

The State of Minnesota and the Minnesota Government Engineering Council (MGEC) are the parties that jointly developed the compensation study in 2008. Initially the study considered wages and all other benefits including health insurance, expenses, bonuses, awards and more. The written reports in 2008 and 2013 were mutually agreed to by the parties. MGEC in the position of writing an addendum to the 2017 Compensation Summary because the state’s representatives refused to agree to a report that the parties could agree to. Failing that, the state’s representatives also refused to revert to a report format used in the past.

The State sets the value of a position at the top step of the assigned wage range. Several of their Compensation Managers have admitted this. Accordingly, Past summary reports reported the survey findings for the minimum, average and maximum of each range. For those reasons, MGEC believes that the same information needs to be reported in the 2017 summary report.

The employer’s argument to focus the report on the average responses artificially emphasis that response and by implication discredits the validity of the minimum wage or the maximum wage.

The employer’s repeated comment that midpoint pay is the market rate is not factual. It’s a reflection of the employer’s desired position that they would like readers to believe. When asked directly, the State Compensation Managers will respond to a question admitting that the maximum of the range is the value of the position in the State and many other public-sector compensation plan models. Because the parties to the compensation study may have different perspectives, the study historically sought to report actual compensation rates. By using tables to report the minimum, weighted average and maximum for each classification the reader could choose for themselves what information to focus on. MGEC believes the summary tables of the report lead the reader to focus on the average. They make the reader do more work to focus on other information.

2017 Compensation Study SUMMARY

State of Minnesota Salary compared to Overall Survey Weighted Salary (Minimum, Average & Maximum)

Survey Title	Number of Organizations	Number of Incumbents	Number of State of MN Employees	Difference Minimum		Difference Average		Difference Maximum	
				State of MN compared to overall survey* -	State of MN compared to overall survey*	State of MN compared to overall survey* -	State of MN compared to overall survey*	State of MN compared to overall survey* -	State of MN compared to overall survey*
Engineer Graduate	10	91	40	(\$3,509)	-8.0%	(\$3,964)	-8.2%	\$121	0.2%
Engineer Graduate 2	19	179	63	(\$4,723)	-9.7%	(\$2,778)	-4.8%	(\$11,673)	-17.3%
Senior Engineer	22	258	172	(\$3,675)	-6.1%	\$593	0.7%	(\$9,395)	-10.7%
Principal Engineer	24	131	210	(\$16,088)	-24.8%	(\$6,933)	-7.2%	(\$21,212)	-21.5%
Administrative Engineer	14	62	72	(\$17,064)	-23.5%	(\$8,493)	-7.8%	(\$19,125)	-17.5%
Engineering Specialist	18	97	199	\$3,684	7.2%	\$14,140	19.3%	\$7,087	9.3%
Engineering Specialist Sr	19	159	156	\$451	0.8%	\$8,470	10.4%	(\$664)	-0.8%
Land Surveyor in Training	5	23	1	\$10,762	21.8%	\$19,399	28.8%	\$12,242	18.2%
Land Surveyor Senior	9	22	32	\$3,341	5.6%	\$13,617	16.4%	\$15,425	17.6%
Land Surveyor Principal	8	31	14	(\$450)	-0.7%	\$15,994	16.4%	(\$3,226)	-3.2%
Land Surveyor Admin Professional	4	4	1	(\$3,257)	-4.4%	\$13,434	12.3%	(\$1,789)	-1.6%
Radio Engineer 1	1	3	10	\$3,382	6.6%	\$14,130	19.5%	\$20,295	26.8%

Graph of State of Minnesota Average Salary compared to Overall Survey Weighted Average Salary

