The same year, termination (both voluntary and involuntary) accounted for about 64 percent of total teacher turnover and about 60 percent of total support services turnover.
- Turnover among principals and assistant principals was 15 and 24 percent, respectively in FY05. Transfers and promotions accounted for most of the turnover for assistant principals while retirement was the primary reason for principals.

**Table 16: Reasons for Turnover by Position, FY05**

Position	Termination*	Retirement	Transfer/ Promotion	Total Turnover
Administrators	2.6%	4.9%	1.8%	9.4%
Principals	1.0%	7.3%	6.7%	15.0%
Assistant Principals	5.0%	2.5%	16.6%	24.1%
Student Support Specialists	0.0%	0.0%	59.4%	59.4%
Teachers	5.5%	2.2%	0.9%	8.6%
Support Services	5.4%	2.9%	0.6%	8.9%
Paraeducators	5.9%	2.2%	4.8%	13.0%

\*Termination may be voluntary or involuntary.

### SALARIES

- In FY06, 6.4 percent of MCPS' 11,209 teachers were at the start of their pay grade and 14.1 percent were at the top of their pay grade. In FY06, 56.1 percent of the 1,136 new teachers were hired at Step 1 of their respective pay grade.
- In FY06, the average FTE salary for administrators represented by MCAASP was \$105,720. For 12-month other professionals represented by MCEA, the average FTE salary was \$90,742, while for 10-month teachers it was \$64,852. For support services employees represented by SEIU, the average FTE salary was \$36,478.
- From FY03 to FY06, the average salary for all teachers increased 10.4 percent, from \$58,758 to \$64,841. During this time, the average salary for new teachers increased by 9.8 percent from \$42,791 to \$46,971.

**Average Salaries for MCEA Positions, FY03-FY06**

Position	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY03-FY06 Change	
					\$	%
Other Professionals	\$84,138	\$88,957	\$88,840	\$91,099	\$6,961	8.3%
Teachers	\$58,758	\$62,156	\$63,131	\$64,841	\$6,083	10.4%
New Teachers	\$42,791	\$42,044	\$45,839	\$46,971	\$4,180	9.8%

---

---

## OLO Findings and Recommendations

---

---

### FINDINGS:

OLO's review of MCPS' Staff Statistical Profile (SSP) and workforce planning literature generated three findings:

- **Finding #1: The Staff Statistical Profile provides important data about the MCPS workforce. However, the current format and contents of the SSP are not conducive to an efficient review.** The SSP offers considerable information on the size and characteristics of the MCPS workforce. However, the usefulness of the SSP to the Council is limited due to its length and absence of an executive summary.
- **Finding #2: The literature on strategic workforce planning suggests that benefits emerge from reviewing workforce data within the context of workforce performance targets.** The meaningful analysis of data on variables such as workforce skills and demographics requires information about what an organization is trying to accomplish. Elected officials and others outside an agency can use the workforce goals and performance data generated by workforce planning to improve their understanding of both management and funding decisions.
- **Finding #3: In its current form, the Staff Statistical Profile does not provide context for the Council to understand MCPS' progress on the agency's workforce goals or the cost-effectiveness of workforce strategies.** The Council has never asked MCPS or the other agencies to submit data on workforce targets or the impact of workforce strategies on workforce trends as part of the *Personnel Management Review*. However, as the Council considers requests for changes in staffing and compensation, understanding an agency's progress on its workforce goals can inform Council decision-making.

### RECOMMENDATIONS:

OLO offers two recommendations for Council action on requests for and uses of MCPS workforce data:

- **Recommendation #1: Request that MCPS reorganize and provide explanatory text to the workforce data presented in future submissions to the Personnel Management Review.** With the goal of producing a more concise and useable document, the Council should request that MCPS reorganize and provide explanatory text in its future submissions of workforce data to the *Personnel Management Review*. OLO also recommends that the Council ask MCPS to provide some selected trend calculations, an executive summary that highlights "the news" contained in the workforce data, and a glossary of key terms.
- **Recommendation #2: Request that MCPS provide context for the Council's review of the workforce data submitted for inclusion in the Personnel Management Review.** In order to react to information about the MCPS workforce as "good" or "bad" news, the Council needs to understand how MCPS' current workforce compares to the school system's overall workforce needs, both now and in the future. As the Council considers the agency's annual budget requests, the Council should examine whether MCPS' proposals align with the agency's current and long term workforce goals.

OLO recommends that some of the performance targets already tracked by MCPS' Office of Human Resources' Family of Measures could provide some of the context needed for review of workforce data. The pairing of workforce trends to targets should facilitate the Council's understanding and practical use of MCPS workforce data in annual budget decision making and general oversight of the MCPS budget.

For a complete copy of OLO Report 2007-7, go to: [www.montgomerycountymd.gov/olo](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/olo)



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**  
MARYLAND

www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org

April 11, 2007

Ms. Karen Orlansky  
Director, Office of Legislative Oversight  
Montgomery County Council  
100 Maryland Avenue  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Dear  Ms. Orlansky:

Thank you for providing the draft Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) report on the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Workforce Data project. This project has provided a comprehensive review of workforce data relevant to the MCPS operating budget and long-term human resources strategy. MCPS staff has reviewed the draft report and found it to be thoughtfully written and helpful to our common goal of assisting the County Council and the general public to make budget decisions regarding MCPS.

I appreciate the collaborative relationship that Ms. Elaine Bonner-Tompkins of the OLO staff developed with MCPS staff with whom she worked during the project. She provided them with an ongoing opportunity for input into the development of the report and responded to technical suggestions.

Regarding Finding 1, the OLO report notes that MCPS uses the data from the annual Staff Statistical Profile (SSP) for many purposes, including developing strategies for the recruitment and retention of teachers and other personnel, meeting specified goals for diversity in staff demographics, planning for leadership development, and budgeting. The comprehensive nature of this report makes it possible to accomplish the many purposes intended for the report. OLO notes that the County Council has its own purposes for using the report. I am hopeful that the County Council's goals can be met within the format of the existing information rather than through a separate report. In the past, Council members have selected from the available material for all agencies without requiring preparation of a distinct report. Although the current report does not provide analytical comments on the data, MCPS users do considerable analysis using the data in the SSP. The results of this analysis may be found in the annual MCPS Strategic Plan—*Our Call to Action: Pursuit of Excellence* and in the *Annual Report on Our Call to Action*. The material presented there may be of great interest to the County Council.

Regarding Recommendation 1, MCPS agrees that the County Council should review workforce data in more detail as part of its ongoing examination of county workforce patterns. Rather than commissioning a new report, the County Council may wish to review its needs across all agencies before asking MCPS to prepare an additional report.

Office of the Superintendent of Schools

850 Hungerford Drive, Room 122 • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 301-279-3381

5

Regarding Recommendation 2, MCPS agrees that the review of workforce data needs to include a review of goals and accomplishments. Much of that is already done in the *Annual Report on Our Call to Action*. Even more can be accomplished through discussion with the County Council. MCPS concurs with the recommendation that the County Council can benefit greatly from additional workforce sessions.

Because many of the issues raised by the report are long-term workforce excellence issues, it is our expectation that the Education Committee and the full County Council will continue to study the recommendations after work is completed on the FY 2008 Operating Budget.

The members of the Board of Education and I look forward to working with the County Council as this report is reviewed and discussed. I believe that the development of useful workforce data for MCPS and other county agencies will be an ongoing process that will prove most valuable. The goal will be to ensure that MCPS attracts and retains the high quality staff that our constituents expect and deserve.

Respectfully,



Jerry D. Weast, Ed.D.  
Superintendent of Schools

JDW:jp

Copy to:

Members of the Board of Education  
Mr. Ikheloa  
Executive Staff  
Ms. DeGraba

### Chapter III: MCPS Workforce Data

This chapter describes the April 2006 Staff Statistical Profile and other documents that contain MCPS workforce data. It summarizes the data included in these resources in two sections:

**Section A, MCPS Staff Statistical Profile (SSP)**, describes the content of the SSP.

**Section B, Synthesis of Staff Statistical Profile Data**, summarizes the data included in the SSP in four categories: demographics, staff qualifications, turnover and retirement eligibility, and salaries. Each category write-up includes a description of the data referenced, summary data tables, sample questions of potential interest to the Council, and key findings.

#### A. MCPS Staff Statistical Profile

MCPS submits the Staff Statistical Profile (SSP) to the County Council annually during budget season as part of the *Personnel Management Review*. The SSP has over 70 tables and graphs with data describing the MCPS workforce overall and by the following positions:

- Administrators and Supervisory Positions
- Principals
- Assistant Principals
- Student Support Specialists
- Other Professionals (i.e., 12-Month Montgomery County Education Association Personnel)
- Teachers
- New Teachers
- Support Services Personnel (i.e., 10 and 12-month SEIU Local 500 Personnel)
- Paraeducators

Table 3 on the next page describes the contents of the SSP across these four data categories and the fiscal years for which data are provided:

**Category 1 – Demographics** describes trends in gender, race/ethnicity, age, and residency;

**Category 2 - Staff Qualifications** tracks degrees, certifications, and total years of experience by position;

**Category 3 - Turnover and Eligibility for Retirement** describes the length of tenure by position, the rates and reasons for turnover (e.g. termination or transfer), and eligibility for retirement within the next 5 to 25 years; and

**Category 4 - Salaries** describes salary schedule placement and average salaries by bargaining unit.

**Table 3: Contents of the Staff Statistical Profile by Category**

Table Title	Positions	Description	Data Collected
<b>Category 1 - Demographics</b>			
Demographic Profile	Entire workforce; administrators; principals; assistant principals; student support specialists; other professionals; new teachers (as of October 15 and as of June 30); teachers; all support services staff; paraeducators	Demographics by number and percent for gender, race, and age.	FY03-FY06
Gender by School Type	Teachers	Provides the number and percent of male and female teachers by school type and total.	FY03-FY06
Residence Profile	Entire workforce	Number and percent of employees by county (MD only), state, and bargaining unit.	FY06
Initial Appointments to Administrative Positions/ New Hire Demographic Profiles	Administrators, principals, assistant principals, student support specialists	Number and percent of new appointments/hires by external/internal candidate status, gender, and race/ethnicity.	FY06
<b>Category 2 - Staff Qualifications</b>			
Degree	Administrators, other professionals, new teachers, teachers, paraeducators	Number and percent by degree.	FY03-FY06
Certification Type	Principals, assistant principals, student support specialists, other professionals, new teachers, teachers	Total number each year with the number and percent who have Standard or Advanced Professional Certificates or another certificate or license, depending on the position.	FY03-FY06
Total Years of Experience	Administrators, principals, other professionals, new teachers, teachers, all support services	Total experience by number and percent. Experience may include teaching and administration.	FY03-FY06
Elementary School Title I Highly Qualified Competency	Paraeducators	Number and percent of Title I elementary school paraeducators by "highly qualified" and "not highly qualified" status.	FY04-FY06
Title I Competency	Paraeducators	Number and percent of Title I "highly qualified" and "not highly qualified" paraeducators by elementary school (lists 20 elementary schools).	FY06

**Table 3: Contents of the Staff Statistical Profile by Category, Continued**

Table Title	Positions	Description	Data Collected
<b>Category 3 - Turnover and Eligibility for Retirement</b>			
Retention of Teachers	Teachers	Number hired each year from FY94-FY05. Number and percent of terminations each year from FY94-FY05, disaggregated by year hired. Terminations do not include retirements.	FY94-FY05
Years of Experience in MCPS	Administrators, other professionals, teachers	Experience at MCPS in five-year increments by number and percent. Experience may include teaching and administration.	FY03-FY06
Years of Experience as an MCPS Principal	Principals	Experience as an MCPS principal in five-year increments by number and percent.	FY03-FY06
Turnover	Administrators, principals, assistant principals, support specialists, teachers, all support services, paraeducators	Total number of staff in the fall and the number and percent of staff who terminated, retired, or were transferred/promoted to a different position that year. Presents total turnover by number and percent.	FY02-FY05
Retirement Eligibility	Administrators, non school-based administrators, principals, assistant principals, student support specialists	Total number and percent eligible to retire from 2006-2035 in five-year increments.	FY06
Retirement Eligibility by Level	Administrators, principals, assistant principals	Total number in elementary, middle, high, and special schools and central offices with number and percent eligible to retire in the next five years.	FY06
<b>Category 4 - Salaries</b>			
FY 2006 Fact Sheet (as of 10/15/2005)	Executive Staff, Administrative and Supervisory, Others Professionals, Teachers, and Support Staff	Number of employees and average salary by head count; number of positions and average salary by FTE.	FY06
Salary Schedule Placement	Administrators, other professionals, new teachers, teachers, all support services	Number and percent by pay grade and intermediate step.	FY06
Annual Salary FY2006	Other professionals, new teachers, teachers	Number and percent by annual salary in \$5,000 intervals.	FY06
Average Salaries	Other professionals, new teachers, teachers	Average salary.	FY06

**B. Synthesis of Staff Statistical Profile Data**

The SSP presents a significant amount of data that can be used to answer questions about the current MCPS workforce and how it has changed in recent years. This section synthesizes the SSP data into four categories: demographics, staff qualifications, turnover and retirement eligibility, and salaries.

Each category write-up includes summary data tables, sample questions of potential interest to the Council, and key findings. The chart below lists the tables described by category subsection.

Table	Title	Page
<b>Category 1 - Demographics</b>		
Table 5	MCPS Workforce Demographic Profile, FY03-FY06	14
Table 6	MCPS Demographic Profile by Administrative Position and Total Workforce, FY06	15
Table 7	MCPS Demographics Profile by Non-Administrative Position and Total Workforce, FY06	15
Table 8	Residency of MCPS Staff, FY06	16
Table 9	Internal and External Hires for School-Based Administrative Positions, FY06	17
<b>Category 2 - Staff Qualifications</b>		
Table 10	Degree by Position, FY03-FY06	18
Table 11	Number of Employees and Type of Certification by Position, FY03-FY06	19
Table 12	Total Years of Experience by Position, FY03-FY06	20
<b>Category 3 - Turnover and Eligibility for Retirement</b>		
Table 13	Years of Experience in MCPS by Position, FY03-FY06	21
Table 14	Termination of New Teachers, FY94-FY05	22
Table 15	Turnover Rate by Position, FY02-FY05	23
Table 16	Reasons for Turnover by Position, FY05	23
Table 17	Administrators Eligible to Retire between FY06-FY35	24
<b>Category 4 - Salaries</b>		
Table 18	Salary Schedule Placement for Teachers, FY06	25
Table 19	Average FY06 Salaries by Employee Group	26
Table 20	Average Salaries for MCEA Positions, FY03-FY06	27

OLO combined data from multiple tables in the SSP to enhance the usefulness of the data shared with the Council. The full SSP contains more detailed data on several of the measures. Additionally, OLO calculated changes in number and percent where trend data was available. These calculations are not included in the SSP. Definitions of key terms referenced in the SSP follow on Table 4 on the next page.

**Table 4: Definitions of Key Terms Used in the Staff Statistical Profile**

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Administrators	Includes both school based (e.g., principals, assistant principals, and student support specialists) and non-school based administrative and supervisory personnel. These employees are represented by the Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel (MCAASP)
School-based Administrators	Includes principals, assistant principals, and student support specialists.
Student Support Specialists	Employees participating in a four year time-limited training program. Participants either become assistant principals or return to the classroom.
Other Professionals	Includes Instructional Specialists, Pupil Personnel Workers, Social Workers, and Psychologists. These employees are represented by the Montgomery County Education Association (MCEA).
Paraeducators	Includes Special Education Itinerant, Special Education, 10- & 12-month Regular, Head Start, JROTC, Computer Lab, and Instructional Data Assistant Paraeducators. These employees are represented by the Service Employee International Union Local 500 (SEIU).
Head Count	Counts all employees without regard to whether the position is full or part time.
Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	Calculates the number of fulltime employees by aggregating full and part time positions. (i.e., 1 full time + .5 part time = 1.5 FTE)
MCPS Bargaining Units	MCAASP: Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel MCEA: Montgomery County Education Association SEIU: Service Employees International Union Local 500

Sources: SSP and conversations with MCPS staff.

In reviewing the SSP data, OLO found slight variations in the number of staff reported by position within the same fiscal year. For example, data on principal experience reports 191 principals in FY05, while data on principal turnover reports 193 principals for the same fiscal year. This variation may occur due to differences in data collection dates.

**Category 1 - Demographics**

This subsection synthesizes the workforce demographic trends tracked in the SSP by:

- a. Demographic Profiles of the MCPS Workforce
- b. Residency of MCPS Workforce
- c. Internal and External Hires for School-Based Administrative Positions

**a. Demographic Profiles of the MCPS Workforce**

**Table 5: MCPS Workforce Demographic Profile, FY03-FY06**

	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY04-FY06 Change*
<b>Total Number</b>	19,951	20,303	20,785	21,277	974
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	26.3%	26.2%	26.2%	26.1%	-0.1%
Female	73.7%	73.8%	73.8%	73.9%	0.1%
<b>Race</b>					
White	70.1%	69.3%	68.2%	67.6%	-1.7%
African-American	18.4%	18.6%	18.8%	18.7%	0.1%
Asian-American	4.6%	4.9%	5.3%	5.7%	0.8%
American Indian	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%
Hispanic	6.5%	6.8%	7.3%	7.6%	0.8%
<b>Age</b>					
Under 20	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	-0.1%
20-29 years	13.4%	14.1%	14.2%	14.5%	0.4%
30-39 years	20.5%	20.6%	20.9%	20.8%	0.2%
40-49 years	27.1%	26.9%	26.1%	25.7%	-1.2%
50-59 years	31.0%	30.4%	30.4%	30.2%	-0.2%
60+ years	7.9%	7.8%	8.3%	8.8%	1.0%

\*Due to inconsistent data collection dates between FY03 and FY04, trends track FY04-FY06.

Source: Personnel Management Review, April 2006 (PMR) © A213

*What have been the trends in the demographics of the MCPS workforce in recent years?*

- The MCPS workforce grew from 20,303 to 21,277 employees (4.9%) from FY04 to FY06.
- As a percent of the workforce, Whites decreased from 69.3 percent in FY04 to 67.6 percent in FY06, or by 1.7 percentage points. The percent of MCPS staff aged 60 or older increased from 7.8 percent of all employees in FY04 to 8.8 percent in FY06.

Table 6 provides workforce data for administrative positions and Table 5 provides this data for other professionals, teachers, support services staff, and paraeducators.

**Table 6: MCPS Demographic Profile by Administrative Position and Total Workforce, FY06**

	Administrators*	Principals	Assistant Principals	Student Support Specialists	Workforce
<b>Total Number</b>	685	193	218	32	21,277
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	39.3%	36.8%	41.3%	46.9%	26.1%
Female	60.7%	63.2%	58.7%	53.1%	73.9%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
White	63.9%	66.8%	52.3%	53.1%	67.6%
African American	30.1%	27.5%	42.2%	31.3%	18.7%
Asian American	2.3%	2.1%	1.4%	6.3%	5.7%
American Indian	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	6.3%	0.3%
Hispanic	3.4%	3.1%	4.1%	3.1%	7.6%
<b>Age</b>					
50+	52.7%	61.1%	36.3%	25.0%	39.0%

\*Includes principals, assistant principals, student support specialists, and other staff represented by MCAASP.

Source: PMR © A217, A229, A239, A246, A213

**Table 7: MCPS Demographic Profile by Non-Administrative Position and Total Workforce, FY06**

	Other Professionals	Teachers	Support Services*	Para-educators	Workforce
<b>Total Number</b>	440	11,209	8,942	2,374	21,277
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	17.7%	20.0%	33.2%	10.6%	26.1%
Female	82.3%	80.0%	66.8%	89.4%	73.9%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
White	72.5%	79.6%	52.7%	65.6%	67.6%
African American	18.0%	12.3%	25.9%	16.2%	18.7%
Asian American	2.7%	4.0%	8.4%	6.1%	5.7%
American Indian	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%
Hispanic	6.6%	3.9%	12.6%	11.6%	7.6%
<b>Age</b>					
50+	54.8%	31.6%	46.4%	—	39.0%

\*Includes paraeducators and other staff represented by SEIU.

Source: PMR © A252, A268, A278, A282, A213

*What is the demographic profile of the MCPS workforce overall and by position?*

- In FY06, MCPS had 21,277 employees by head count. Of these, 73.9 percent were female, and 26.1 percent were male.
- Over two-thirds of MCPS' workforce (67.6%) were White in FY06, while 18.7 percent were African American and the remaining 13.6 percent were Asian American, American Indian, and Hispanic. 39.0 percent of the MCPS workforce was at least 50 years old.
- In FY06, 79.6 percent of teachers were White, 12.3 percent were African American, and 8.1 percent were Asian American, American Indian, or Hispanic. Nearly one-third (31.6%) of teachers were at least 50 years old.

**b. Residency of the MCPS Workforce**

**Table 8: Residency of MCPS Staff, FY06**

Place of Residence	Percent
Montgomery County	73.7%
Frederick County	8.1%
Prince George's County	5.8%
Howard County	4.1%
Other Maryland Counties	4.1%
Other State*/District of Columbia	4.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*May include staff who have not completed a change of address.

Source: PMR © A214

*Where do MCPS staff members reside?*

- Nearly three-quarters (73.7%) of MCPS staff live in Montgomery County.
- Eight percent of MCPS staff reside in Frederick County, six percent live in Prince George's County, and four percent reside in Howard County.
- Only 4.2 percent of MCPS employees live outside of the State of Maryland in Virginia, Washington, D.C., West Virginia, Pennsylvania, or another state.

**c. Internal and External Hires for School-Based Administrative Positions**

**Table 9: Internal and External Hires for School-Based Administrative Positions, FY06**

Position	External Hires	Internal Hires	Total	% Internal Hires
New Principals	5	22	27	81.5%
New Assistant Principals	3	60	63	95.2%
New Student Support Specialists	1	15	16	93.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>91.5%</b>

Source: PMR © A235, A242, A248

*How frequently does MCPS hire internally for school-based administrative positions?*

- In FY06, MCPS hired 106 new principals, assistant principals, and student support specialists. Of these, 97, or 91.5 percent, were internal candidates.
- The rate of internal hires varies by administrative position, with the percent of internal hires being higher for new assistant principals and student support specialists at 94 to 95 percent compared to 82 percent for new principals.

**Category 2 - Staff Qualifications**

This subsection addresses questions of staff qualifications, including degree, type of certification, and years of experience. Data are presented for:

- a. Degree by Position
- b. Type of Certification by Positions
- c. Years of Experience by Position

**a. Degree by Position**

Table 10 describes the highest degree attained by position from FY03 to FY06.

**Table 10: Degree by Position, FY03-FY06**

	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY04-FY06 Change*
<b>Administrators</b>					
Bachelor's	4.8%	4.6%	4.7%	4.7%	0.1%
Master's and Above	94.8%	95.0%	94.9%	94.9%	-0.1%
<b>Other Professionals</b>					
Bachelor's	1.7%	1.5%	2.1%	2.0%	0.5%
Master's and Above	98.3%	98.5%	97.9%	98.0%	-0.5%
<b>Teachers</b>					
Bachelor's	19.5%	20.0%	19.0%	18.8%	-0.2%
Master's and Above	80.4%	79.9%	80.9%	81.1%	0.2%
<b>New Teachers</b>					
Bachelor's	46.2%	43.0%	42.0%	43.8%	0.8%
Master's and Above	53.8%	57.0%	57.9%	56.2%	-0.8%
<b>Paraeducators</b>					
Bachelor's	29.7%	30.6%	31.6%	34.4%	3.8%
Master's and Above	6.0%	6.1%	6.3%	5.9%	-0.2%

\*Due to inconsistent data collection dates between FY03 and FY04 for teachers and paraeducators, trends track FY04-FY06.

Source: PMR © A218, A253, A270, A261, A283

*What are the trends in degrees held by MCPS staff?*

- The percent of administrators and other professionals with at least a Master's degree or equivalent has been relatively steady from FY04 to FY06, ranging from 94.9 percent to 98.5 percent.
- The group most likely to hold a Bachelor's degree is "new teachers." In FY06, 43.8 percent of new teachers held a Bachelor's degree compared with 18.8 percent of all teachers and 34.4 percent of paraeducators.

**b. Type of Certification by Position**

**Table 11: Number of Employees and Type of Certification by Position,\* FY03-FY06**

	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY03-FY05 Change
<b>Principals, Assistant Principals, and Student Support Specialists</b>					
Number of Employees	406	413	421	443	15
Standard Professional Certificate	8.4%	9.7%	10.2%	9.3%	1.8%
Advanced Professional Certificate	91.6%	90.3%	89.8%	90.7%	-1.8%
<b>Other Professionals</b>					
Number of Employees	411	396	422	—	11
Standard Professional Certificate	9.0%	9.6%	11.8%	—	2.8%
Advanced Professional Certificate	81.5%	79.5%	78.0%	—	-3.5%
<b>Teachers</b>					
Number of Employees	10,632	10,731	10,841	—	209
Standard Professional Certificate	40.4%	35.8%	37.2%	—	-3.2%
Advanced Professional Certificate	52.8%	58.4%	56.6%	—	3.8%
<b>New Teachers</b>					
Number of Employees	1,086	940	1,079	—	-7
Standard Professional Certificate	60.7%	57.2%	59.5%	—	-1.2%
Advanced Professional Certificate	19.8%	16.1%	18.6%	—	-1.2%
<b>Title I Paraeducators</b>					
Number of Employees	—	190	175	202	—
Highly Qualified	—	80.5%	85.1%	96.0%	—
Not Highly Qualified	—	19.5%	14.9%	4.0%	—

\*Percent may not equal 100 due to other possible certifications or unknown certification.

Source: PMR © A233, A240, A247, A254, A275, A264, A285

*What types of certification are held by MCPS school-based administrators?*

- From FY03 to FY05, the percent of principals, assistant principals, and student support specialists with an Advanced Professional Certificate decreased by 1.8 percentage points, from 91.6 percent to 89.8 percent. However, in FY06 the percent increased to 90.7.

*What percent of new teachers held Standard or Advanced Professional Certificates?*

- From FY03 to FY05, about 80 percent of all new teachers held a Standard or Advanced Professional Certificate.

*What percent of Elementary School Title I paraeducators are highly qualified?*

- The percent of highly qualified paraeducators in Title I schools increased from 80.5 percent to 96.0 percent from FY04 to FY06.

c. Years of Experience by Position

Table 12: Years of Experience by Position,\* FY03-FY06

	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY03-FY06 Change
<b>Administrators**</b>					
Total Number	619	625	642	685	66
0.1-5.0 years	3.4%	3.0%	2.8%	3.6%	0.2%
25.1+ years	50.5%	49.9%	47.9%	43.8%	-6.7%
<b>Principals**</b>					
Total Number	188	190	191	193	5
0.1-5.0 years	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
25.1+ years	65.9%	63.2%	59.2%	54.0%	-11.9%
<b>Other Professionals**</b>					
Total Number	411	398	428	440	29
0.1-5.0 years	5.4%	4.5%	5.4%	5.7%	0.3%
25.1+ years	37.2%	41.0%	40.2%	39.3%	2.1%
<b>Teachers**</b>					
Total Number	10,632	10,804	10,974	11,209	577
0.1-5.0 years	29.1%	26.4%	25.8%	25.5%	-3.6%
25.1+ years	17.3%	17.5%	16.6%	16.3%	-1.0%
<b>New Teachers**</b>					
Total Number	984	777	960	1,136	152
0.1-5.0 years	73.3%	78.8%	74.4%	74.6%	1.3%
25.1+ years	0.5%	0.8%	1.3%	1.0%	0.5%
<b>Support Services</b>					
Total Number	8,289	8,476	8,742	8,942	653
0.1-5.0 years	33.9%	35.2%	35.3%	35.4%	1.5%
25.1+ years	11.1%	10.9%	11.0%	10.8%	-0.3%

\*Includes years worked at MCPS or another agency.

\*\*Distinct years of experience for teaching or administration are not available.

Source: PMR © A220, A232, A256, A272, A264, A280.

*How much experience do MCPS staff members have?*

- In FY06, 54 percent of principals had more than 25 years of experience.
- Experience levels varied by groups. In FY06, new teachers were the most likely to have five years or less of experience at 74.6 percent followed by support services staff at 35.4 percent, and teachers overall at 25.5 percent.

**Category 3 - Turnover and Eligibility for Retirement**

Subsection 3 provides an overview of turnover and retirement eligibility data for the MCPS workforce by:

- a. Years of MCPS Experience by Position
- b. Termination of New Teachers
- c. Turnover Data by Position
- d. Administrator Eligibility to Retire

**a. Years of MCPS Experience by Position**

Table 13 describes total years of MCPS professional experience for three positions from FY03 to FY06 as a proxy of staff retention. While this data is provided in five year increments from 0.1 to more than 40.1 years in the Staff Statistical Profile, it is summarized in two categories below: those with less than 10 years of experience with MCPS and those with more.

**Table 13: Years of Experience in MCPS by Position,\* FY03-FY06**

Position	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY03 - FY06 Change
<b>Administrators - MCAASP</b>					
0.1-10 years	38.1%	39.5%	39.3%	41.3%	3.2%
10.1+ years	61.9%	60.5%	60.7%	58.7%	-3.2%
<b>Other Professionals - 12-month MCEA</b>					
0.1-10 years	38.7%	36.9%	40.0%	41.8%	3.1%
10.1+ years	61.3%	63.1%	60.0%	58.2%	-3.1%
<b>Teachers - 10-month MCEA</b>					
0.1-10 years	61.9%	61.7%	62.4%	63.3%	1.4%
10.1+ years	38.1%	38.3%	37.6%	36.7%	-1.4%

\*Includes prior and continuous employment adjusted for long-term leave. Distinct years of experience for teaching or administration are not available.

Source: PMR © A219, A255, A271

*How much experience do MCAASP- and MCEA-represented employees have in MCPS?*

- In FY06, 58.7 percent of administrators and 58.2 percent of other professionals had more than ten years of experience at MCPS. Fewer teachers (36.7%) had over 10 years of experience in the school system.
- From FY03-FY06, the percent of administrators, other professionals, and teachers with over ten years of experience at MCPS has decreased. From FY03 to FY06, the percent of administrators dropped by 3.2 percentage points, other professionals by 3.1 percentage points, and teachers by 1.4 percentage points.

**b. Termination of New Teachers**

Table 14 describes the annual and cumulative termination rate for new teachers hired between FY94 and FY05. Termination reflects teachers who leave voluntarily or involuntarily but does not include retirement. The table also includes the total number of teachers hired annually.

**Table 14: Termination of New Teachers, FY94-FY05**

Hire Date	Number Hired	Percent of Cohort Terminating by Fiscal Year												Total
		94	95	96	97	98	99	00	01	02	03	04	05*	
FY94	594	5.9	5.6	5.1	4.4	4.9	4.4	3.0	2.2	3.0	2.2	2.2	1.9	44.6
FY95	657		4.6	4.0	5.8	3.7	3.5	4.4	5.5	4.9	2.4	2.3	1.4	42.3
FY96	557			6.3	7.9	7.7	4.8	3.6	3.2	2.7	3.1	3.8	1.8	44.9
FY97	667				6.7	7.9	6.1	5.5	5.1	6.0	3.4	4.0	2.7	47.7
FY98	816					6.7	7.1	7.1	3.4	5.4	3.3	3.4	2.2	38.7
FY99	1,221						9.7	7.9	3.0	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.4	35.4
FY00	1,241							11.6	6.4	7.4	4.5	5.2	3.2	38.4
FY01	1,258								9.1	8.9	7.1	6.4	5.7	37.2
FY02	1,275									12.5	7.8	6.6	5.7	32.7
FY03	1,094										12.1	7.6	8.3	28.0
FY04	945											9.8	11.7	21.6
FY05	1,117												9.2	9.2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11,442</b>													<b>33.5</b>

\*Data through October 15, 2005

Source: PMR © A267

*What is MCPS' termination rate for new teachers? What was the trend from FY94-FY05?*

- Of 11,442 teachers hired from FY94 to FY05, 33.5 percent had terminated employment with MCPS by October 15, 2005.
- The rate of termination for new teachers after one year increased from 6.7 percent in FY98 to 9.7 percent in FY99. The number of new hires increased by 50 percent, from 816 to 1,221, during the same time frame.

**c. Turnover Data by Position**

Tables 15 and 16 describe trends in turnover rate by position between FY02 and FY05 as well as reasons for turnover by position for FY05.

**Table 15: Turnover Rate by Position, FY02-FY05**

	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY02-FY05 Change
Administrators	12.6%	9.8%	8.4%	9.4%	-3.2%
Principals	16.1%	15.5%	10.4%	15.0%	-1.1%
Assistant Principals	25.9%	18.1%	21.8%	24.1%	-1.8%
Student Support Specialists	40.6%	52.9%	63.6%	59.4%	18.8%
Teachers	8.8%	7.3%	8.9%	8.6%	-0.2%
Support Services	8.7%	7.7%	8.1%	8.9%	0.2%
Paraeducators	12.4%	11.3%	10.9%	13.0%	0.6%

Source: PMR © A221, A234, A241, A249, A267, A281, A287

**Table 16: Reasons for Turnover by Position, FY05**

Position	Termination*	Retirement	Transfer/Promotion	Total Turnover
Administrators	2.6%	4.9%	1.8%	9.4%
Principals	1.0%	7.3%	6.7%	15.0%
Assistant Principals	5.0%	2.5%	16.6%	24.1%
Student Support Specialists	0.0%	0.0%	59.4%	59.4%
Teachers	5.5%	2.2%	0.9%	8.6%
Support Services	5.4%	2.9%	0.6%	8.9%
Paraeducators	5.9%	2.2%	4.8%	13.0%

\*Termination may be voluntary or involuntary.

Source: PMR © A221, A234, A241, A249, A267, A281, A287

*What is the turnover rate for selected MCPS positions? What are the reasons for turnover?*

- Turnover among teachers and support services staff was similar from FY02 to FY05, averaging 8.4 percent for both groups. In FY05, total turnover was 8.6 percent for teachers and 8.9 percent for support services. The same year, voluntary and involuntary termination accounted for about 64 percent of total teacher turnover and about 60 percent of total support services turnover.
- In FY05, turnover for principals and assistant principals was 15 and 24 percent, respectively. For assistant principals, transfers and promotions accounted for most of their turnover compared to retirement as a primary reason for principals. Turnover rates for student support specialists at 59.4% in FY05 were high by design as employees in this position either return to their classrooms or become assistant principals within four years.

**d. Administrator Eligibility to Retire**

Table 17 provides FY06 data on the number of administrators by type and the percents eligible to retire between 2006 and 2035.

**Table 17: Administrators Eligible to Retire between FY06-FY35**

	<b>Administrators</b>	<b>Principals</b>	<b>Assistant Principals</b>	<b>Student Support Specialists</b>
<b>FY06 Total Number</b>	579	170	192	27
<b>Percent Eligible to Retire by Years</b>				
<b>2006-2010</b>	23.5	30.0	15.1	14.8
<b>2011-2015</b>	22.5	24.7	16.1	11.1
<b>2016-2020</b>	17.1	18.2	13.5	3.7
<b>2021-2025</b>	13.6	14.1	16.1	11.1
<b>2026-2030</b>	15.9	11.2	27.1	44.4
<b>2031-2035</b>	7.4	1.8	12.0	14.8

\*Old Retirement Plan members are not included in the numbers above.

Source: PMR © A224, A236, A243, A250 and OLO calculations

*How many administrators and which types of administrators are eligible to retire within the next five to ten years?*

- In FY06, MCPS had a total of 579 administrators. Of this group, 24 percent are eligible to retire within five years; another 23 percent are eligible to retire within the next ten years.
- Eligibility for retirement varies by position. Nearly 55 percent of all principals can retire within the next 10 years compared to 31 percent of assistant principals and 26 percent of student support specialists.

**PAY INCREASES - MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE NOT AT MAXIMUM SALARY (1)**

vs.

**CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (CPI)**

Year	MCG GWA	MCG Service Increment (2)	Total MCG Pay Increase	CPI Change (3)	Difference MCG vs. CPI Change	Date of CPI Changes
<b>FY04-FY07 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>19.57%</u>	<u>10.01%</u>	<u>+9.56%</u>	
2005(FY06)	2.75%	3.5%	--	3.70%	--	11-04 - 11-05
2004(FY05)	2.00%	3.5%	--	3.6%	--	11-03 - 11-04
2003(FY04)	2.90% (5)	3.5%	--	2.4%	--	11-02 - 11-03
<b>FY00-FY03 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>29.59%</u>	<u>11.24%</u>	<u>+18.35%</u>	
2002(FY03)	3.50%	3.5%	--	2.8%	--	11-01 - 11-02
2001(FY02)	3.25%	3.5%	--	2.2%	--	11-00 - 11-01
2000(FY01)	3.00%	3.5%	--	3.3%	--	11-99 - 11-00
1999(FY00)	2.60%	3.5%	--	2.5%	--	11-98 - 11-99
<b>FY96-FY99 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>27.53%</u>	<u>7.79%</u>	<u>+19.74%</u>	
1998(FY99)	2.00%	3.5%	--	1.9%	--	11-97 - 11-98
1997(FY98)	2.70%	3.5%	--	0.5%	--	11-96 - 11-97
1996(FY97)	3.00%	3.5%	--	3.8%	--	11-95 - 11-96
1995(FY96)	3.00%	3.5%	--	1.4%	--	11-94 - 11-95
<b>FY92-FY95 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>18.19% (4)</u>	<u>10.48%</u>	<u>+7.71%</u>	11-91 - 11-94
<b>FY88-FY91 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>33.19%</u>	<u>22.46%</u>	<u>+10.73%</u>	11-87 - 11-90

(1) Excludes police and fire bargaining unit employees.

(2) Employees at the maximum of their assigned grade are not eligible for a service increment.

Approximately 29.3% of permanent employees (excluding police and fire bargaining unit employees) are at maximum as of December 2005.

(3) CPI(u) change (FY88-97) for all Urban Consumers, Washington, D.C., area. CPI(u) change (FY98 to date) all urban Consumers, Washington/Baltimore area.

(4) For FY94 employees received a \$250 lump sum payment (not added to base salary) in August 1993.

(Note: This amount is not included in the reported data.)

(5) Average of non-represented (2.0% effective 7/13/03) and MCGEO (3.75% effective 1/30/03) adjustments.

**PAY INCREASES - MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE AT MAXIMUM SALARY (1)**

vs.

**CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (CPI)**

Year	MCG GWA	MCG Service Increment (2)	Total MCG Pay Increase	CPI Change (3)	Difference MCG vs. CPI Change	Date of CPI Changes
<b>FY04-FY07 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>7.84%</u>	<u>10.01%</u>	<u>-2.17%</u>	
2005(FY06)	2.75%	0.0%	--	3.7%	--	11-04 - 11-05
2004(FY05)	2.00%	0.0%	--	3.6%	--	11-03 - 11-04
2003(FY04)	2.90% (5)	0.0%	--	2.4%	--	11-02 - 11-03
<b>FY00-FY03 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>12.93%</u>	<u>11.24%</u>	<u>+1.69%</u>	
2002(FY03)	3.50%	0.0%	--	2.8%	--	11-01 - 11-02
2001(FY02)	3.25%	0.0%	--	2.2%	--	11-00 - 11-01
2000(FY01)	3.00%	0.0%	--	3.3%	--	11-99 - 11-00
1999(FY00)	2.60%	0.0%	--	2.5%	--	11-98 - 11-99
<b>FY96-FY99 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>11.13%</u>	<u>7.79%</u>	<u>+3.34%</u>	
1998(FY99)	2.00%	0.0%	--	1.9%	--	11-97 - 11-98
1997(FY98)	2.70%	0.0%	--	0.5%	--	11-96 - 11-97
1996(FY97)	3.00%	0.0%	--	3.8%	--	11-95 - 11-96
1995(FY96)	3.00%	0.0%	--	1.4%	--	11-94 - 11-95
<b>FY92-FY95 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>3.0% (4)</u>	<u>10.48%</u>	<u>-7.48%</u>	11-91 - 11-94
<b>FY88-FY91 Compounded Change:</b>						
			<u>24.73%</u>	<u>22.46%</u>	<u>+2.27%</u>	11-87 - 11-90

(1) Excludes police and fire bargaining unit employees.

(2) Employees at the maximum of their assigned grade are not eligible for a service increment. Approximately 29.3% of permanent employees (excluding police and fire bargaining unit employees) are at maximum as of December 2005.

(3) CPI(u) change (FY88-97) for all Urban Consumers, Washington, D.C., area. CPI(u) change (FY98 to date) all urban Consumers, Washington/Baltimore area.

(4) For FY 94 employees received a \$250 lump sum payment (not added to base salary) in August 1993. (Note: This amount is not included in the reported data.)

(5) Average of non-represented (2.0% effective 7/13/03) and MCGEO (3.75% effective 1/30/03) adjustments.

24

**PAY INCREASES - MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE NOT AT MAXIMUM SALARY (1)**

**vs.  
PRIVATE SECTOR**

YEAR	MCG GWA	MCG Service Increment (2)	Total MCG Pay Increase	Private Sector Pay Increase (3)	Difference MCG vs. Private Sector
<b>FY04-FY07 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>19.57%</u>	<u>10.87%</u>	<u>+8.70%</u>
2005(FY06)	2.75%	3.5%	--	3.65%	--
2004(FY05)	2.00%	3.5%	--	3.45%	--
2003(FY04)	2.90% (5)	3.5%	--	3.40%	--
<b>FY00-FY03 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>29.59%</u>	<u>18.23%</u>	<u>+11.36</u>
2002(FY03)	3.50%	3.5%	--	3.75%	--
2001(FY02)	3.25%	3.5%	--	4.55%	--
2000(FY01)	3.00%	3.5%	--	4.45%	--
1999(FY00)	2.60%	3.5%	--	4.35%	--
<b>FY96-FY99 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>27.53%</u>	<u>17.38%</u>	<u>+10.15%</u>
1998(FY99)	2.00%	3.5%	--	4.25%	--
1997(FY98)	2.70%	3.5%	--	4.20%	--
1996(FY97)	3.00%	3.5%	--	4.00%	--
1995(FY96)	3.00%	3.5%	--	3.90%	--
<b>FY92-FY95 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>18.19% (4)</u>	<u>19.07%</u>	<u>-0.88%</u>
<b>FY88-FY91 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>33.19%</u>	<u>23.76%</u>	<u>+9.43%</u>

(1) Excludes police and fire bargaining unit employees.

(2) Employees at the maximum of their assigned grade are not eligible for a service increment. Approximately 29.3% of permanent employees (excluding police and fire bargaining unit employees) are at maximum as of December 2005.

(3) Source: World At Work Salary Budget Survey.

Pay increase is average for non-exempt employees and exempt employees in Eastern Region and includes cost-of-living adjustments, general wage increases, and merit raises.

(4) For FY 94 employees received a \$250 lump sum payment (not added to base salary) in August 1993. (Note: This amount is not included in the reported data.)

(5) Average of non-represented (2.0% effective 7/13/03) and MCGEO (3.75% effective 11/30/03) adjustments

25

**PAY INCREASES - MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE AT MAXIMUM SALARY (1)**

vs.

**PRIVATE SECTOR**

YEAR	MCG Amount of COLA %	MCG Service Increment % (2)	Total MCG Pay Increase%	Private Sector Pay Increase (3)	Difference MCG vs. Private Sector
<b>FY04-FY07 Compounded Change:</b>					
2005(FY06)	2.75%	0.0%	<u>7.84%</u>	<u>10.87%</u>	<u>-3.03%</u>
2004(FY05)	2.00%	0.0%	--	3.65%	--
2003(FY04)	2.90% (5)	0.0%	--	3.45%	--
				3.40%	--
<b>FY00-FY03 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>12.93%</u>	<u>18.23%</u>	<u>-5.30%</u>
2002(FY03)	3.5%	0.0%	--	3.75%	--
2001(FY02)	3.25%	0.0%	--	4.55%	--
2000(FY01)	3.0%	0.0%	--	4.45%	--
1999(FY00)	2.6%	0.0%	--	4.35%	--
<b>FY96-FY99 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>11.13%</u>	<u>17.38%</u>	<u>-6.25%</u>
1998(FY99)	2.0%	0.0%	--	4.25%	--
1997(FY98)	2.7%	0.0%	--	4.20%	--
1996(FY97)	3.0%	0.0%	--	4.00%	--
1995(FY96)	3.0%	0.0%	--	3.90%	--
<b>FY92-FY95 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>3.00% (4)</u>	<u>19.07%</u>	<u>-16.07%</u>
<b>FY88-FY91 Compounded Change:</b>					
			<u>24.73%</u>	<u>23.76%</u>	<u>+0.97%</u>

(1) Does not include police and fire bargaining unit employees.

(2) Employees at the maximum of their assigned grade are not eligible for a service increment. Approximately 29.3% of permanent employees (excluding police and fire bargaining unit employees) are at maximum as of December 2005.

(3) Source: World At Work Salary Budget Survey. Percent increase is the average for non-exempt salaried and exempt employees (Eastern Region) and includes all salary increases (e.g., COLA, general wage increases and merit raises.)

(4) For FY 94 employees received a \$250 lump sum payment (not added to base salary) in August 1993. (Note: This amount is not included in the reported data.)

(5) Average of non-represented (2.0% effective 7/13/03) and MCGEO (3.75% effective 11/30/03) adjustments.

26

**ELIGIBILITY OF PERMANENT EMPLOYEES FOR SERVICE INCREMENT  
(If at Maximum Salary, NOT Eligible; If Not at Maximum Salary, Eligible)**

Bargaining Unit	Number	Percent	At Maximum	Not at Maximum	TOTAL
Police Bargaining Unit (FOP)	364	34.4%	694	65.6%	1058 100%
Fire Bargaining Unit (IAFF)	434	45.8%	513	54.2%	947 100%
MCGEO, UFCW Local 1994	1252	28.7%	3111	71.3%	4363 100%
Eligible at Permanent Status (Local 1994 and IAFF)	17	4.5%	365	95.5%	382 100%
<b>Total Represented</b>	<b>2067</b>	<b>30.6%</b>	<b>4683</b>	<b>69.4%</b>	<b>6750</b> <b>100%</b>
<b>Total Unrepresented (1)</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>1159</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>1679</b> <b>100%</b>
<b>ALL EMPLOYEES</b>	<b>2587</b>	<b>30.7%</b>	<b>5842</b>	<b>69.3%</b>	<b>8429</b> <b>100%</b>

(1) Includes employees in the Management Leadership Service who are not eligible to receive service increments, but may receive performance based pay.

27

**COMPARISON OF SALARIES FOR MIDDLE MANAGEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS  
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT VS. MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT**

<u>FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (1)</u> <u>Effective January 2006</u>		<u>MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT (2)</u> <u>Effective July 2005</u>						
<u>Federal Grade</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>MCG Grade</u>	<u># Permanent FT Emp.</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum (2)</u>	<u>% Diff. At Min</u>	<u>% Diff. At Max</u>
GS-11	\$54,272	\$70,558	21	343	\$41,594	\$68,772	-30.5%	-2.6%
GS-12	\$65,048	\$84,559	23	495	\$45,635	\$75,589	-42.5%	-11.9%
			24	317	\$47,808	\$79,244	-36.1%	-6.7%
			25	359	\$50,088	\$83,091	-29.9%	-1.8%
GS-13	\$77,353	\$100,554	24	317	\$47,808	\$79,244	-61.8%	-26.9%
			25	359	\$50,088	\$83,091	-54.4%	-21.0%
			26	105	\$52,488	\$87,132	-47.4%	-15.4%
			27	42	\$54,984	\$91,373	-40.7%	-10.0%
			M3	231	\$56,085	\$102,512	-37.9%	1.9%
GS-14	\$91,407	\$118,828	28	86	\$57,455	\$95,826	-59.1%	-24.0%
			29	3	\$60,046	\$100,500	-52.2%	-18.2%
			31	1	\$65,632	\$110,568	-39.3%	-7.5%
			M2	85	\$65,283	\$118,513	-40.0%	-0.3%
GS-15	\$107,521	\$139,774	M2	85	\$65,283	\$118,513	-64.7%	-17.9%
			M1	22	\$74,656	\$132,599	-44.0%	-5.4%

(1) Locality Pay for Washington - Baltimore (DC-MD-VA-WV and St. Marys County-MD)  
(2) Does not include longevity

**FY '06 SALARY RANGE COMPARISON  
WASHINGTON-BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN REGION vs MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT  
HUMAN RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA  
2005 SURVEY**

Human Resources Association (HRA) Job Title	Montgomery County Government (MCG) Job Title	MCG Range		HRA Avg. Range		% Change Req. to Reach HRA Avg. Minimum		% Dif. Bet. MCG & HRA Minimum		HRA Range		% Change Req. to Reach HRA Avg. Maximum		% Dif. Bet. MCG & HRA Maximum	
		Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Computer Oper. I	IT Technician I	\$30,499	\$27,400	\$27,400	\$27,400	-10.2%	-10.2%	11.3%	11.3%	\$49,556	\$45,000	-9.2%	-9.2%	10.1%	10.1%
Computer Oper. II	IT Technician II	\$33,129	\$29,500	\$29,500	\$29,500	-11.0%	-11.0%	12.3%	12.3%	\$54,392	\$49,200	-9.5%	-9.5%	10.6%	10.6%
Analyst/Developer III	IT Specialist III	\$52,488	\$57,200	\$57,200	\$57,200	9.0%	9.0%	-8.2%	-8.2%	\$87,132	\$92,800	6.5%	6.5%	-8.1%	-8.1%
Analyst/Developer IV	Sr. IT Specialist	\$57,455	\$64,800	\$64,800	\$64,800	12.8%	12.8%	-11.3%	-11.3%	\$95,826	\$104,900	9.5%	9.5%	-8.7%	-8.7%
Sr. Systems Analyst-Designer	Sr. IT Specialist	\$57,455	\$66,200	\$66,200	\$66,200	15.2%	15.2%	-13.2%	-13.2%	\$95,826	\$116,300	21.4%	21.4%	-17.6%	-17.6%
Sr. PC Network Supp. Spec.	IT Specialist I	\$39,711	\$44,700	\$44,700	\$44,700	12.6%	12.6%	-11.2%	-11.2%	\$65,610	\$74,900	14.2%	14.2%	-12.4%	-12.4%
Sr. Computer Sys. Admin.	Sr. IT Specialist	\$37,455	\$50,300	\$50,300	\$50,300	-12.5%	-12.5%	14.2%	14.2%	\$95,826	\$87,200	-9.0%	-9.0%	9.9%	9.9%
Accounting Clerk I	Principal Admin. Aide	\$29,281	\$23,800	\$23,800	\$23,800	-11.9%	-11.9%	13.5%	13.5%	\$47,302	\$40,400	-14.6%	-14.6%	17.1%	17.1%
Accounting Clerk II	Office Services Coordinator	\$33,129	\$27,600	\$27,600	\$27,600	-16.7%	-16.7%	20.0%	20.0%	\$54,392	\$44,400	-18.4%	-18.4%	22.5%	22.5%
Accounting Clerk III	Fiscal Assistant	\$33,129	\$29,400	\$29,400	\$29,400	-11.3%	-11.3%	12.7%	12.7%	\$54,392	\$46,000	-15.4%	-15.4%	18.2%	18.2%
Payroll Clerk	Office Services Coord.	\$33,129	\$30,200	\$30,200	\$30,200	-8.8%	-8.8%	9.7%	9.7%	\$54,392	\$48,800	-10.3%	-10.3%	11.5%	11.5%
Accountant I	Accountant I	\$36,219	\$33,000	\$33,000	\$33,000	-3.4%	-3.4%	3.5%	3.5%	\$59,730	\$54,700	-8.4%	-8.4%	9.2%	9.2%
Accountant III	Accountant III	\$45,635	\$45,100	\$45,100	\$45,100	-1.2%	-1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	\$75,589	\$72,900	-3.6%	-3.6%	3.7%	3.7%
Budget Analyst	Mgmt. & Budget Spec. II	\$43,563	\$41,100	\$41,100	\$41,100	-5.7%	-5.7%	6.0%	6.0%	\$72,095	\$71,700	-0.5%	-0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
Senior Budget Analyst	Sr. Mgmt. & Budget Spec.	\$54,984	\$47,300	\$47,300	\$47,300	-14.0%	-14.0%	16.2%	16.2%	\$91,373	\$84,200	-7.9%	-7.9%	8.5%	8.5%
Buyer/Estimator	Procurement Spec. II	\$43,563	\$38,100	\$38,100	\$38,100	-12.5%	-12.5%	14.3%	14.3%	\$72,095	\$69,500	-3.6%	-3.6%	3.7%	3.7%
Sr. Benefits Specialist	Human Resources Spec. III	\$50,088	\$44,200	\$44,200	\$44,200	-11.8%	-11.8%	13.3%	13.3%	\$83,091	\$72,800	-12.4%	-12.4%	14.1%	14.1%
Human Resources Mgr.	Manager III	\$56,085	\$58,400	\$58,400	\$58,400	4.1%	4.1%	-4.0%	-4.0%	\$102,512	\$102,700	0.2%	0.2%	-0.2%	-0.2%
Library Assistant	Library Assistant I	\$29,281	\$23,500	\$23,500	\$23,500	-19.7%	-19.7%	24.6%	24.6%	\$47,302	\$37,600	-20.5%	-20.5%	25.8%	25.8%
Custodian	Blgd. Svc. Wkr. II	\$24,026	\$19,700	\$19,700	\$19,700	-18.0%	-18.0%	22.0%	22.0%	\$37,608	\$34,700	-7.7%	-7.7%	8.4%	8.4%
Mail Clerk	Mail Clerk	\$27,027	\$22,400	\$22,400	\$22,400	-17.1%	-17.1%	20.7%	20.7%	\$43,124	\$35,100	-18.6%	-18.6%	22.9%	22.9%
Mail Clerk Supvr.	Mail Services Supervisor	\$34,632	\$30,800	\$30,800	\$30,800	-11.1%	-11.1%	12.4%	12.4%	\$56,996	\$49,500	-13.2%	-13.2%	15.1%	15.1%
Security Guard I	Security Officer I	\$31,771	\$21,700	\$21,700	\$21,700	-31.7%	-31.7%	46.4%	46.4%	\$31,911	\$33,600	5.4%	5.4%	-2.7%	-2.7%
Sec./Admin. Asst. I	Security Officer III (L.T.)	\$45,635	\$32,200	\$32,200	\$32,200	-29.4%	-29.4%	41.7%	41.7%	\$75,589	\$48,800	-35.4%	-35.4%	54.9%	54.9%
Sec./Admin. Asst. II	Administrative Aide	\$28,122	\$24,400	\$24,400	\$24,400	-13.2%	-13.2%	15.3%	15.3%	\$45,162	\$39,200	-13.2%	-13.2%	15.2%	15.2%
Sec./Admin. Asst. III	Principal Admin. Aide	\$29,281	\$27,600	\$27,600	\$27,600	-5.7%	-5.7%	6.1%	6.1%	\$47,302	\$45,800	-3.2%	-3.2%	3.3%	3.3%
Executive Asst./Secretary	Office Services Coordinator	\$33,129	\$32,400	\$32,400	\$32,400	-2.2%	-2.2%	2.3%	2.3%	\$54,392	\$51,600	-5.1%	-5.1%	5.4%	5.4%
Sec./Admin. Asst. III	Senior Executive Admin. Aide	\$36,219	\$36,400	\$36,400	\$36,400	0.5%	0.5%	-0.5%	-0.5%	\$59,730	\$61,400	2.8%	2.8%	-2.7%	-2.7%
Admin Asst./Secretary to the Chief Exec.	Exec. Admin. Aide to CAO	\$39,711	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$44,000	10.8%	10.8%	-9.7%	-9.7%	\$65,610	\$68,900	5.0%	5.0%	-4.8%	-4.8%
Office Manager	Administrative Specialist II	\$50,088	\$42,500	\$42,500	\$42,500	-15.1%	-15.1%	17.9%	17.9%	\$83,091	\$80,600	-3.0%	-3.0%	3.1%	3.1%
Public Relations Rep.	Public Information Officer II	\$37,928	\$38,900	\$38,900	\$38,900	2.6%	2.6%	-2.5%	-2.5%	\$62,597	\$65,500	4.6%	4.6%	-4.4%	-4.4%
Graphic Designer	Graphics Artist II	\$33,129	\$41,600	\$41,600	\$41,600	25.6%	25.6%	-20.4%	-20.4%	\$54,392	\$64,600	18.8%	18.8%	-15.6%	-15.6%
Legal Secretary	Legal Secretary II	\$45,635	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	-12.3%	-12.3%	14.1%	14.1%	\$75,589	\$69,000	-8.7%	-8.7%	9.5%	9.5%
Sr. Legal Asst./Paralegal	Paralegal Specialist	\$54,984	\$71,900	\$71,900	\$71,900	30.8%	30.8%	-23.5%	-23.5%	\$91,373	\$119,700	31.0%	31.0%	-23.7%	-23.7%
Attorney II	Asst. County Attorney II	\$68,632	\$79,100	\$79,100	\$79,100	15.3%	15.3%	-13.2%	-13.2%	\$113,953	\$139,100	22.1%	22.1%	-18.1%	-18.1%
Attorney III	Asst. County Atty. III	\$45,635	\$38,400	\$38,400	\$38,400	-15.9%	-15.9%	18.8%	18.8%	\$75,589	\$63,200	-16.4%	-16.4%	19.6%	19.6%
Social Worker	Community Health Nurse II	\$50,088	\$38,400	\$38,400	\$38,400	-24.0%	-24.0%	30.4%	30.4%	\$75,589	\$84,300	11.5%	11.5%	-10.3%	-10.3%
Staff Nurse (RN)	Nurse Practitioner	\$45,635	\$44,100	\$44,100	\$44,100	16.6%	16.6%	-14.2%	-14.2%	\$83,091	\$98,200	18.2%	18.2%	-15.4%	-15.4%
Nurse Practitioner	Community Health Nurse II	\$50,088	\$38,400	\$38,400	\$38,400	-24.0%	-24.0%	30.4%	30.4%	\$75,589	\$84,300	11.5%	11.5%	-10.3%	-10.3%
Occupational Health Nurse	Community Health Nurse II	\$45,635	\$44,900	\$44,900	\$44,900	-1.6%	-1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	\$75,589	\$76,300	0.9%	0.9%	-0.9%	-0.9%
Marketing Coordinator	Transit Mktng. Specialist	\$41,594	\$38,000	\$38,000	\$38,000	-8.6%	-8.6%	9.5%	9.5%	\$68,772	\$65,600	-4.6%	-4.6%	4.8%	4.8%
Laborer (Heavy)	Public Service Worker II	\$24,974	\$23,400	\$23,400	\$23,400	-6.3%	-6.3%	6.7%	6.7%	\$39,330	\$38,100	-3.1%	-3.1%	3.2%	3.2%
Equipment Operator	Equipment Operator III	\$33,129	\$28,400	\$28,400	\$28,400	-14.3%	-14.3%	16.7%	16.7%	\$54,392	\$46,900	-13.8%	-13.8%	16.0%	16.0%

Avg % Change FY05: -4.80%  
Avg % Difference FY05: 7.04%

Avg % Change FY06: -3.72%  
Avg % Difference FY06: 6.10%

NOTES:  
o 2005 HRA Compensation Survey Report includes data on 311 survey jobs from 347 participating employers (including Mont. Co. Govt.) in the Washington-Baltimore Consolidate Metropolitan Statistical Area. The survey provides useful data on current salaries in the area but is not a reliable measure of salary changes over time, as survey participants, jobs, and job matches change from year to year.



FY '06 MAXIMUM SALARY COMPARISONS  
SELECTED LOCAL JURISDICTIONS - SELECTED CLASSES  
(IN THOUSANDS)

MCG TITLE	MONT CO GOVT GRADE	ALEX CITY GOVT	ANNE AR CO GOVT	ARL CO GOVT	BALT CITY GOVT	BALT GOVT	FAIR CO GOVT	HOWARD CO GOVT	MNCPPC GOVT	PG CO	WSSC GOVT	MONT CO		MCG Vs MEDIAN
												GOVT	MEDIAN	
ACCOUNTANT/AUDITOR III	23	76.1	60.4	74.4	44.8	50.3	77.0	67.1	69.2	85.0	70.8	66.1	75.9	10.2%
BUILDING SERVICE WORKER II	8	34.4	29.7	35.4	24.9	35.1			40.6	34.5	38.5	34.8	37.6	7.5%
CARPENTER I	17	51.8	49.3	49.3	28.5	50.7		49.6	54.0	45.7	58.9	49.6	57.0	13.0%
COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSE II	23	76.1	69.0	79.5	50.3	70.0			80.8	63.9	80.8	69.0	75.6	14.0%
CORRECTION SHIFT COMMANDER- LT	24	79.9	69.0	79.5	48.2	69.7		67.1		52.7	69.0	59.4	51.9	12.9%
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER I	15	62.6	34.5	64.3	42.2	63.3		49.6		55.3	55.3	55.3	59.7	-14.3%
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER III	18	62.2	30.8	44.1	27.4	46.2		32.8		37.9	41.2	37.9	41.2	7.4%
DATA ENTRY OPERATOR II	10	41.2	30.8	44.1	27.4	46.2		32.8		37.9	41.2	37.9	41.2	8.0%
ELECTRICIAN I	18	72.5	79.3	74.4	31.5	53.0		56.2		45.7	52.8	52.9	59.7	11.4%
ENGINEER III	25	51.8	54.2	54.2	51.8	77.0		82.4		71.7	86.1	75.7	83.1	8.9%
ENGINEER TECHNICIAN II	18	51.8	54.2	54.2	51.8	77.0		82.4		71.7	86.1	75.7	83.1	8.9%
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	14	43.1	38.2	39.8	26.7	29.3		39.7		56.1	58.9	54.2	59.7	8.2%
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III	16	51.8	41.9	49.3	32.7	38.6		48.1		41.6	47.4	40.7	49.6	17.9%
FIRE/RESCUER LIEUTENANT	81	79.9	74.2	84.7	53.5	60.4		78.0		45.7	47.2	46.7	54.4	14.2%
FIREFIGHTER//RESCUER I	F1	62.8	59.0	35.5	45.5	43.0		35.0		62.2	78.0	45.5	58.1	-0.6%
FIREFIGHTER//RESCUER III	F3	65.8	60.9	59.4	46.6	50.8		64.2		69.1	62.5	62.5	58.1	21.7%
FISCAL ASSISTANT	16	43.1	39.1	44.1	27.4	31.7		40.2		39.9	49.9	41.8	54.4	2.5%
HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR II	21	65.8	48.6	68.2	35.3	44.0		54.7		52.7	62.2	54.7	88.8	23.4%
HUMAN RESOURCE SPECIALIST III	25	76.1	85.4	76.8	47.7	50.3		74.3		65.0	75.6	75.0	83.1	20.4%
HVAC MECHANIC I	18	56.8	68.3	31.5	42.1	60.9		56.2		89.2	58.9	56.2	59.7	9.8%
IT SPECIALIST III (LGPA Title: Autm Sysrms Spcl)	28	78.1	85.4	81.8	47.7	46.0		60.6		75.2	58.9	75.7	87.1	5.9%
IT SPECIALIST III (LGPA Title: Pgr Anal - Jmy Lvl)	28	83.9	79.3	77.2	48.1	52.5		74.3		65.0	66.4	72.6	87.1	13.1%
IT TECHNICIAN II	16	49.4	51.7	37.1	34.9	49.4		49.4		66.4	58.9	49.4	54.4	16.7%
LIBRARIAN I	21	60.0	69.2	44.1	56.0	63.7		61.0		56.6	68.1	60.5	68.8	9.1%
MANAGEMENT & BUDGET SPECIALIST III	25	76.1	91.9	76.8	62.7	63.4		67.1		65.0	75.6	60.5	68.8	12.0%
MECHANIC II	18	59.6	41.9	56.9	33.9	42.1		56.2		65.0	58.9	76.5	83.1	8.0%
OFFICE CLERK	5	37.6	30.8	35.4	25.4	26.5		32.8		52.7	58.9	55.1	59.7	7.7%
PERMIT SERVICES INSPECTOR III	23	59.6	48.6	69.2	35.8	40.0		54.7		34.5	35.1	34.8	33.1	-5.0%
PLANNING SPECIALIST III	23	76.1	73.6	74.4	51.8	50.3		67.1		52.7	53.7	53.7	75.6	28.9%
POLICE OFFICER I	P2	62.6	64.1	64.3	46.5	63.0		39.7		69.2	55.7	68.1	75.6	9.9%
POLICE SERGEANT	A1	79.9	75.0	84.7	69.3	61.9		39.7		57.6	62.2	62.6	65.4	4.2%
POLICE TELECOMMUNICATOR III	19	54.2	41.9	54.2	38.7	36.5		75.0		77.0	82.2	73.2	83.3	12.0%
PRINCIPAL ADMIN AIDE	13	49.4	33.9	49.3	27.4	34.9		49.4		60.3	54.0	54.0	62.6	13.7%
PRINTING TECHNICIAN II	15	49.4	54.2	54.2	34.2	34.9		40.2		61.0	52.7	47.3	47.3	-0.1%
PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST II	22	43.8	54.7	79.5	42.2	50.3		60.6		48.5	47.2	49.4	51.9	4.9%
PUBLIC SERVICE WORKER II	9	39.4	31.2	35.4	24.3	24.8		34.3		53.5	70.8	57.7	72.1	20.0%
RECREATION SPECIALIST	21	79.9	73.6	64.3	44.1	50.3		54.7		38.1	35.4	35.4	39.3	9.8%
SOCIAL WORKER II	23	79.9	74.4	74.4	48.1	54.7		67.1		66.9	65.6	65.6	68.8	4.6%
THERAPIST II	24	65.8	74.4	74.4	54.7	70.0		67.1		60.8	67.1	67.1	75.6	11.2%
										81.0	72.2	72.2	79.2	8.9%

NOTES:  
o Salary data from local sources, including FY 2006 Local Government Personnel Association Salary Survey. Survey includes data from 36 public sector organizations in the national capital area. 40 of 88 non-school jobs have been matched.  
o Median salary does not include Montgomery County (MCG).  
o The percent difference between MCG Vs Median is calculated by dividing dollar difference between MCG salary and median by the MCG salary.  
o MNCPPC = Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission  
WSSC = Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission

PERCENT DIFFERENCE FROM MEDIAN SALARY  
 FY 08 MINIMUM SALARY COMPARISONS  
 SELECTED LOCAL JURISDICTIONS - SELECTED CLASSES

MCG TITLE	MONT CO GOVT GRADE	MEDIAN	ALEX CITY GOVT		ANNE ARCO GOVT		ARL CO GOVT		BALT CITY GOVT		BALT CO GOVT		FAIR CO GOVT		HOWARD CO GOVT		MNCPPC		MONT CO GOVT (MCG)		PG CO GOVT		WSSC
			GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	
ACCOUNTANT/AUDITOR III	23	43.3	6.3%	-8.0%	3.9%	-15.5%	-6.8%	8.8%	5.1%	0.0%	5.4%	-14.8%	-3.3%										
BUILDING SERVICE WORKER II	8	23.3	8.4%	-5.2%	0.0%	-7.9%	-9.6%	3.8%	3.1%	3.8%	3.1%	2.9%	-3.8%										
CARPENTER I	17	31.5	-0.6%			-18.0%	-2.9%	7.4%	5.9%		10.0%	0.6%	10.4%										
COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSE II	23	42.0	9.5%	-8.8%	-0.3%	12.1%	-4.0%	0.0%	-1.8%		8.7%	-7.7%	18.5%										
CORRECTION SHIFT COMMANDER- LT	24	46.3	4.3%								-8.1%	-9.9%	-9.8%										
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER I	15	34.6	9.5%								0.0%	-9.8%	-9.8%										
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER III	18	36.2	4.5%								10.6%	5.5%	-1.1%										
DATA ENTRY OPERATOR II	10	24.6	1.1%	-6.0%	8.4%	-3.7%	-5.4%	12.6%	-9.9%	0.0%	5.5%	-1.1%	-10.5%										
ELECTRICIAN I	18	32.8	0.0%			-14.2%	1.6%	-3.0%	15.3%	0.0%	10.4%	-3.4%	-4.2%										
ENGINEER III	25	49.0	-10.6%	0.3%	-8.2%	-12.9%	2.7%	-5.7%	13.9%	0.0%	2.2%	-17.1%	1.8%										
ENGINEER TECHNICIAN II	18	34.1	-8.1%	-2.9%	-3.7%	1.8%	2.4%	-2.1%	-1.8%	12.1%	6.3%	-6.5%	1.8%										
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	14	27.7	-6.0%			-10.7%	-13.5%	0.0%	1.6%	8.8%	10.1%	4.1%	0.1%										
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III	18	31.1	0.7%	0.4%	-4.1%	-8.5%	-5.8%	-2.1%	0.0%	8.8%	6.8%	2.0%	-10.9%										
FIRE/RESCUER LEUTENANT	B1	47.9	8.8%	-7.5%	8.9%	-8.5%	-6.6%	9.1%	11.5%		0.0%	-2.8%											
FIREFIGHTER/RESCUER I	F1	34.8	8.9%	-5.0%	2.2%	-17.5%	-9.3%		-2.2%		3.3%	5.5%											
FIREFIGHTER/RESCUER III	F3	38.4	3.4%	-9.8%	-2.8%	-25.2%	-1.1%	12.8%	2.1%	24.1%	3.0%	0.0%											
FISCAL ASSISTANT	26	27.2	-4.4%	7.6%	-2.1%	-13.0%	-7.0%	1.7%	0.0%		21.8%	21.6%	7.5%										
HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR II	18	36.9	7.8%	-1.9%	13.6%	-20.1%	-5.4%	8.8%	0.5%	-5.9%	12.8%	-1.1%	-0.5%										
HUMAN RESOURCE SPECIALIST III	25	46.0	0.0%	15.2%	0.3%	-17.2%	-12.3%	0.5%	9.5%	-2.0%	5.0%	-8.1%	0.5%										
HVAC MECHANIC I	18	34.5	-0.5%			-18.4%	-3.4%	5.9%	-10.8%	11.9%	14.1%	-7.2%											
IT SPECIALIST III (LGPA Title: Autm Systems Spclt)	28	48.0	0.0%	15.2%	7.8%	-17.2%	-20.3%		9.4%	-1.3%	14.0%	-19.9%	-14.9%										
IT SPECIALIST III (LGPA Title: Prog Anal - Jrmv Lvl)	26	46.1	10.1%	8.6%	1.3%	-14.4%	-8.5%		3.8%	9.9%	2.9%	7.7%											
IT TECHNICIAN II	16	32.2	-2.2%	-2.9%	-2.9%	-4.8%	-14.3%				8.9%												
LIBRARIAN I	21	38.2	-2.9%	9.7%	9.7%	-5.3%	-5.4%	0.2%			8.9%												
MANAGEMENT & BUDGET SPECIALIST III	25	46.2	-0.4%	23.5%	-0.1%	11.1%	15.9%	0.1%	-1.5%	6.2%	6.2%	-20.2%	-20.2%										
MECHANIC II	18	34.4	4.7%	-9.4%	0.0%	-12.7%	-3.2%	-3.2%	9.8%	-1.8%	5.2%	5.9%	0.9%										
OFFICE CLERK	5	22.3	12.6%	3.9%	4.6%	0.0%	-2.3%	3.5%	-0.5%	8.8%	-3.8%	-12.2%	-8.6%										
PERMIT SERVICES INSPECTOR III	23	35.7	-1.7%	-1.3%	14.3%	-19.6%	0.0%	4.3%	1.1%	8.8%	24.5%	-0.5%											
PLANNING SPECIALIST III	23	45.2	1.7%	1.0%	-0.8%	-5.6%	-10.8%	2.2%	0.8%	-4.3%	0.9%	-16.5%											
POLICE OFFICER I	P2	38.2	-0.8%	-1.3%	1.9%	-3.4%	-2.8%	11.7%	1.9%		5.8%	0.8%	-14.1%										
POLICE SERGEANT	A1	51.4	-6.0%	1.6%	-0.3%	2.5%	-5.7%	0.3%	7.2%	-15.3%	5.8%	-5.0%	-5.0%										
POLICE TELECOMMUNICATOR III	19	32.8	0.0%	-4.8%	0.0%	-2.6%	-7.5%	25.2%	2.0%	3.2%	15.7%	-2.0%	-2.0%										
PRINCIPAL ADMIN AIDE	13	27.7	7.8%	-8.2%	7.5%	-14.4%	-0.4%	0.0%	-1.7%	37.8%	5.7%	-0.7%	11.8%										
PRINTING TECHNICIAN II	15	30.1	-0.9%	-100.0%	8.8%	-5.3%	-8.5%	0.9%	10.9%	12.2%	5.4%	-8.7%	-8.2%										
PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST II	22	41.0	-3.2%	-13.0%	17.2%	-15.5%	-1.7%	7.2%	0.0%	19.5%	6.2%	-26.1%	2.0%										
PUBLIC SERVICE WORKER II	9	24.1	3.5%	-3.9%	-3.5%	-4.7%	-11.2%	-0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	3.4%	4.0%											
RECREATION SPECIALIST	21	40.3		13.3%	-3.6%	-10.3%	0.0%	-0.5%	-8.1%	7.3%	3.1%	14.4%											
SOCIAL WORKER II	23	44.5	6.5%		1.1%	-11.4%	-1.1%	-6.7%	2.2%		2.6%	-12.9%											
THERAPIST II	24	45.0	-11.7%		0.0%						6.3%	14.4%											
AVG % DIFF FROM MEDIAN:			1.3%	-3.4%	2.6%	-9.4%	-5.3%	2.7%	2.2%	6.1%	6.0%	-4.8%	-2.5%										
# OF CLASSES MATCHED:			37	30	39	34	37	34	34	27	39	37	23										

NOTES:

- o Salary data from local sources, including FY 2008 Local Government Personnel Association Salary Survey. Survey includes data from 36 public sector organizations in the national capital area. 40 of 88 non-school jobs have been matched.
- o Median salary includes MCG. The percent difference from the median is calculated by dividing dollar difference between the respective jurisdiction/agency salary and median by the median salary.
- o MNCPPC = Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission
- o MCG = Montgomery County Government
- o WSSC = Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission

PERCENT DIFFERENCE FROM MEDIAN SALARY  
 FY '06 MAXIMUM SALARY COMPARISONS  
 SELECTED LOCAL JURISDICTIONS - SELECTED CLASSES

MONT CO GOVT GRADE	MCG TITLE	MEDIAN	ALEX CITY GOVT		ANNE AR CO GOVT		ARL CO GOVT		BALT CITY GOVT		BALT CO GOVT		FAIR CO GOVT		HOWARD CO GOVT		MNCPPC		MONT CO GOVT (MCG)		PG CO GOVT		WSSC
			GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	GOVT	
23	ACCOUNTANT/AUDITOR III	69.2	10.1%	-12.6%	7.6%	-35.2%	-27.2%	11.4%	-2.9%	0.0%	9.7%	-6.0%	2.4%										
8	BUILDING SERVICE WORKER II	35.1	-2.0%	-15.5%	0.9%	-28.2%	-28.2%	0.0%	-1.1%	15.8%	7.2%	-1.7%	9.6%										
17	CARPENTER I	50.2	3.2%	-1.8%	-43.2%	-23.8%	1.1%	7.7%	-1.1%	7.7%	13.8%	-8.8%	17.5%										
23	COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSE II	69.2	9.8%	0.0%	-22.5%	-27.3%	1.1%	0.0%	-3.2%	0.0%	9.2%	-12.2%											
24	CORRECTION SHIFT COMMANDER-LT	69.4	15.2%	-0.5%	14.7%	-30.6%	0.5%	-100.0%	-100.0%	0.0%	14.3%	-7.8%											
15	CORRECTIONAL OFFICER I	56.0	11.8%	6.0%	6.0%	-26.7%	10.1%	-13.8%	-17.1%	10.1%	3.9%	-3.9%											
18	CORRECTIONAL OFFICER III	57.5	8.2%	-40.1%	11.8%	-30.8%	-26.9%	16.8%	-17.1%	10.1%	4.2%	-4.2%											
10	DATA ENTRY OPERATOR II	39.5	4.2%	-22.1%	2.3%	-40.8%	-20.5%	0.0%	6.9%	1.9%	12.7%	-13.7%	-0.4%										
18	ELECTRICIAN I	53.0	-5.9%	2.8%	-3.4%	-32.8%	-17.8%	0.0%	6.9%	1.9%	7.9%	-7.0%	11.8%										
25	ENGINEER III	77.0	-5.7%	13.1%	-1.2%	-25.3%	-19.8%	1.2%	-10.0%	11.1%	8.8%	2.3%	7.3%										
16	ENGINEER TECHNICIAN II	54.9	3.5%	-13.1%	-4.4%	-35.8%	-29.5%	11.0%	-4.5%	15.7%	19.1%	0.0%	13.8%										
14	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	41.8	9.6%	-11.2%	4.3%	-30.9%	-22.6%	7.3%	-2.5%	14.3%	15.1%	-3.2%	0.0%										
16	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR III	47.2	3.1%	-4.4%	9.2%	-31.0%	-22.1%	-0.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	11.2%											
B1	FIRE/RESCUER LIEUTENANT	77.5	21.0%	-31.4%	-12.1%	-17.0%	-32.3%	12.4%	-32.3%	12.4%	20.2%	7.8%											
F1	FIREFIGHTER/RESCUER I	51.7	2.6%	-5.0%	-7.4%	-27.2%	-20.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	15.8%										
F3	FIREFIGHTER/RESCUER III	64.1	2.6%	-9.3%	2.4%	-36.3%	-26.3%	7.2%	-6.7%	25.4%	26.2%	-7.4%											
16	FISCAL ASSISTANT	43.1	0.0%	-16.9%	18.4%	-39.7%	-33.4%	1.9%	-1.8%	-8.5%	17.6%	-9.9%	8.4%										
21	HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR II	58.5	0.5%	13.0%	20.9%	-44.3%	-25.4%	7.8%	-0.5%	-4.3%	9.9%	-14.0%	0.0%										
25	HUMAN RESOURCE SPECIALIST III	75.8	14.2%	12.2%	7.5%	-37.3%	-39.5%	1.2%	-20.4%	6.3%	14.5%	-19.0%	4.2%										
26	HUMAN RESOURCE SPECIALIST II	76.1	0.0%	7.9%	5.0%	-34.5%	-28.5%	1.2%	1.2%	18.6%	18.6%	-11.5%	-9.6%										
IT	IT SPECIALIST III (LGPA Title: Aulm Systems Spcl)	73.5	-2.3%	13.5%	2.3%	-28.6%	-31.0%	4.5%	-2.4%	11.8%	7.5%	-11.5%	16.4%										
IT	IT SPECIALIST II (LGPA Title: Pmgr Anal - Jiny Lvl)	50.8	-1.6%	19.7%	0.0%	-18.4%	8.5%	0.3%	-12.6%	0.0%	12.7%	-15.4%	-1.6%										
21	LIBRARIAN I	61.0	6.2%	-25.4%	1.3%	-38.6%	-25.0%	18.7%	0.0%	2.2%	8.2%	-8.2%	-1.6%										
25	MANAGEMENT & BUDGET SPECIALIST III	76.8	9.2%	-10.6%	2.8%	-28.3%	-23.2%	11.5%	-4.9%	-3.8%	6.3%	-6.2%	4.9%										
18	MECHANIC II	56.2	8.0%	-11.2%	28.5%	-34.9%	-15.9%	18.5%	0.0%	18.0%	38.1%	0.0%	1.8%										
5	OFFICE CLERK	34.5	10.1%	6.4%	7.6%	-25.1%	-27.2%	11.4%	-2.9%	0.0%	9.3%	-3.7%											
23	PERMIT SERVICES INSPECTOR III	89.2	-0.3%	2.1%	2.4%	-28.0%	-36.9%	4.1%	-2.9%	0.0%	9.3%	-8.0%	-19.4%										
23	PLANNING SPECIALIST III	82.8	6.5%	0.0%	12.9%	-7.6%	-17.4%	-5.4%	0.0%	-4.7%	4.1%	-8.3%											
P2	POLICE OFFICER I	82.8	0.2%	-22.5%	0.2%	-28.4%	-28.8%	12.0%	-8.6%	-0.2%	11.0%	2.7%	-17.0%										
A1	POLICE SERGEANT	75.0	4.5%	-26.4%	4.2%	-42.0%	-28.3%	-2.4%	-15.0%	29.0%	15.7%	2.5%											
19	POLICE TELECOMMUNICATOR III	54.1	0.1%	6.7%	6.7%	-30.8%	-28.4%	2.8%	-0.1%	9.3%	0.0%	2.5%	11.5%										
13	PRINCIPAL ADMIN AIDE	47.3	49.4	-9.7%	31.2%	-16.9%	21.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.5%	18.9%	-11.8%	18.9%										
15	PRINTING TECHNICIAN II	49.4	10.1%	-12.9%	-1.0%	-32.1%	-30.5%	12.3%	-4.2%	13.4%	9.9%	1.0%											
22	PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST II	60.6	18.6%	10.1%	-3.8%	-34.1%	-24.7%	0.0%	-18.2%	3.4%	2.8%	0.1%											
0	PUBLIC SERVICE WORKER II	35.8	18.6%	8.5%	-28.8%	-20.2%	2.1%	-5.9%	-2.1%	7.6%	9.9%	-3.8%	4.0%										
21	RECREATION SPECIALIST	66.9	-11.6%	3.9%	-6.6%	-31.2%	-23.8%	5.6%	-8.0%	27	39	37	22										
23	SOCIAL WORKER II	68.6	37	28	39	33	37	34	35	27	39	37	22										
24	THERAPIST II	74.4	37	28	39	33	37	34	35	27	39	37	22										
AVG % DIFF FROM MEDIAN:			3.9%	-6.6%	4.9%	-31.2%	-23.8%	5.6%	-8.0%	7.6%	9.9%	-3.8%	4.0%										
# OF CLASSES MATCHED:			37	28	39	33	37	34	35	27	39	37	22										

NOTES:  
 o Salary data from local sources, including FY 2006 Local Government Personnel Association Salary Survey. Survey includes data from 36 public sector organizations in the national capital area. 40 of 88 non-school jobs have been matched.  
 o Median salary includes MCG. The percent difference from the median is calculated by dividing dollar difference between the respective jurisdiction/agency salary and median by the median salary.  
 o MNCPPC = Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission  
 MCG = Montgomery County Government  
 WSSC = Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission

**PROJECTED TOTAL PAY INCREASES  
2005 - 2006**

**SALARY BUDGET SURVEYS**

<u>Survey Name</u>	Number of Organizations Participating in Survey	Geographic Area of Survey	Average Total Pay Increase (1)	
			<u>Survey - Actual 2005</u>	<u>Survey - Budgeted 2006</u>
World At Work	2529 1241	National Eastern U.S.	3.65% 3.65%	5.43% 3.75% 3.75%
Society For Human Resource Management	1400	National	3.70%	5.43% 3.70%
Mercer	1350	National	3.60%	5.43% 3.60%
Hewitt Associates	1056	National Washington D.C.	3.60% 4.00%	5.43% 3.60% 3.90%

(1) Average salary increase (e.g., cost of living, merit, general wage adjustment, etc.) reported for non-exempt and exempt salaried employees.

(2) Approximately 69% of employees (5,842) received a 3.5% service increment in calendar year 2005; approximately 4% of employees (338) received performance based pay averaging 3.97%; approximately 89% (7,482) received a 2.75% general wage adjustment; and approximately 11% (947) received a 4.03% general wage adjustment.