State and Local Government Workforce: 2019 Survey

The Center for State and Local Government Excellence (SLGE) has partnered with the International Personnel Management Association for Human Resources (IPMA-HR) and the National Association of State Personnel Executives (NASPE) to conduct an annual survey of public sector human resources professionals since 2009. Survey questions are focused around the workforce changes and challenges their organizations face and the initiatives they put in place to better serve their hiring and retention needs for the future.

This survey was sent to 7,152 members of IPMA-HR and 85 members of NASPE. The online survey was conducted from March 20 to June 3, 2019 by the Center for State and Local Government Excellence (slge.org) with 335 public human resource professionals submitting responses. Unless otherwise noted, charts in this report reflect 2019 data. While a small number of respondents represent federal or other sectors (e.g., non-profits), the data displayed in Figures 2 through Figure 21 represent state and local government respondents only.

While a few of the figures in this report include data from prior survey years, a more longitudinal analysis is available in the 2018 report: "State and Local Government Workforce: 2018 Data and 10 Year Trends".

Hiring and layoffs are key indicators this survey tracks. While hiring has changed modestly in recent years, the share indicating they have instituted layoffs has dropped from 42 percent in 2009 to 7 percent in 2019. Looking at longer-term employment projections, both state and local workforces are anticipated to increase, with a projected growth of 3.8 percent among state employees and 7.4 percent among local employees from 2016 to 2026.¹

Benefits continue to be both a key strength for state and local government (with 88 percent indicating their benefits are competitive in the labor market), and an area for continued changes and experimentation. Some of those changes are in the form of adjusting employer/employee contributions to retirement or health care costs, while others have been more non-economic, such as flexible work schedules (51 percent; see Figure 13).

The gig economy is a particular focus for this year’s survey, with respondents indicating both the overall share of the workforce that such workers represent and the impacts on the organization as a whole (e.g., 3.6 percent indicating a significant increase in management flexibility and a total of 10.1 percent indicating a decrease in employee morale).

Finally, as organizations work to attract and retain skilled workers, they have found a variety of approaches to be of value, ranging from a focus on online advertising (83 percent) and social media (51 percent) to employee development programs such as in-house training (67 percent), onboarding (53 percent), and paid family leave (21 percent), as shown in Figures 12 and 20.
Participants

1) You work for... (n = 335)

- Local: 78%
- State: 15%
- Federal: 7%
- Other: 1%

All figures that follow reflect state and local government respondents only.

Workforce Changes

2) Which of the following workforce changes has your government implemented over the past year? (n = 307)

- 80% Hired employees
- 54% Hired contract or temporary employees
- 39% Broad-based pay increases
- 37% Narrow, position-specific increases
- 31% Re-employment of retired government staff
- 10% None
- 10% Travel or training restrictions
- 7% Layoffs
- 6% Hiring freezes
- 5% Other
- 4% Early retirement incentives
- 2% Pay freezes
- 1% Furloughs
- 1% Pay Cuts

3) Over the past year, what positions, if any, has the organization had a hard time filling?
(Difficult to fill: n = 308; Gig economy: n = 196)

- Policing: 32%
- Engineering: 29%
- Maintenance work/labor: 24%
- Skilled Trades: 24%
- Dispatch: 22%
- IT: Network Administration: 21%
- Driving/Equipment Operation (CDL): 20%
- Accounting: 19%
- IT: Other: 18%
- Health care: Nursing: 18%
- Building and grounds cleaning: 17%
- Building permitting and inspections: 17%
- Automotive maintenance: 15%
- IT: Support: 15%
- Corrections/jails: 12%
- Planning: 12%
- Health care: Mental health professionals: 11%
- Other: 11%
- IT: Web Development: 11%
- Firefighting/Emergency medical: 11%
- Management (executive level): 10%
- Management (mid-level): 9%
- Health care: Physicians: 9%
- Business and financial operations: 8%
- Utilities: Other: 8%
- Management (mid-level): 8%
- Human and social services: 7%
- Office and administrative support: 7%
- Transportation (including transit): 6%
- Legal services: 6%
- Health care: Other: 5%
- Recreation programs: 5%
- IT: Other: 4%
- Accounting: 4%
- Human and social services: 4%
- Recreation programs: 4%
- Transportation (including transit): 3%
- Management (executive level): 3%
- Health care: Mental health professionals: 3%
- Recreation programs: 2%
- Transportation (including transit): 2%
- Management (mid-level): 2%
- Health care: Nursing: 2%
- Housing: 2%
- Health care: Physicians: 2%
- Legal services: 2%
- Other: 2%
- Accounting: 2%
- Transportation (including transit): 2%
- Health care: Physicians: 2%
- Health care: Other: 1%
- Health care: Mental health professionals: 1%
- Transportation (including transit): 1%
- Health care: Mental health professionals: 1%
- Other: 1%
- Other: 1%
- Health care: Other: 1%
- Health care: Physicians: 1%
- Management (executive level): 1%
- Management (mid-level): 1%
- Rehabilitation: 1%
- Recreation programs: 1%
- Transportation (including transit): 1%
- Accounting: 1%
- Law and public order: 1%
- Management (executive level): 1%
- Management (mid-level): 1%
- Rehabilitation: 1%
- Transportation (including transit): 1%
- Accounting: 1%
- Law and public order: 1%
- Management (executive level): 1%
- Rehabilitation: 1%
Figure 3 displays those positions which at least 4 percent of respondents indicated as being hard to fill. Gig economy percentages are based on the total number of responses; when respondents left any of the questions blank, it was counted as not filling any positions of that type via the gig economy.

The percentage reporting certain positions as being hard to fill has grown over time. This is evident with positions in policing, engineering, and firefighting (See Figure 4).

Positions filled via the gig economy may include those with many independent contractors available (e.g., information technology) or those that lend themselves to temporary services (office/administrative support, accounting, maintenance work/labor), or consulting companies (engineering, permitting).

4) 2015-2019 Hard to fill positions
(2019: n = 308; 2015: n = 267)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers / Engineering</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance work / Labor</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled trades</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving/equipment operation (CDL)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care: Nursing</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building permitting and inspections</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive maintenance</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT IS THE GIG ECONOMY?

The gig economy includes work that is procured on a temporary or contingent basis, as workload needs dictate. As queried in this survey, it excludes those services that are contracted on an annual or longer-term basis, such as a city engineer or an attorney who, if not a full-time employee, may be part of a multi-year contract.

While these positions cannot be neatly categorized, in 2017 the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) identified five generalizable characteristics of gig workers: (1) self-employed and performing single projects or tasks on demand; (2) providing labor services; (3) working for pay (not providing services in-kind); (4) obtaining work or performing services either offline or online through applications or websites; and (5) performing gig work either part time or full time.

For more analysis, discussion, and resources on Gig Workers, see: “Gig Workers: Local Government’s New Workforce Dynamics Inspire New Workplace Thinking,” by Franzel, Young, and Liss-Levinson, PM Magazine, August 27, 2018, available at https://icma.org/articles/pm-magazine/pm-article-gig-workers.

This is the second year that the survey has asked about gig economy hiring. While the initial question, as repeated this year, dealt with which positions were filled with gig workers, this year’s survey also asks about the scale of gig hiring as a portion of the overall organization and the impact on morale, productivity and other organizational characteristics.
5) For what positions were workload needs met in part via the gig economy? \((n = 196)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Support</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and grounds cleaning</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance work/Labor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Network administration</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational programs</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers / Engineering</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Web development</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care: Nursing</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled trades</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and financial operations</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care: Physicians</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building permitting and inspections</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human and social services</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care: Mental health professionals</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation and translation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation and serving</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care: Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities: Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections/Jails</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving/Equipment operation (CDL)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (including transit)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) What portion of your organization’s workload would you estimate is hired via the gig economy? \((n = 308)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiring on the gig economy may have both positive and negative impacts on the organization. At its most basic level, such hiring gives an organization a certain level of flexibility. Beyond that, the exact mix of impacts may depend on the individuals hired, the organizational readiness to engage short-term talent, or the workload issues that are driving hiring needs (e.g., development cycles). The impacts may also be positive in some areas and negative in others. Figure 7 shows the overall positive and negative ratings reported, with negative impacts shown as negative numbers. Those indicating “No impact” are omitted from the graph.

7) Impacts of gig economy hiring \((n = 196)\)

- Management flexibility
  - Significant increase
  - Slight increase
  - Significant decrease

- Morale of full-time employees
  - Significant increase
  - Slight increase
  - Slight decrease
  - Significant decrease

- Morale of part-time employees
  - Significant increase
  - Slight increase
  - Slight decrease
  - Significant decrease

- Cost of services
  - Significant increase
  - Slight increase
  - Slight decrease
  - Significant decrease

- Turnover (full-time or part-time employees)
  - Significant increase
  - Slight increase
  - Slight decrease
  - Significant decrease

*No respondents indicated ‘Slight increase.’
With the first year of this survey series coinciding with the aftermath of the Great Recession, a number of the issues covered have been examined on a year-over-year basis, including trends in full-time and part-time hiring (Figure 8), as well as layoffs, quits, and retirements (Figure 9).

8) Changes in workforce versus the prior year (n = 301)

In contrast, in 2009, 44 percent reported that employees were postponing retirement.

Recruitment

In finding new staff to fill organizational needs, the skills required are not always job-specific. Figure 11 shows those cross-functional skills most in demand, while Figure 12 shows what methods have been most successful in identifying qualified candidates.

10) Changes by retirement-eligible employees regarding their plans for retirement

(2019: n = 283; 2018: n = 313; 2017: n = 279)

In contrast, in 2009, 44 percent reported that employees were postponing retirement.

9) Workforce separations

As for how employees are making decisions around retirement, the survey also asks about whether retirement-eligible employees are accelerating or postponing their departures (Figure 10).
Attracting new employees is not just a matter of advertising, but also a function of the organization’s culture, compensation, and benefits. One of the non-economic factors that recruits may consider is the flexibility afforded by their prospective employer. Figure 13 shows the current percentages offering various workplace flexibility, while Figure 14 shows how the trend is either to maintain or increase the number of positions eligible for such flexibility or the range of such programs offered.

### Flexible Work Practices

13) Flexible work practices offered (n = 302)

- **Flexible work hours**: 51%
- **Flexible schedule (e.g., 4 days, 10 hours)**: 46%
- **No flex work practices are offered**: 31%
- **Regular telework for eligible positions**: 24%
- **Job Sharing**: 7%
- **Other**: 7%

### Benefits and Compensation

Retirement and health benefits can be significant attractions for a career in state or local government and are judged to be an area where employers are more competitive with the private sector than they are in the area of compensation (See Figures 15 and 16).

15) Do you feel the wage compensation you offer is competitive with the labor market? (n = 288)

- **Yes**: 56%
- **No**: 41%
- **Don’t know / no response**: 2%
16) Do you feel the benefits compensation you offer is competitive with the labor market? (n = 287)

- 88% No
- 11% Yes
- 1% Don’t know/no response

17) Over the past year, what changes, if any, has your government made to the health benefits provided to employees or retirees? (n = 272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Shifted more health care costs from employer to employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Implemented wellness programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Shifted employees to high deductible plans with an HSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Shifted more costs from employer to retirees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Set funds aside to cover future retiree health benefit costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Implemented chronic care management programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Established a health reimbursement arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Shifted retirees to high deductible plans with an HSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Eliminated retiree health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Increased requirements (years to vest, age of eligibility) to qualify for retiree health benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Shifted from traditional retiree health care to a defined contribution model (e.g., health savings plan) for new employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Shifted from traditional retiree health care model to a defined contribution model for current employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) Retirement benefit changes.

- New employees: n = 311; Current employees: n = 281

Whether due to insurance plan changes, reactions to demographic shifts, cost concerns, or long-term strategies to steer employee behavior (e.g., through wellness programs), many jurisdictions have adjusted their health of retirement plans (See Figures 17 and 18).

Among the initiatives discussed below, autoenrollment in a supplemental retirement plan is not an option currently allowed in all states, but it is one that is discussed in greater detail in a separate SLGE report. The 48 percent reporting that employees are not prepared for retirement (Figure 20) is part of the reason both for SLGE’s research on programs like autoenrollment, but also on financial literacy programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Increased employee contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Decrease pension benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Increased pension eligibility requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Increase employer contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Reduced/eliminated cost of living adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Replaced a defined benefits plan with a hybrid plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Replaced a defined benefit plan with a defined contribution plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Instituted auto-enrollment in supplemental defined contribution plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Decreased employer contributions to defined contribution plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Required new employees to choose between primary defined benefit and defined contribution plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19) Do you feel your employees are prepared financially for their retirement? (n = 287)

- Yes: 26%
- No: 25%
- Don't know/no response: 48%

20) Programs used to encourage employee retention and development. (n = 273)

- Exit interviews: 69%
- Employee development: In-house training: 67%
- Employee development: Funds/reimbursement for training/travel: 63%
- Wellness programs: Informational: 59%
- Leave benefits: Sick leave banking/donations: 56%
- Onboarding program: 53%
- Recognition programs: 53%
- Employee development: Leadership development: 50%
- Merit-based salary increases: 40%
- Financial literacy/financial wellness training: 33%
- Wellness programs: On-site fitness facilities: 32%
- Wellness programs: Reimbursement (gym membership, smoking cessation programs): 32%
- Employee satisfaction surveys: 29%
- Employee development: Career paths/career ladders: 29%
- Leave benefits: Consolidated annual/personal/sick leave: 23%
- Mentoring: 22%
- Leave benefits: Paid family leave: 21%
- Transit benefits: 18%
- Bonuses: 14%
- Community engagement (support for volunteer involvement, matching donations): 13%
- Employee skills assessments/personality inventories: 12%
- Collaborative/distributed leadership: 8%
- Stay interviews: 8%
- Job rotations: 4%
- Financial assistance with student loan repayment: 4%
- Other: 3%
- None of the above: 3%
- Financial assistance with home purchases: 1%
- Don't know: 1%
- Backup or emergency child care provider: 1%
- Other: 3%
- None of the above: 3%
- Financial assistance with home purchases: 1%
- Don't know: 1%
- Backup or emergency child care provider: 1%

**Looking Ahead**

Among programs to encourage employee retention and development (Figure 20), state and local governments have long provided sick leave (provided to 95 percent of state and 90 percent of local employees6), but may also provide sick leave banking (56 percent of organizations responding). Less common benefits or engagement strategies include mentoring (22 percent), assistance with repaying student loans (4 percent), and provision of backup child care (1 percent).

Not all workforce issues that an organization may be facing are reflected in the initiatives they currently have in place. Looking ahead, for example, 37 percent identified the impact of technology on employment (modifying or eliminating jobs) as an important issue (see Figure 21). This question did not ask what was being done to address that issue, just whether that was an important priority for future consideration.
21) Looking ahead, which workforce issues are important to your organization? (n = 272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive compensation package</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and retention of qualified personnel with needed skills</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for public service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee morale</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining staff needed for core services</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce succession planning</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee development</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and inclusion</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to manage workload when current staff is at their limit and new</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff cannot be hired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing employee health care costs</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public perception of government workers</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of technology on employment (modifying or eliminating jobs)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a more flexible workplace (e.g., job sharing, outsourcing,</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiring retirees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing employee retirement plan costs</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee financial literacy</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship recruiting</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing contract personnel</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing personnel shared across jurisdictions</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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