

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF IOWA

LEGAL DIVISION

DAVID S. BAILEY
LYNETTE A. F. CONNER
MARTIN H. FRANCIS
MICHAEL J. GOEDERT
RICHARD L. JOHNSON
GARY L. KAUFMAN
BURNETTE E. KOEBERNICK
DAVID J. LYONS
RONALD R. ROWLAND

RESEARCH DIVISION

DANIEL S. BOLENDER
THANE R. JOHNSON
SUSAN L. LERDAL
MICHAEL W. WELLMAN



LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU

STATE CAPITOL BUILDING
DES MOINES, IOWA 50319
515 281-3566
DONOVAN PEETERS, DIRECTOR

IOWA CODE PUBLICATION

JOANN G. BROWN
ACTING CODE EDITOR
JANET L. WILSON
CODE CONSULTANT

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE

JOHN F. GOELDNER
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER
GERALDINE WEGTER
ASST. PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER

November 15, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: INTERESTED PARTIES
FROM: Donovan Peeters
RE: Summary of Staff Meeting on Comparable Worth

On Friday, November 8, 1985, representatives of the various staff agencies of the Iowa General Assembly met to discuss the implementation of the comparable worth study to be conducted by Arthur Young. In particular, there were some points raised at a meeting among Roger Gallentine (AY), Thane Johnson (LSB), and Holly Lyons (LFB) that needed to be addressed. A copy of a summary of that meeting is attached.

The major points of the discussion were as follows:

CLARIFICATION OF THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT

Discussion indicated that, due to complexities in the decision-making process, some doubts had arisen as to whether the Legislative Council had adopted the job description option or the job evaluation system option in addition to the basic contract. It was the consensus to take the necessary steps to clarify this point.

PERSONNEL INFORMATION REQUESTED BY CONSULTANT

There was some discussion regarding the basic personnel information requested by the consultant in order to begin the study. The agencies saw no problem in submitting this information, with the proviso that no duplication be made of materials already submitted to the Legislative Service Bureau. The only major question that arose was in regard to how to accommodate changes occurring during the course of the study. For example, new personnel or positions being added, current personnel leaving or

November 15, 1985

Page 2

positions being eliminated, changes in job titles, salaries, etc. It was the consensus to consult with Arthur Young to establish a policy on this.

INVOLVEMENT OF SESSION-ONLY EMPLOYEES IN THE STUDY

Major questions arose as to how to handle the job evaluation in regard to session-only employees involved in the study. It was the consensus that all session-only employees should be given questionnaires and that sufficient time should be given to them to complete the questionnaire after the start of session. On a case-by-case basis, some could be given the option to work on them before they assume their session positions. The same principles would apply "in reverse" to interim-only employees.

COMPARABLE WORTH STAFF COMMITTEE

The consultant had requested the formation of a staff committee to serve as liaison with the consultant. After discussion, it was the consensus that to provide as much representation as possible without being cumbersome that the committee should be composed of:

- The Secretary of the Senate or designee to represent Senate staff;
- The Chief Clerk of the House or designee to represent House staff;
- A representative of caucus staffs, to be chosen by the four caucus staff heads;
- The Director or designee to represent the Legislative Fiscal Bureau;
- The Director or designee to represent the Legislative Service Bureau;
- The Director of designee to represent the Computer Support Bureau;
- The Citizens' Aide/Ombudsman or designee to represent the Office of Citizens' Aide/Ombudsman
- The Deputy Code Editor or designee to represent the Iowa Code office.

Additional members could serve on an ex officio basis.

APPEALS BOARD AND PROCESS

The consultant had also suggested an appeals process to be used in regard to dissent from the findings and other aspects of the study. It was the consensus to develop a formal appeals process in regard to the findings of the study with a tentative consensus that the staff committee should function as the appeals board. Such a process could possibly be based on current grievance procedures.

November 15, 1985

Page 3

QUESTIONNAIRE

Considerable discussion arose in regard to the proposed questionnaire.

A major point was that the session/interim dichotomy in legislative work needed to be addressed better. A key point of legislative staff work is that the responsibilities, activities, and work climate vary so much between session and interim. It was the consensus that, at a minimum, space should be specifically provided for two answers in regard to questions on which the session-interim dichotomy impacts.

It was also the consensus that more space should be provided for answers in regard to several questions, based on the observation that people usually write to fill the allotted space and thus restricted space results in restricted answers.

In regard to specific questions, it was felt that Question 13 on "Contacts with Others" could be improved, perhaps using the executive branch questionnaire as a model. Also, in regard to Question 21, it was thought that a broadening of the question could be made to cover types of education not listed, such as continuing education, training courses, and the more informal or unconventional types of education (or perhaps a separate question on this).

In addition it was the consensus that the cover letter to accompany the questionnaire needed work in that more information is needed as to what is expected on the questionnaire in terms of both procedures and results in order to achieve consistency in the handling of it. It was also the consensus that a common understanding and guidelines were needed on supervisor-employee relations in handling the questionnaire so as to achieve consistent treatment of it among the various staff agencies.

TIMETABLE

It was the consensus that adjustments will be needed in the timetable.

It was felt that the timetable would need to be "stretched out" for the following reasons:

- Time would be needed to revise the questionnaire;
- Many questionnaires would not be distributed until after the start of session;
- Many interviews, if not the bulk of them, should be conducted during session to get a full understanding of the nature of legislative work (although, for the same reason some Iowa Code Office interviews would need to be during the interim);

November 15, 1985

Page 4

- The questionnaires and interviews should be handled in such a way as to not interfere with the extremely heavy work load during session; and
- The "domino effect" of the questionnaires and interviews being done later would impact by delaying the later states of the timetable.

FUTURE APPLICATION OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

It was the consensus to study at a later date the question of policies and procedures for maintaining the job evaluation instrument for future use when new job classes are created.

FUTURE MEETINGS

It was the consensus to arrange a meeting with the consultant as soon as practical, as well as a meeting of the Comparable Worth Staff Committee to be held independent of the meeting with the consultant. (See the memo of November 13 for further developments on this point.)

It was also the consensus that there should be no distribution of questionnaires to staff until after meeting with the consultant and resolving some of the questions developed at the meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

Attached will be found the memorandum of October 28 from Thane Johnson on the initial preparatory meeting with the consultant and the memorandum of November 13 on the next meeting.