

M I N U T E S

SERVICE COMMITTEE

May 29, 1986

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

The meeting of the Service Committee was called to order at 10:40 a.m. by the Chairman, Representative John Connors, on Thursday, May 29, 1986, in Committee Room 22 of the State House, Des Moines. Members present in addition to the Chairman were:

Senator Lee Holt  
Senator Jim Wells  
Senator Joe Welsh  
Representative Tom Jochum  
Representative Delwyn Stromer

Also present were:

Mr. Donovan Peeters, Director, Legislative Service Bureau  
Mr. Dennis Prouty, Director, Legislative Fiscal Bureau  
Mr. William Angrick, Citizens' Aide  
Mr. Sandy Scharf, Director, Computer Support Bureau  
Mr. Joe O'Hern, Chief Clerk, House of Representatives  
Ms. Marie Thayer, Secretary, Senate

Senator Holt moved that minutes of the April 21, 1986, meeting of the Service Committee be approved as distributed to Committee members, and the motion was adopted.

COMPUTER SUPPORT BUREAU POSITION

Chairman Connors noted that he had received a communication from Mr. Scharf requesting that the Legislative Computer Support Bureau be allowed to advertise and fill the position of Systems Analyst on or after July 1, 1986. Noting that Mr. Scharf was attending a meeting of the Computer Outreach Committee of the Legislative Council, Mr. Peeters commented that the position was authorized during the 1985-1986 Fiscal Year but was not filled in order that the Computer Support Bureau could meet the 3.5% budget reduction. Mr. Peeters noted that the position was budgeted for the 1986-1987 Fiscal Year. Senator Wells moved that the Committee recommend that the Legislative Council approve Mr. Scharf's request. Senator Holt seconded the motion, and it carried.

LEGAL EXPENSES OF THE CITIZENS' AIDE

Mr. Angrick commented that the Office of Citizens' Aide was sued in federal district court in the Washington, D.C. area by a former Iowa resident. He noted that the suit and a subsequent appeal to the federal court of appeals were dismissed, but it was necessary to secure the services of the Washington, D.C. law firm of Hogan and Hartson, at a cost of \$795.99. Mr. Angrick requested tentative approval by the Legislative Council to increase the moneys allotted to the Office of Citizens' Aide by that amount if it is necessary in order that the Citizens' Aide budget be balanced at the close of the 1985-1986 Fiscal Year. Chairman Connors asked whether a federal agency would pay a portion of the bill. Mr. Angrick responded in the negative. Representative Stromer asked whether the expenses could be assessed to the Attorney General. Mr. Angrick responded to this question in the negative, adding that the Office of Citizens' Aide has not used the Attorney General for legal assistance since the Citizens' Aide might at some future time be investigating the Attorney General's office. Senator Wells moved that the Service Committee request that the Legislative Council approve Mr. Angrick's request. Representative Stromer seconded the motion, and it carried.

PROPOSED JOB DESCRIPTIONS FOR CITIZENS' AIDE OFFICE

Mr. Angrick noted that at the April meeting he had asked permission to develop proposed job descriptions and pay range reassignments for the Office of Citizens' Aide. He noted that such a proposal is similar to the existing situation in other legislative agencies. He commented that he is proposing an Assistant and Assistant I for entry level, and Assistant II who would be called upon to perform additional responsibilities, and an Assistant III for an individual with at least three years' experience and the ability to supervise field investigations and/or provide training within the office. He commented that because of the proposed Comparable Worth Report, he is not proposing pay grade assignments at this time. Material was distributed that includes the present job description and proposed descriptions, copies of which may be obtained from the Legislative Service Bureau. Representative Stromer noted that the Assistant III anticipates a grade assignment of 28 or 29 even though Mr. Angrick has indicated that he will not request approval for the grade assignments. Representative Stromer asked whether Mr. Angrick anticipates that his Assistants would be promoted to a grade 29 after three years' experience. Mr. Angrick commented in the negative, indicating that promotions will be made on the need to fill the duties of the position. Representative Stromer moved that the Service Committee recommend that the Legislative Council approve the proposed job descriptions as submitted by Mr. Angrick. Senator Wells seconded the motion, and it carried.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CITIZENS' AIDE

Chairman Connors acknowledged receipt of a letter from Mr. Angrick noting that his appointment as Citizens' Aide ends July 1, 1986 and that he wishes to seek reappointment.

#### ACCESS OF CITIZENS' AIDE TO RECORDS

Mr. Angrick stated that the Citizens' Aide is enforcing a subpoena against the Department of Human Services regarding its access to child abuse investigation files. Mr. Angrick expressed a belief that the Department's response to the subpoena is a direct challenge to the agency oversight ability of the General Assembly. He noted that the Department responded that the Office of Citizens' Aide does not have the authority to enforce the subpoena. He distributed copies of two documents relating to the subpoena. Copies of the documents are available from the Legislative Service Bureau upon request. Senator Holt moved that the Service Committee receive and file Mr. Angrick's report. Senator Wells seconded the motion, and it carried.

#### LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU BUDGET ITEM

Mr. Peeters commented that the Legislative Council approved a request for Iowa and the Legislative Service Bureau to participate in the Boundary Block Suggestion Project being conducted by the United States Bureau of the Census. He added that participation in the project has taken a considerable portion of the travel budget of the Service Bureau since Mr. Gary Kaufman, who was assigned to the project, was required to make several out-of-state trips as well as visits to county courthouses. He requested that future travel expenses of the Boundary Block Suggestion Project be paid out of the General Assembly funds under section 2.12 of the Code since this is a unique legislative project which was not included in the projections used in the preparation of the Service Bureau budget. Representative Stromer expressed the belief that each legislative agency has unique situations which occur. Chairman Connors asked Mr. Peeters for additional information about the costs of the travel and indicated that the Service Committee would defer action until it received further information. The Committee agreed.

#### STATUS REPORT ON COMPARABLE WORTH

Mr. Peeters distributed copies of a status report on comparable worth that contained a synopsis of the activities of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee and proposed Rules of Procedure for review of comparable worth study report results. A copy of the report may be obtained from the Legislative Service Bureau.

Mr. Peeters reviewed the decisions of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee. He noted that the proposed rules specify that a request for review must be filed by June 30th with supporting documentation for a properly filed request for review filed by July 7th. He noted that Rule 10 provides that the Appeals Committee must complete its reviews by August 1st and prepare a report of its decisions. He added that further language in proposed Rule 10 reflects what the Staff Committee believes was the intent of the Service Committee and the Legislative Council. The Rule states: "The Service Committee may adopt, reject, modify, or take any other action within its authority in regard to decisions of the Appeals Committee. The actions of the Service Committee will be reported to the Legislative Council."

Representative Stromer asked who will appeal. Mr. Peeters responded that any employee may request a review of the employee's factor scores. Representative Stromer asked whether employers would have the ability to appeal. It was noted that the Service Committee and the Rules and Administration Committees of each House set the salaries. Mr. Peeters commented that the report is the result of recommendations of Arthur Young and Co. He added that it is within the discretion of the Service Committee and the Legislative Council to either adopt it or to alter it or do whatever is desired.

Chairman Connors asked about the composition of the Appeals Committee. Mr. Peeters responded that the Appeals Committee membership differs from the membership of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee since seven of the nine members of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee are not covered by the consultant's report. He also commented that five members of the Appeals Committee are also members of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee. Chairman Connors expressed the belief that individuals who might appeal the decisions of the report should not be hearing appeals.

The Service Committee recessed briefly for the sine die ceremony of the General Assembly and reconvened to continue discussion about the composition of the Appeals Committee. In response to a question from Chairman Connors concerning why employees would hear their own appeals, Mr. Peeters responded that the composition of the Appeals Committee is similar to the composition of the Committee for the executive branch employees. He commented that if a member's position is under review, the member of the Appeals Committee could disqualify himself or herself.

Representative Stromer asked for additional information about the process used in the executive branch. Mr. O'Hern responded that the executive branch process included a preliminary review by a comparable worth committee, but in addition to this there was also an appeals process. He commented that the review, including the appeals process, included a committee composed entirely of employees.

Chairman Connors asked why there isn't a separate review by each department head. Mr. O'Hern commented that the legislative study includes employees from several different legislative agencies and in order to provide consistency across the agencies, it was believed that the individual agency heads should not make determinations on job classifications. He also noted that implementation may be difficult because there is not a single final authority over all legislative employees.

Senator Welsh suggested that employees make their appeals to their division head and then appeals would go to the Service Committee. Mr. O'Hern described the membership of the Staff Committee, commenting that it was established for a review process and to provide input from the administrators. He commented that two additional partisan staff members were added to the original seven-member committee. He commented that the Staff Committee had reviewed the process used by the executive branch and had noted that the review process consisted of a committee that was entirely composed of employees. He added that the Staff Committee felt that the Committee that heard reviews should have a fixed membership and should include representation both from covered employees and agency heads.

Chairman Connors noted that the time for the Legislative Council meeting had arrived and the Committee agreed to defer action on the proposed rules for review of the report and agreed by unanimous consent to receive and file the Arthur Young Report on Comparable Worth for the legislative branch.

The Service Committee reconvened at 1:50 p.m. with the same Committee members present who had been present during the morning session. In addition the following members of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee were present:

- Ms. Marie Thayer, Secretary of the Senate
- Mr. Joe O'Hern, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives
- Ms. Judy Bertelsen, representing the Senate partisan staff
- Ms. Cathy Sears, representing the House partisan staff
- Mr. Donovan Peeters, Legislative Service Bureau
- Mr. Dennis Prouty, Legislative Fiscal Bureau
- Ms. Phyllis Barry, Iowa Code Office
- Mr. Bill Angrick, Office of Citizens' Aide
- Mr. Sandy Scharf, Computer Support Bureau

In addition, present were Mr. David Boyd, Deputy State Court Administrator, and Mr. Roger Gallentine from Arthur Young and Company.

#### PROCESS FOR COMPARABLE WORTH REVIEW IN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

In response to a question from Chairman Connors about the process used in the Judicial Branch for comparable worth review, Mr. Boyd commented that a three-member board consisting of the Deputy Court Administrator, the Chief Judge of a Judicial District, and a Chief Juvenile Court Officer in a district comprised a three-member board for review. However, prior to this establishment, there was a separate team made up of employees covered who reviewed the questionnaires and performed the initial evaluations from which the point totals were figured. Mr. Boyd commented that the judicial review also involved the establishment of an entirely new classification system with uniform statewide classifications as well as a comparable worth analysis. He commented that all appeals were conducted by classification and not by individual.

In response to a question from Representative Stromer, Mr. Boyd responded that the judicial branch included about 75 different classifications before July 1, 1986. Representative Stromer inquired whether the judicial branch modified the results from the initial Arthur Young study. Mr. Boyd responded in the negative, but added that the judicial branch was not under the collective bargaining process when the document was completed. He commented that some changes in position grades were made during the appeal process.

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE AND MEMBERSHIP OF APPEALS COMMITTEE

Chairman Connors commented that it appears that covered employees were a part of the appeal process during the judicial branch implementation of the Arthur Young study. Senator Wells moved that the Service Committee recommend that the Legislative Council approve the Proposed Rules of Procedure for Review of Comparable Worth Study Report results. The motion died for lack of a second.

The Committee proceeded to discuss the membership of the Appeals Committee. Senator Welsh suggested that those members of the Appeals Committee who are not administrators should be replaced by their supervisors. Mr. Peeters interjected that Proposed Rule 9 states that the Appeals Committee may contact any legislative employee for further information when desired as an aid in handling any review. Senator Welsh moved that the membership of the Appeals Committee be amended and the four members who are covered employees be replaced by their division heads. Senator Holt seconded the motion, and it carried.

Senator Holt moved that the Service Committee recommend that the Legislative Council approve the status report as amended. Representative Jochum seconded the motion, and it carried.

Chairman Connors recognized Mr. Gallentine for comments about the Report for the legislative branch of government completed by Arthur Young and Company. Mr. Gallentine described the various portions of the Report, noting that Exhibit 3 contains recommended job titles which includes merging some of the present classifications. He noted that Exhibit 4 contains a sample letter that could be distributed to legislative employees describing the factors used in developing the job classifications, the classification of the individual, and the appeal procedure.

Mr. Gallentine stated that ongoing administration of the plan is necessary in order to remain consistent in job classifications. He stated that a salary structure needs to be developed that will encompass all jobs and he recommended that employees be placed within the grade to which they are assigned at their current salary level. He indicated that if an employee's current salary level is below the range to which they are assigned, they should be brought up to the base of compensation for the grade to which they are assigned. He stated that he does not recommend using steps per se but to use percentage pay increments. Mr. Gallentine stressed that it is important for administrators who are creating new jobs to maintain the job factors and degrees. He suggested that an evaluation committee should be utilized.

He suggested that if job market issues are considered, a pay supplement should be provided for that job rather than an increase in the grade of the job.

Mr. Gallentine suggested that only one pay grade should be used for any one job title and if there are different levels to a job title, different skill efforts should be required. He suggested that a pay supplement might be created for those positions that have a great deal of overtime. He stated that compensatory time should be consistent across departments. Representative Stromer suggested that implementing a plan must be accomplished by means of a uniform set of rules.

Mr. O'Hern inquired about the merit pay plan to which the positions correspond. Mr. Gallentine responded that the salary ranges were not considered by Arthur Young and Company. He noted that the judicial branch used pay plan 000 and 001 which were combined into one consistent plan. For those overlapping grades, the judicial branch considered where the preponderance of the jobs were and used that pay plan. Mr. Gallentine stated that he encourages his clients to contact him during the implementation phase and suggested that contact be made through Mr. Peeters who is the project coordinator. In response to a request by Mr. O'Hern, Mr. Gallentine agreed to return to Iowa to answer questions if necessary.



Chairman Connors asked how Mr. Gallentine would implement the plan. Mr. Gallentine stated that he would accept the document and refer it to a committee for implementation. He commented that it is not possible for employees to appeal their classifications until the document has been accepted and a salary structure adopted.

Representative Stromer inquired about steps in each grade. Mr. Gallentine responded that he recommends that steps be eliminated, but increments be provided within each pay grade. He suggested that some governmental subdivisions in some states are adopting nonrecurring bonuses based upon performance evaluations so that those at a maximum salary within their grade can receive extra pay through superior performance.

Representative Connors asked how the pay plan can be implemented after all appeals are completed. Mr. Gallentine responded that he recommends that the employees be placed within their grades at their existing salaries. He suggested that the General Assembly may wish to establish priorities with regard to the expense of implementing comparable worth. He commented that one use of funding might be to bring people outside their range up to the range to which they are assigned. Mr. Gallentine explained that an employee who is above the range to which his or her position is assigned would be frozen at that employee's existing salary rate and must wait for salary increases to catch up with him.

Mr. Peeters commented that the next step for the Comparable Worth Staff Committee is to devise a notice and appeal form for employees. It is also necessary to adopt salary ranges for each grade.

Mr. O'Hern noted that House and Senate employees could use the existing pay structure which is in the pay resolution. Mr. Gallentine acknowledged that it is difficult to disseminate appeal processes when the authority to determine pay grades is diffused into several different committees. He commented that he would look at the House and Senate pay ranges in comparison with other levels and report back to the Service Committee.

Discussion followed relating to the work of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee and the dissemination of information to covered employees. Mr. O'Hern suggested that an explanatory letter be mailed to all session-only employees rather than mailing all materials concerning comparable worth to them. He added that the employees be informed that any kind of written response will result in review of their classification and the employees can then pick up the necessary materials from the House or Senate. The Service Committee agreed to this procedure.



ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

DIANE BOLENDER  
Senior Research Analyst