

## M I N U T E S

### SERVICE COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

September 3, 1986

#### PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

The meeting of the Service Committee of the Legislative Council was called to order at 10:20 a.m. by the Chairman, Representative John Connors, on Wednesday, September 3, 1986, in the Speaker's Conference Room 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

Chairman Connors announced that Representative Stromer was unable to be present during the morning but would be present for the afternoon portion of the meeting.

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

Mr. Donovan Peeters, Director, Legislative Service  
Bureau, Chairperson  
Mr. Joe O'Hern, Chief Clerk of the House, Vice Chairperson  
Mr. Bill Angrick, Citizens' Aide  
Ms. Cynde Clingan, Acting Secretary of the Senate  
Ms. Cathy Sears, Executive Secretary to the Speaker,  
representing House Partisan Staff  
Ms. Judy Bertelson, Executive Secretary to the Minority Leader  
of the Senate, representing Senate Partisan Staff  
Mr. Sandy Scharf, Director, Computer Support Bureau  
Ms. Phyllis Barry, Deputy Code Editor, Iowa Code Office  
Mr. Dennis Prouty, Director, Legislative Fiscal Bureau

Also present were Ms. Diane Bolender and Mr. Thane Johnson from the Legislative Service Bureau and other interested individuals.

Senator Holt moved that the minutes of the July 17 Service Committee meeting be approved as distributed to Committee members, and the motion was adopted.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING LEGISLATIVE SALARY MATRIX

Chairman Connors asked Mr. Peeters to explain his actions in granting approval for merit step increases to two employees of the Legislative Service Bureau, one from step 6 to step 7 in a grade, and one from step 7 to step 8 in a grade. Mr. Peeters responded that although the salary matrices used in the executive branch provide for only six steps in each grade, the Senate has placed employees on steps 7 and 8 of a grade. He noted that five individuals employed by the Senate are currently on step 7 or 8 in a grade.

Mr. Peeters continued that during the salary discussions in June, 1985, Acting Director Bernie Koebernick reported that the Tour Guide Supervisor would be raised from step 6 to step 7 as part of the annual merit increase process and this report was approved by the Service Committee. Mr. Peeters commented that he was using a similar action in providing step 7 for an employee of the Legislative Service Bureau and step 8 for the Tour Guide Supervisor. Chairman Connors stated that both he and Representative Stromer believe that an action to increase an employee's salary beyond step 6 should have the specific approval of the Service Committee before implementation. Chairman Connor asked that no further action be taken until Representative Stromer was present at the meeting.

REPORT OF COMPARABLE WORTH STAFF COMMITTEE

Mr. Peeters stated that prior to the meeting Service Committee members had received a copy of the Report of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee. He announced that, on review of the Report by the Staff Committee, three omissions and typographical errors were discovered and have been corrected by the issuance of an addendum to the Report. The omissions and typographical errors include a recommendation that the Leader's Administrative Assistants have a 4 classification series rather than a 3 classification series, correcting the title on the fourth column on the summary sheet for the Legislative Research Analyst job series to read "Senior Legislative Analyst Level", and the addition of a proposed classification of "Legislative Text Processor II". Copies of the Report and the Addendum may be obtained from the Legislative Service Bureau.

Mr. Peeters explained that the Staff Committee used the factors used by the Consultant from Arthur Young as well as the explanations and degrees for each factor and the factor score sheet. He stated that although the Staff Committee followed these factors in making its evaluations and reviews, the Staff Committee did refine and clarify some of them. The Staff Committee analyzed each appealed position a total of three times and each unappealed

position at least twice and the Report reflects a high degree of consensus among the members of the Staff Committee. Chairman Connors asked whether Staff Committee members spoke with the Consultant during the Committee deliberations. Mr. Peeters responded in the negative. Senator Welsh moved that the Service Committee receive and file the Report and Addendum of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee.

ABSENCE OF CONSULTANT OR REPRESENTATIVE FROM ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY FROM MEETING

Chairman Connors stated that he was disturbed that the Consultant from Arthur Young & Co., Roger Gallentine, was not present at the Service Committee meeting to defend the Consultant's Report. Mr. Peeters responded that he had originally contacted Mr. Gallentine to inform him of the date on which the Service Committee meeting had been tentatively scheduled and was assured that Mr. Gallentine would keep the date open in order to attend the meeting. Mr. Peeters stated that when he had contacted Mr. Gallentine with the confirmed date, he had been informed that Mr. Gallentine would be unable to attend but would send another individual from Arthur Young & Company. Mr. Peeters noted that an employee of Arthur Young & Company from the Milwaukee office had stated on September 3 that Mr. Gallentine understood that Arthur Young's work on the contract was completed and he had not planned on sending anyone to the meeting.

In response to a question from Chairman Connors, Mr. Peeters stated that he believed that Arthur Young & Company had received payment in full for the contract, but included with the payment was a note that it was intended that a representative from Arthur Young & Company attend the Service Committee meeting. Chairman Connors asked the Legislative Service Bureau to contact the Des Moines office of Arthur Young & Company and request that they send a representative to attend the Service Committee meeting. The representative from the Legislative Service Bureau was informed that employees of the Des Moines office were not familiar with the study and would not be attending the meeting.

Senator Welsh suggested that the Legislative Service Bureau inform the National Conference of State Legislatures about the actions of Arthur Young & Company so that members of other legislatures might be informed.

REVIEW OF STAFF REPORT

Mr. Peeters reviewed the contents of the Staff Report, noting that it had been divided into six different parts, including the following: A general introduction, a review of methodology of the Committee, a review of appeals, a review of unappealed positions,

general recommendations of the Staff Committee, and an appendix containing a number of exhibits.

Mr. Peeters stated that the Staff Committee found real inconsistencies in the Arthur Young Report, including both the frequent misapplication of some factors and a misunderstanding of some positions, especially one-of-a-kind positions. He noted that because of this conclusion, the Staff Committee had communicated with the Service Committee requesting permission to review the unappealed positions as well as those that were appealed, and had received approval from the Service Committee.

Chairman Connors indicated that he wanted all those individuals who appealed the Report of the Staff Committee to be notified that they have the right to appear before the Service Committee to discuss the comments that they filed as their appeals. The Committee recessed at 11:10 a.m. so that those individuals who filed comments could be notified of their right to appear. The Committee reconvened at 11:20 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Senator Welsh moved that the Service Committee go into Executive Session to hear comments of those employees filing comments to the recommendations of the Staff Committee unless the employee specifically stated that he or she desired that the session be open. The motion was adopted unanimously by the Service Committee members present. There were no objections to a request of Ms. Maryjo Welsh that she be present during the Executive Session in order to brief Representative Stromer on the proceedings. Ms. Diane Bolender was present during all of the Executive Session and Mr. Thane Johnson was present during the afternoon portion in their capacities as staff to the Committee.

The Committee went into Executive Session at 11:25 a.m. and recessed for lunch at 12:40 p.m. The Executive Session reconvened at 2:30 p.m. with the same Service Committee members present who had been present during the morning session except that Representative Stromer was present. The following individuals addressed the Service Committee in Executive Session:

Ms. Wilma Zika  
Ms. Carol Edwards  
Mr. John Goeldner  
Ms. C. J. Kelly  
Ms. Sue Lerdal  
Ms. Diane Bolender  
Ms. Lynette Donner  
Mr. Gary Kaufman  
Mr. Dennis Harbaugh  
Mr. Ray Knapp  
Ms. Liz Izaccson

The other individuals filing comments informed the Committee that they did not wish to appear before the Committee, except for one who was not contacted since he was out-of-state on vacation.

COMMENTS FROM STAFF COMMITTEE CONCERNING APPEALS

Chairman Connors reconvened the Committee at 3:00 p.m. and asked for discussion from Committee members and the Staff Committee concerning comments filed to the Staff Committee Report.

There was no discussion concerning the comments of Wilma Zika and Carol Edwards.

COMMENTS OF JOHN GOELDNER AND GERALDINE WEGTER

With regard to the comments by John Goeldner, Public Information Officer, and Geraldine Wegter, Assistant Public Information Officer, Senator Welsh noted that Mr. Goeldner stated Ms. Wegter was required to have a Bachelor's degree and that she possesses degrees in journalism and photography. Mr. Peeters stated that the Staff Committee reviewed the tasks the individual in the job is actually performing, and members felt that the Assistant Director of the Public Information Office was primarily dispensing straightforward factual information of relatively low complexity. He stated that the Staff Committee did have a problem in evaluating the Public Information Office since there are no guidelines as to exactly what information and services the individuals in that office should be providing. He suggested that a policy statement for the functions of the Office should be developed and implemented, but he believes the evaluation of the Assistant Public Information Officer is accurate in terms of the job presently being performed.

Representative Jochum asked whether there is a need to expand the Office's functions. Mr. Peeters responded that there is a need to perform record keeping as to workload and then to evaluate that workload. Mr. Peeters suggested that the Service Committee might consider freezing the positions where they currently are, provide for the establishment of a policy statement, and then reevaluate the positions. Mr. Peeters stated that he was not aware of Ms. Wegter's qualifications in graphics and photography and that those qualifications were a factor in her being hired. He commented that the Staff Committee believed she was dispensing relatively straightforward factual information and was not having significant opportunity to do work in these other areas.

COMMENTS OF C. J. KELLY

With regard to the comments by C. J. Kelly, Senate Journal Editor, Mr. Peeters stated that the House and Senate Journal Editors and their assistants were evaluated separately because the structures of the two houses in this area are so different. Chairman Connors stated that Ms. Kelly felt that as Senate Journal Editor she is not directly supervised and that her factor score for mental/visual was lower than it should have been. It was noted by the Staff Committee that she is supervised by the Secretary of the Senate and her staff does perform data entry for her.

COMMENTS OF MR. KNAPP

With regard to the comments by Mr. Knapp, Legislative Fiscal Bureau Systems Analyst, Senator Welsh asked whether the data processing backgrounds of Mr. Knapp and Mr. Kaufman were considered when the Staff Committee evaluated their positions. Mr. Scharf commented that Mr. Knapp does write programs for the computer, but several Legislative Fiscal Bureau employees are able to write programs for the computer. With regard to Mr. Knapp's comments that he monitors hardware and software on the market, Mr. Scharf commented that any computer employee in a position similar to Mr. Knapp's monitors hardware and software. Mr. Prouty commented that Mr. Knapp's job duties have changed with the purchase of a separate legislative computer and the establishment of the Computer Support Bureau. Representative Stromer asked whether there is strong competition for Mr. Knapp's skills in the private sector. Mr. Prouty responded that he did not believe so.

COMMENTS OF MR. KAUFMAN

With regard to the comments by Mr. Kaufman, Legal Counsel with Computer Programming Duties, Mr. Peeters explained that in the Staff Report the separate position classification for him was eliminated and the Service Committee must view the scores for the legal counsel job descriptions. Chairman Connors asked whether Mr. Kaufman actually has three different jobs in the Legislative Service Bureau. Mr. Peeters responded that his reapportionment job has been viewed by the Staff Committee as part of his regular work assignment since legal counsels and research analysts develop specialties in specific subject areas.

Senator Welsh noted that legislative employees who are placed in a job category for which a series of classifications has been recommended have not been informed where they would be placed in the job series and are not sure whether they should be appealing their position classification. Mr. Peeters responded that the

decisions. as to the placement of specific individuals in specific positions in which a series has been created will come in the implementation process. He noted that the Staff Committee discussed the issue, but believed that management should develop criteria for the different position classifications in a series and then develop recommendations for their present staff.

Mr. Peeters added that the consultant had greatly condensed the current job series, but the Staff Committee has expanded the job series in many cases. He commented that the Staff Committee members did not believe that they were the appropriate party for making a decision placing specific individuals in specific position classifications within a job series. He expressed the belief that legislative employees can have an approximate idea of which position classification into which they would be placed by looking at the position classification series and their legislative background.

Chairman Connors asked whether a Research Analyst II could assume that he or she would be placed in the new Research Analyst II classification. Mr. Peeters responded that there should be developed by each agency some definitions of what each classification requires based upon the functions of the positions. He added that once those definitions are developed and criteria listed, it will be easier to determine the specific individuals that should be placed in each individual classification. Mr. Peeters concluded that the Service Committee could recommend a policy that employees should be placed in the new positions as nearly as possible equivalent to their current positions.

Representative Stromer noted that the Arthur Young Report assigns different entry level grades for each of Caucus Staff Research Analyst, Legislative Service Bureau Research Analyst, and Legislative Fiscal Bureau Fiscal Analyst. He asked whether the Staff Committee began its study of positions by reviewing the Arthur Young recommendations. Mr. Peeters commented that the procedure used by the Staff Committee was to look at various positions in groups when members of the Staff Committee thought positions were related. The Staff Committee then decided if the positions were different or not different and scored alike those positions that the Staff Committee determined were alike. In response to further questions from Representative Stromer, Mr. Peeters commented that the Staff Committee established a series of position classifications as a result of the public hearing held by the Staff Committee during which testimony was given by many individuals that assignments and responsibilities change over time as a result of experience. He noted that the Staff Committee had begun its work by looking at the Arthur Young's scores for each job, but concluded that the scores for factors were often inaccurate.

COMMENTS BY DIANE BOLENDER AND THANE JOHNSON

With regard to the comments by Diane Bolender and Thane Johnson, Senior LSB Research Analysts, Mr. Peeters noted that the impact of errors factor that they appealed was discussed by the Staff Committee, and the Staff Committee determined that the Consultant's definitions were ambiguous. The Staff Committee developed guidelines for each degree and determined that the fifth degree for the impact of errors factor meant that the position could be compared to a position in which an error was life threatening. Also, the errors at the fifth degree would not be subject to supervisory review or checking. The Staff Committee concluded that no one in the legislative branch should be assigned a fifth degree for impact of errors. Mr. Peeters added that the Deputy Directors of the two central agencies and the Senior Caucus Staff Director position were given a fourth degree for impact of errors. Mr. Peeters stated that he believed that the Staff Committee believed that for other legislative employees, there are many mechanisms for detecting errors including both an internal review and an external review. Representative Stromer interjected that although there are employees who review bills, these reviews are often for grammatical errors, and the impact of an error in a bill may not be understood until after the session has adjourned. He expressed the belief that he could justify giving a fourth degree level for impact of errors for the Senior Research Analyst position.

With regard to the appeal of the work environment factor, Mr. Peeters stated that the Staff Committee also discussed this factor at length. He commented that the Staff Committee determined that work environment was intended to encompass the entire spectrum of working environments and any individual who has an office environment should receive a first degree even though the office environment may be poor. A poor office is still a good work environment compared to outdoor construction work or a meat packing plant, for example. He commented that the second degree level was given in a few cases in which there were noxious fumes or loud noise present.

COMMENTS OF LEGAL COUNSELS

With regard to the comments by Lynette Donner, Marty Francis, and David Lyons, Legal Counsels in the Legislative Service Bureau, Mr. Peeters commented that the Staff Committee did not assign the eighth degree level to the knowledge from education factor since the initial requirement of a law degree is only partly relevant to the job. He stated that for this reason the Staff Committee discounted the law degree slightly. He commented that his comments with regard to impact of errors factor for the Senior Research Analyst position also would apply to the Legal Counsel position.

COMMENTS OF MR. HARBAUGH

With regard to the comments by Dennis Harbaugh, Senate Democratic Caucus Staff Director, Mr. Peeters commented that the Staff Committee believes that there are clearly defined differences between the duties and responsibilities of a Caucus Staff Director and a Senior Caucus Staff Director and both positions should remain due to the important role in the policy-making process that a caucus staff director may assume over time. He stated that he believes that criteria should be developed by the specific agencies for the two positions. He added that the Staff Committee believes that the Senior Caucus Staff Research Analyst position would be a relatively rare position that would be granted, and that this individual would assist legislative leadership in determining what the caucus position should be in specific areas. He also added that even though the Senior Caucus Research Analyst would be one grade higher than the Senior Caucus Staff Director, this does not necessarily translate into a higher salary for the Senior Research Analyst, since there is only a one-step salary difference between grades. It was also discussed that there are examples of a supervisor being at a lower salary rate than someone being supervised by that supervisor.

COMMENTS OF MS. ISAACSON

Chairman Connors noted that Ms. Isaacson had commented that the entry level grade for Caucus Staff Research Analysts is higher than the grade given to any individual on the Chief Clerk's staff. Mr. O'Hern interjected that in the House of Representatives presently, one position in the Chief Clerk's Office is higher than the current entry level for Research Analysts. He commented that the Report of the Staff Committee represents the first time in which all legislative positions were analyzed at the same time. Mr. Peeters interjected that the Staff Committee did not compare the grade levels from agency to agency in its deliberations, but the final results correspond to the duties and responsibilities of each position.

GENERAL QUESTIONS ON STAFF REPORT

Chairman Connors asked for additional information about the final vote on the Report of the Staff Committee. Mr. Peeters responded that the Final Report was approved unanimously although each member had disagreement with certain elements in the Report. He noted that on any decision, any member of the Staff Committee was free to call for a vote and when such votes were called in those cases only one or two individuals voted in the minority. The only exception was on the vote to raise by one level the education factor for tour guide and tour guide supervisor and this

was defeated on a 4-3 vote. He expressed the belief that the Staff Committee members all felt comfortable with the final work product.

Representative Stromer asked whether any new positions were created by Arthur Young. Mr. Peeters commented that the Arthur Young Report contemplated changing some job titles and some new job classifications were created. He explained that the Staff Committee, based on its knowledge of legislative positions, believed that including many positions into a single classification was not an accurate reflection of duties and responsibilities of the position. He commented that the Staff Committee in rules approved by the Service Committee, stated that an appeal could be made for creation of a new classification. Mr. Peeters explained in response to a further question from Representative Stromer, that the ability to create new classifications was clarified in additional rules filed with the Service Committee.

Representative Jochum asked that the minutes include a statement that a majority of the appeals to the Service Committee have come from employees of the nonpartisan staff. He stated that the Service Committee is confident that partisan politics were not a factor in the decisions made by the Staff Committee.

Chairman Connors stated that the Committee should study the appeals not heard and review the minutes of the September 3rd meeting. The next meeting was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, September 16, 1986.

Chairman Connors stated that several persons who had filed appeals and appeared before the Service Committee had made comments that the Staff Committee had done a thorough job in analyzing the positions.

#### FURTHER COMMENTS CONCERNING LEGISLATIVE SALARY MATRIX

Chairman Connors again brought up the subject that had been raised during the morning session concerning the step increases granted by the Director of the Legislative Service Bureau. In response to a question by Representative Stromer, Mr. Peeters stated that in June, 1985, the report made to the Service Committee by Acting Director Burnette Koebernick of the Legislative Service Bureau had reported that the Tour Guide Supervisor be raised from step six to step seven as part of the annual merit increase process, and the Service Committee adopted the request without question. He also added that the Senate has placed five employees at step seven or eight in their grades. Representative Stromer expressed the belief that the General Assembly always attempts to adopt the position used by merit employment system and the merit employment system's position is a six-step grade.

Chairman Connors commented that he believes that step increases beyond the six steps should be specifically approved by the Service Committee. Mr. Peeters responded that the legislative agencies had used a different procedure for merit increases this year than had been used in the past, in accordance with guidance from the Service Committee. Specific approval was not granted for merit step increases. Chairman Connors agreed that the Legislative Service Bureau was not setting a precedent since other agencies had granted step increases beyond the sixth step in the past.

Ms. Clingan, Acting Secretary of the Senate, indicated that one full-time individual employed by the Senate was granted a meritorious step increase, to step seven, by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee. Representative Stromer also noted that increases beyond step five require two years between step increases rather than one year.

Chairman Connors asked Mr. Peeters to file a report on the legality of increasing steps beyond step six for the next meeting of the Service Committee.

Representative Stromer asked for answers to the following questions:

1. Is there a set policy as to how to give a meritorious step increase for an employee? If so, what is it?
2. Can a meritorious step increase be given beyond a specific step level without waiting for two years to elapse?
3. How can a step increase to step eight be justified? Is there any precedent for moving an employee to step eight in less than two years?

Senator Wells moved that the Service Committee adopt the position in the future that any granting of step increases beyond the sixth step must be approved by the Service Committee. The motion was adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Service Committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

DIANE BOLENDER  
Senior Research Analyst