ANALYSIS OF STATE EMPLOYEE SALARY INCREASES

Year	General Salary Increase Provided or Proposed	Annual Inflation*
1973	5%	6.2%
1974	4%	11.0%
1975	5% (in addition to an 11.9% salary adjustment)	9.1%
1976	5%	5.7%
1977	5%	6.5%
1978	5%	7.6%
1979	6.5%	11.3%
1980	6.5%	13.5%
1981	9% (in addition to a 10% salary adjustment)	10.3%
1982	8% (reduced by Governor's budget allotments)	6.2%
1983	2% contribution to retirement	3.2%
1984	2% contribution to retirement	4.3%
1985	9.5% higher education faculty and senior administrative staff, 5.5% for all other state employees	3.5%
1986	4% with a minimum of \$50 per month; the Governor deferred this increase for agencies under his control to January 1, 1987	1.9%
1987	0%	3.7%
1988	0%	4.1%
1989	11.4% higher education faculty at UND and NDSU; 9.5% higher education faculty at other four-year universities; 7.3% higher education faculty at two-year colleges; 9.1% faculty at the medical school; administrative, professional, and classified employees at the institutions of higher education received increases averaging between 8.7% and 9.7%; 7.1% for all other state employees	4.8%
1990	7% higher education faculty at four-year universities, 5% higher education faculty at two-year colleges, 0% all other state employees	5.4%
1991	4% with a minimum of \$50 per month	4.2%
1992	\$40 per month	3.0%
1993	\$60 per month	3.0%
1994	3% (to the extent available from agency savings)	2.6%
1995	2%	2.8%
1996	3% (includes 1% for salary inequity correction and merit increases)	2.9%
1997	3% (includes 1.5% for salary inequity correction and merit increases)	2.3%
1998	3% (includes 1.5% for salary inequity correction and merit increases; in addition, the North Dakota University System received a \$3.2 million pool of funds for the 1997-99 biennium to address salary compression, market, and equity problems)	1.5%
1999	2% with a minimum of \$35 per month - Increases over \$35 were based on merit and equity	2.2%
2000	2% with a minimum of \$35 per month - Increases over \$35 were based on merit and equity. An additional 1% was provided to the extent the increase could be paid with existing agency resources.	3.4%
2001 ¹	3% with a minimum of \$35 per month - Increases over \$35 were based on merit and equity	2.8%

Year	General Salary Increase Provided or Proposed	Annual Inflation*
2002 ¹	2% with a minimum of \$35 per month - Increases over \$35 were based on merit and equity	1.6%
2003	Up to 1% effective on January 1, 2004, for the executive and judicial branches to the extent that the increase could be provided from pooled savings realized from the eliminated full-time equivalent (FTE) positions and from accumulated savings from other vacant FTE positions. At least 70% of the funding for the increase provided was required to be from pooled savings of the eliminated FTE positions. No specific funding was provided to higher education institutions for salary increases, with the intent that any salary increases provided be from existing appropriation authority. The judicial branch eliminated four vacant FTE positions and provided a 1% salary increase to its employees effective January 1, 2004. The executive branch did not receive a salary increase.	
	Up to 2% effective on January 1, 2005, for the executive and judicial branches to the extent that the increase could be provided from pooled savings realized from the eliminated FTE positions and from accumulated savings from other vacant FTE positions. At least 70% of the funding for the increase provided was required to be from pooled savings of the eliminated FTE positions. No specific funding was provided to higher education institutions for salary increases, with the intent that any salary increases provided be from existing appropriation authority. The executive branch and the judicial branch did not eliminate positions to receive salary increases on January 1, 2005.	
2005	4%	3.4%
2006	4%	3.2%
	4% with a minimum of \$75 per month (salary increases were to be based on merit and equity and were not to be given across the board)	2.8%
	4% with a minimum of \$75 per month (salary increases were to be based on merit and equity and were not to be given across the board)	4.3% (projected)
	5% with a minimum of \$100 per month (salary increases are to be based on merit and equity and are not to be given across the board)	1.8% (projected)
	5% with a minimum of \$100 per month (salary increases are to be based on merit and equity and are not to be given across the board)	2.1% (projected)

^{*}Percentage change, consumer price index annual rate, Economy.com

\$5 million, \$2.7 million of which was from the general fund, for market equity compensation adjustments for classified employees as approved by Human Resource Management Services.

\$4,628,824 from the general fund for equity and special needs for entities under the control of the State Board of Higher Education. A portion of this amount was used for salary increases to address equity issues.

\$178,233, \$142,697 of which was from the general fund, for salary equity adjustments for elected and appointed officials.

²In addition, the 2007 Legislative Assembly provided \$10 million, \$5 million of which was from the general fund and \$5 million of special funds, for market equity salary adjustments based on market data for classified employees. Employees furthest from market were to receive the largest increase (Senate Bill No. 2189).

The 2007-09 legislative appropriation for the University System included funding for parity to provide for inflationary costs, including the general fund share of 5 percent per year salary increases and health insurance increases.

³In addition, the 2009-11 executive budget recommends \$24.3 million, \$13.7 million of which is from the general fund, to address salary equity issues for certain agencies. Agencies will have flexibility to use salary equity funding to address salary issues relating to the competitive employment market, salary issues in targeted occupations, and internal agency and interagency salary equity issues.

¹In addition, the 2001 Legislative Assembly provided: