

M I N U T E S

SERVICE COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

September 16, 1986

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

The meeting of the Service Committee was called to order by the Committee Chairman, Representative John Connors, at 10:25 a.m. on Tuesday, September 16, 1986 in the Speaker's Committee Room of the State House, Des Moines. Members present in addition to the Chairman were:

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

Also present were the following members of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee:

Mr. Donovan Peeters, Director, Legislative Service Bureau,
Chairman
Mr. William Angrick, Citizens' Aide
Mr. Dennis Prouty, Director, Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Mr. Sandy Scharf, Director, Computer Support Bureau
Ms. Phyllis Barry, Deputy Code Editor, Iowa Code Office
Ms. Cynde Clingan, Acting Secretary of the Senate
Ms. Cathy Sears, Executive Secretary, Speaker of the House,
representing partisan staff in the House

Also present were:

Mr. Roger Gallentine, Consultant, Arthur Young & Company
Ms. Holly Lyons, Fiscal Analyst, Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Mr. Thane Johnson, Senior Research Analyst, Legislative
Service Bureau
Ms. Diane Bolender, Senior Research Analyst, Legislative
Service

Senator Holt moved that the minutes of the September 3rd Service Committee meeting be approved as distributed to Committee members. Senator Wells seconded the motion, and it carried.

PERSONNEL ACTION OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU

Mr. Peeters distributed copies of a memorandum relating to the granting of step increases beyond step six in a grade to two employees of the Legislative Service Bureau effective for the current fiscal year. The memorandum was requested at the September 3 meeting of the Service Committee. A copy of the memorandum may be obtained from the Legislative Service Bureau upon request. Mr. Peeters stated that he was asked to comment upon the legality of granting step increases beyond step six. He noted that although the laws and rules of the merit system prohibit such practice except for certain meritorious increases, the laws and rules of the merit system do not apply to employees of the legislative branch. He expressed the belief that there are few rules for guidance in personnel matters relating to employees of the central legislative staff and, therefore, are no rules or laws to violate. He stated that he believes that it is advisable to review all minutes of the Service Committee to determine any Service Committee personnel guidelines that may have been stated in the past and he will so assign employees of the Legislative Service Bureau to do so. Chairman Connors agreed that Mr. Peeters' suggestion is a good one.

In response to questions from Representative Stromer, Mr. Peeters explained that a merit increase to step seven in a grade for an employee of the Legislative Service Bureau was approved by the Service Committee one and one-half years ago as proposed by Mr. Koebernick, Acting Director of the Legislative Service Bureau. He stated that prior to his (Mr. Peeters') arrival as Director of the Service Bureau, no formal personnel system had been adopted for employees of the agency. He commented that he is in the process of developing such a personnel system, including a formal personnel evaluation process. He stated that he would use the evaluation form next year for determining salary increases, but for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1986 he had followed the past practice and given a one step merit increase to all employees of the Legislative Service Bureau.

Mr. Stromer commented that the personnel action was not approved by the Service Committee. Mr. Peeters commented that the process used for the current fiscal year for granting merit increases was different from that used in past fiscal years, and for this fiscal year the directors of each central staff agency had merely submitted a report indicating that merit increases would be given and that report was received and filed; this report was not specifically approved. Mr. Peeters stated that he did not implement any reclassifications for the current fiscal year in light of the continuing Comparable Worth Study. Representative Stromer commented that he would excuse Mr. Peeters for granting the step increases beyond step six in a grade for the two

positions, noting that Mr. Peeters may have misunderstood that such an action would require specific approval of the Service Committee.

FUTURE MERIT STEP INCREASES BEYOND STEP SIX

Chairman Connors noted that at the September 3 meeting, a motion was adopted that the Service Committee would recommend that the Legislative Council require approval for any merit step increases beyond the sixth step of a grade. He also suggested that the Service Committee approve the recommendation of Mr. Peeters that the past minutes of the Service Committee be perused for personnel guidelines and a list be made of any formal actions of a general nature taken by the Service Committee in regard to the personnel practices of the central legislative staff agencies.

MOTIONS RELATING TO PERSONNEL PROCESS

Representative Jochum moved that the Service Committee recommend a personnel process for adoption by the Legislative Council, and that the Legislative Service Bureau review minutes of the Service Committee and inform the Service Committee of any personnel guidelines that had been established. Senator Wells seconded the motion, and it carried with all members present voting in the affirmative except Representative Stromer. The personnel guidelines will be of assistance to the Service Committee as it develops a personnel process for employees of the central staff agencies.

RECESS

The Committee recessed briefly while waiting for the arrival of Mr. Gallentine.

MOTION CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPARABLE WORTH PLAN

Following brief discussion by the Service Committee, Senator Holt moved that any comparable worth plan adopted by the Legislative Council should be implemented for all employees at the same time. Representative Stromer seconded the motion, and it carried.

DISCUSSION WITH MR. GALLENTINE CONCERNING PLAN'S IMPLEMENTATION

With regard to the plan's implementation, Chairman Connors commented that in the implementation of the executive branch comparable worth plan, upgrades were not implemented above grade

thirty-two except for nurses. He asked the Committee to discuss implementation of recommended grade increases and grade decreases. Representative Stromer asked whether Mr. Gallentine recommends that employees whose grades were reduced have their salaries frozen but the downgrades not implemented. Mr. Gallentine commented that under "red circling" the employee's salary is frozen until the maximum salary level at the recommended grade catches up with the employee's salary. He noted that if cost of living increases are applied to an employee's salary as well as to the salaries in each grade, then the salary range at the lower level would never catch up with the employee's salary.

Representative Connors asked how new employees would be placed in the system. Mr. Gallentine responded that a new employee would be placed in the new salary range, not in a salary range being "red circled".

MOTION CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION FOR DOWNGRADED EMPLOYEES

Senator Holt moved that the Service Committee recommend that the Legislative Council adopt a policy that the salaries of employees who are placed in grades below the grades to which they are presently assigned and who are receiving annual salaries in excess of the maximum salaries for their newly-assigned pay grades under the comparable worth report will continue to receive their current salaries without any increase, including cost of living increases, until the maximum salaries in the grades to which the employees have been assigned are increased to a point above the annual salaries being received by employees. Senator Wells seconded the motion, and it carried.

COMMENTS FROM ROGER GALLENTINE ON STAFF COMMITTEE REPORT

Representative Stromer asked Mr. Gallentine for comments about the adjustments to the Arthur Young Comparable Worth Report made by the Comparable Worth Staff Committee, and whether the changes have been so significant that the Arthur Young & Company study is no longer valid. Mr. Gallentine responded that in any comparative study of job classifications, it is not possible for the raters to achieve one hundred percent job objectivity. He noted that different individuals will look at the same jobs differently. Mr. Gallentine stated that he is not concerned about the adjustments made by the Comparable Worth Staff Committee, noting that Staff Committee members have a different perception of some of the jobs than Arthur Young & Company staff. He noted that the Staff Committee adjusted the points of some positions upward and others down, and he noted that any client will make some adjustments to the recommendations of the consultant. He expressed the belief that the Staff Committee has not tried to slant the study upward.

Representative Stromer expressed the belief that he and Chairman Connors could have used the same criteria used for the study and placed individuals in various grades according to their job classifications without the assistance of Arthur Young and Company. Chairman Connors responded that if the General Assembly had conducted the study and placed all of the positions in various grades according to job classifications, the results of the study would not have had credibility. He expressed the belief that the use of an outside consultant to view each position objectively was necessary for a credible study. He expressed the belief that the Staff Committee has developed a credible report and he emphasized that the Staff Committee was unanimous in its vote to adopt its report.

Copies of correspondence from Mr. Gallentine to the Service Committee, dated August 25, were distributed to Committee members and Mr. Gallentine was asked to comment upon his letter. Mr. Gallentine commented that he typically meets with department heads after initial recommendations have been made, and these meetings are valuable for consistency throughout the study.

Mr. Gallentine expressed the belief that the Staff Committee has used the Arthur Young system and has consistently applied the factors.

Mr. Gallentine expressed the belief that the distinctions between grades under the Iowa system are less than is typical, noting that in private industry the distinctions between grades are usually from five percent to seven percent salary differential, not four percent as in Iowa.

With regard to the Staff Committee's recommendations providing for the establishment of a series of classifications for several positions, Mr. Gallentine expressed the belief that the Study Committee has recommended a redefinition of jobs. He cautioned the Service Committee about the importance of placing individuals within a job series on the basis of the functions they perform, not simply on the basis of their years of experience. He expressed the belief that the establishment of the job series was fine. He commented that it appears that one of the differences in factor scores between the jobs in a series is based upon the breadth of the personal interactions and contacts of various employees performing similar jobs.

Mr. Gallentine proposed that legislative representatives meet with both executive and judicial branch individuals involved in both the Comparable Worth and the personnel process in order to determine if there is consistency across the various branches for similar positions, especially in the clerical areas. He stressed that if the Service Committee changes any of the grades of positions so that they differ from the Staff Committee's recommendations, the Service Committee should also identify

factors to be changed to meet these requirements so that the total factor score will add up to the grades in which the employees are assigned.

COMMENTS FROM ROGER GALLENTINE ON APPELLANT COMMENTS

Mr. Gallentine was asked to review the comments filed by employees to the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Gallentine expressed the belief that concerns of individuals filing comments to the Staff Committee Report appear to fit into the following categories:

1. They appear to be cases in which the evaluation by the Consultant and by the Staff Committee differ, and the employee wishes to be assigned the higher of the two. He suggested a review of both recommendations.

2. The employee's evaluations of his or her position were from five to seven grades higher in appeals from the Arthur Young Report. He suggested that such an appeal be referred back to the Staff Committee for comments.

Mr. Gallentine agreed with the Staff Committee's conclusion that it is not appropriate for the Staff Committee to make judgments relating to the placement of specific individuals within a job series.

Mr. Gallentine concluded that he would be happy to provide commentary to the Staff Committee concerning the comments filed by individuals to the Staff Committee's Report. He noted that the comments illustrate a narrowing of judgment and disputes from the original appeals filed to the Arthur Young Report. He suggested that the comments to the Staff Committee might be reviewed again by the Staff Committee. Mr. Peeters responded that the Staff Committee has already reviewed the comments filed to the Staff Committee Report and the result of that review was the Addendum to the Staff Committee Report. He stated that members of the Staff Committee do not believe there is a need to further review the comments. He stated that many employees appealed the factors relating to impact of error and work environment, and the Staff Committee feels comfortable that these factors were correctly applied.

FURTHER COMMENTS FROM ROGER GALLENTINE

Chairman Connors asked Mr. Gallentine whether he believes he had sufficient time to write an accurate report. Mr. Gallentine responded that the legislative positions are not typical jobs. He noted that the job interviews were conducted during the legislative session so that the consultants were not able to

observe the jobs during the legislative interim. He commented that the Staff Committee may have a different perception of some of these jobs because the Staff Committee members are present all through the year and have seen both the session and interim work load. Mr. Gallentine stressed that the biggest item of credibility for the Staff Committee's Report is that their recommendations did not involve raising the grades of all employees four or five grades.

Representative Stromer noted that the Arthur Young & Company Report had placed the Legislative Service Bureau Research Analyst, the Caucus Staff Research Analyst, and the Fiscal Analyst in different grades, but the Staff Committee had placed them all in the same grade. He asked for comments. Mr. Gallentine commented that he and members of his staff had viewed these positions as similar but different. He commented that the Arthur Young and Company Report reflected a belief that writing the law was a different kind of activity from the tasks of the Caucus staff and the Fiscal Bureau, and each of the positions requires a different knowledge base. He indicated that the conclusion by the Staff Committee that the positions were equal was notable.

Representative Stromer noted that the Arthur Young Report had placed Minority Caucus Staff employees in lower grades than Majority Caucus Staff employees. He expressed the belief that members of the Minority Caucus Staff do not have the same degree of access to the regular staff that Majority Caucus Staff have. He noted that Minority Staff must assist legislators to maintain a posture and asked why Arthur Young & Company gave Minority Staff a lower grade. Mr. Gallentine commented that the grade levels were lower because it was perceived that the personal contacts of Minority Staff were fewer. He commented that Representative Stromer views the positions from a different perspective than Arthur Young & Company did.

Senator Wells asked for further clarification about the differences between Caucus Staff Research Analyst and other similar staff. Mr. Gallentine responded that although partisan staff research analysts and Legislative Service Bureau attorneys all attend the same meetings, one drafts legislation and the other has different kinds of responsibilities.

LUNCHEON RECESS

It was agreed that members of the Staff Committee would be allowed to respond after the luncheon break. The Committee recessed for lunch at 11:40 a.m. and reconvened at 1:20 p.m. with the same Committee members present who had been present during the morning session.

RESPONSE TO ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY COMMENTS BY MR. PEETERS

Chairman Connors asked Mr. Peeters to respond to the comments made by Mr. Gallentine during the morning session. Mr. Peeters commented that Mr. Gallentine, in his written response to the Staff Committee's Report, had stated that the Staff Committee's recommendations regarding the research analyst, secretary, and other job series positions represent an organizational restructuring, but he (Mr. Peeters) believes the recommendations were not just organizational restructuring, but that the Staff Committee perceived a difference in the roles the holders of a specific job series perform, either due to the nature of the responsibilities given to them by their supervisors or due to responsibilities assumed over time. The Staff Committee noted changes in assignments with the development of experience and the Staff Committee's recommendations reflect that. He stated that the Staff Committee agreed that extreme care should be taken in assigning employees to the different levels in order to assure that there are differences between the classification levels of a job series. He commented that discussions with Mr. Gallentine over the luncheon recess indicate that the Staff Committee and Mr. Gallentine are not in disagreement as much as had been originally perceived.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF DOWNGRADES

Chairman Connors explained to the Committee members that executive branch employees were not downgraded as a result of Comparable Worth and the motion adopted during the morning session for legislative employees is not the same as the policy adopted for executive employees. He stated that his intention is to ensure that employees whose salaries are above the maximum in the grade to which the employee has been assigned under comparable worth will not receive any salary increases, including cost of living, until the maximum salary for the range to which the employee has been assigned increases. He asked whether there were any comments with regard to the motion made during the morning session. There were no comments.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM GARY KAUFMAN AND VIVIAN ANDERS

Chairman Connors asked whether Committee members had received copies of correspondence from Mr. Gary Kaufman and Ms. Vivian Anders. He wanted to insure that all Committee members had received copies of these letters.

Chairman Connors asked Mr. Peeters about the training required for Mr. Kaufman's job. Mr. Peeters responded that Mr. Kaufman has a law degree from the University of Iowa, an aerospace engineering

degree from Iowa State University, plus knowledge and experience in several computer languages.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION CONCERNING COMMENTS FILED

Senator Welsh commented that employees were fearful because they did not know in a job series which position classification to which they would be assigned. Mr. Peeters commented that Mr. Kaufman is requesting an extra step in the legal counsel series for his specific qualifications, and Mr. Peeters believes it was the intent of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee that he not be given an extra step.

Senator Welsh, noting that many of the comments filed to the Staff Committee Report were filed by employees of the Legislative Service Bureau, commented that he believes the LSB employees have some valid points but is not sure of the manner in which to proceed. He suggested that the Staff Committee and Service Committee might sit down together with the employees who filed comments.

Chairman Connors asked why the employees of the Public Information Office were downgraded. Mr. Peeters responded that the Public Information Office was established with the idea that the employees would be performing functions which have not been greatly implemented due to time constraints, such as editing pamphlets, supervising model legislatures, and other similar public relations duties. He noted that the employees have been overwhelmed with requests for straight-forward information and have not had the time to develop the higher skilled functions that are specified in their job qualifications. He stressed that a principle of comparable worth is to evaluate the jobs the employees are actually performing, not the jobs contained in the job descriptions. He acquiesced that Ms. Wegter possesses qualifications relating to graphics and photography, and has had little or no opportunity to use those skills. He agreed that the functions of the agency could be developed, and stated that he is working with them to add to their functions on an experimental basis. Mr. Gallentine interjected that if the office can be changed so that the employees can perform the functions that they were hired to perform, these employees can then return to the Service Committee for a reviewing of their positions for possible upgrade.

Chairman Connors asked about the factor score assigned to the tour guides. Mr. Peeters responded that the Staff Committee, among all the appeals considered, was the most evenly divided on the grade assigned to the tour guides. He explained that a motion was made to raise the education factor one level and the motion failed on a four to three vote.

Representative Stromer noted that the Staff Committee adjusted a great number of salaries from the salary grade assigned by the consultant. He asked for further information. Mr. Peeters responded that comparing the grades assigned specific jobs by the consultant and the Staff Committee resulted in the following overall changes:

1. One position was lowered three grades.
2. Five positions were lowered two grades.
3. Twelve positions were lowered one grade.
4. Eighteen positions remained the same.
5. Nineteen positions were raised one grade.
6. Sixteen positions were raised two grades.
7. Eight positions were raised three grades.
8. Three positions were raised four grades.

Mr. Peeters responded to further questions by Representative Stromer that he does not have more detailed information about the number of employees who received increases and who filed comments to the Staff Committee's Report.

Representative Stromer asked for further information about the Senate Journal Editor and the comparison between that position and House Assistant Journal Editor. Mr. Peeters responded that the two positions are not comparable since the Assistant Chief Clerk in the House is Journal Editor in the House. He commented that the Journal Editor in the Senate is currently a grade twenty-five, was assigned grade twenty-six by the consultant, and was assigned grade twenty-five by the Staff Committee. The Assistant Journal Editor in the House is assigned grade twenty-one.

Representative Stromer asked whether any of the department heads petitioned to raise the grades of their employees. Mr. Peeters commented that at the beginning of the Staff Committee's deliberations there was a fear that each director would be advocating increases in grades for his or her employees, but this situation did not occur. He commented that for the various agencies, some employees were increased, some decreased, and some stayed the same. He expressed the belief that the deliberations of the Staff Committee were as objective as they could be.

MOTION TO ADOPT THE STAFF COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Senator Welsh moved that the Service Committee recommend that the Legislative Council adopt the Comparable Worth Staff Committee's Report. Representative Jochum seconded the motion.

In response to a question from Representative Stromer concerning the differences in grades assigned for majority and minority party staff personnel, Mr. Peeters responded that he did not believe that there are grade differences. He commented that

the administrative assistants to the leadership have been placed in a job series and they will be slotted into specific position classifications at the discretion of the leader for whom they work. Representative Stromer asked whether if the Service Committee recommends adoption of the report, it is accepting the new positions that have been created. Mr. Peeters responded that new positions have not been created, only new position classifications. He noted that such positions as the Leader's Secretary can now be placed in one of four position classifications within the relevant job series, but there are no new positions.

Senator Joe Welsh moved that his motion be amended so that the position of Senior Caucus Staff Legislative Research Analyst be eliminated. He noted that there are not employees currently in that classification. Ms. Sears commented that if the job series were implemented currently, there would be a potential that someone could be placed in the Senior Caucus Staff Legislative Research Analyst position. Mr. Peeters interjected that such a job series provides a caucus staff research analyst with the same advancement opportunities that are present in a central staff agency.

Representative Jochum stated that he is reluctant to support the motion since the caucus staff serves some of the same purposes as the Legislative Fiscal Bureau and Legislative Service Bureau employees.

Representative Stromer commented that he sees some potential for difficulty when the Report provides for increasing job grades at the same time that both gubernatorial candidates are discussing the poor economic conditions in the state. Representative Connors responded that the Comparable Worth study has determined that the legislative jobs be placed in grades according to their worth, and he expressed the belief that the Service Committee can justify the establishment of the specific position classifications since the positions have been placed in grades as a result of an objective report. Senator Welsh withdrew his prior motion.

Representative Stromer asked about the kinds of salaries research analysts are receiving in the rest of state government. He expressed the belief that the grades twenty-four, twenty-seven and thirty appear to be more what executive branch employees would be receiving compared to the grades twenty-seven, thirty and thirty-three in the Comparable Worth Staff Committee's Report. He moved that Senator Welsh's motion be amended to provide that the entry level for the Caucus Staff Research Analyst remain at twenty-four with the subsequent higher levels placed at grades twenty-seven, thirty, and thirty-three. He noted that his caucus has received approximately eighty applications for a vacancy in a research analyst position currently assigned grade twenty-four. Senator Holt seconded the motion, and it failed with two

affirmative votes by Representative Stromer and Senator Holt and the remaining members of the Committee voting in the negative.

Senator Holt asked whether the legislative employees will have any vehicle for appeal if the Legislative Council adopts the Staff Committee's Report. Representative Connors noted that individuals might lobby for changes in the pay resolution.

The vote on Senator Welsh's motion to recommend adoption of the Staff Committee's Report was four affirmative votes by Chairman Connors, Senators Wells and Welsh, and Representative Jochum and two negative votes by Senator Holt and Representative Stromer.

MOTION ON EFFECTIVE DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

Representative Stromer moved that the Service Committee recommend to the Legislative Council that none of the changes recommended in the Staff Committee's Report take effect until the adoption of the pay resolution by the Seventy-Second General Assembly. The motion was adopted.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GRADE INCREASES

Chairman Connors asked how the Committee wishes to implement the grade changes. He suggested that there are several alternatives. Employees could be assigned their new grade at the same step at which they currently occupy in their current grade or the Service Committee could recommend a proposal similar to that used in the executive branch which is that those being assigned a higher grade will be assigned at one step below the step on which they occupy their current grade.

Representative Stromer asked about the cost of implementation. Ms. Lyons from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau stated that adoption of the Staff Committee's Report adjusted on a grade/step to grade/step minus-one step would cost approximately one hundred eighty one thousand dollars per year if employees were placed in a position similar to the position that they currently occupy. She commented that if the adjustment were made in all grades, step-to-step, the cost would be about two hundred sixty thousand dollars. In response to questions from Representative Stromer concerning implementation of the Arthur Young Report, Ms. Lyons responded that the cost of implementation of the Arthur Young and Company Report, based on Arthur Young & Company's recommendation that all employees be placed in the new salary ranges at their current salary levels is fifty-four thousand dollars. The cost of implementing Arthur Young's pay grade assignments, but adjusting grades on a step-to-step basis is one hundred forty-two thousand dollars.

Chairman Connors called for a motion. Senator Wells moved that the Service Committee recommend that the Legislative Council approve an implementation policy using a step-to-step minus-one step approach to be consistent with the approach used by the executive branch and judicial branch. Representative Jochum seconded the motion, and it carried with Senator Holt and Representative Stromer voting in the negative and the remainder of the Committee voting in the affirmative.

JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Committee agreed to recommend to the Legislative Council that a job evaluation committee be designated for administering job evaluation matters and the Committee would have the responsibility for analyzing and evaluating job classifications using the evaluation plan.

RECOMMENDATION RELATING TO PAY MATRIX

Senator Holt moved that a joint committee composed of the Service Committee and the Comparable Worth Staff Committee meet to recommend a pay matrix for all legislative employees and to consider and make recommendations relating to overtime pay and compensatory time off for overtime. Senator Wells seconded the motion, and it carried.

METHOD USED BY STAFF COMMITTEE

Mr. Peeters commented that the members of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee in their deliberations did not begin with discussions of salary or grade level, but instead discussed the various factors and the allocations of points for those various factors. He stated that the evaluation of the Staff Committee was objective and accurate and the results for a position were not known until all factors had been considered and points had been assigned.

ADVANCEMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN A POSITION

Representative Stromer noted that Arthur Young & Company does not recommend the use of steps for advancement of an individual position. Mr. Peeters stressed that all advancements should be based upon an individual's performance. He commented that he will be instituting an annual performance review system for the Legislative Service Bureau which will include a review for both grade and step.

In response to the comments about the step increases, Mr. Gallentine commented that he had recommended the use of percentage increments for salary increases, but the effect is pretty much the same as the step increase philosophy.

Representative Stromer expressed opposition to a job classification system in which an individual could receive as much as a five thousand dollar increase in salary over as little as a two-year period. Mr. Gallentine responded that an individual who is advanced from grade twenty-seven to grade thirty-three will be performing different functions than he or she performed at the lower grade and thus be compensated at a higher rate. He commented that there now is no merit increase for outstanding job performance. He suggested that it is important to establish criteria and demand that people be performing the job outlined in the criteria in order to have their responsibilities upgraded.

BUDGET PROPOSALS OF CENTRAL STAFF AGENCIES

Mr. Angrick noted that the members of the central staff agencies will be submitting proposed budgets for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1987 to the Service Committee at its next meeting. He asked whether the budgets should include the costs of implementing comparable worth. Chairman Connors responded that the budget should be prepared as it would normally be prepared and a second budget should be prepared that includes the cost of comparable worth.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Connors thanked the members of the Staff Committee for their time and effort. He noted that their task was to be objective, and he believes that they have performed the job in a commendable manner. He stated that he was pleased that the Comparable Worth Staff Committee Report received a unanimous vote from Staff Committee members.

The Service Committee adjourned a 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

DIANE BOLENDER
Senior Research Analyst

service, september
db/dg/20