

M I N U T E S  
SALARY SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE  
SERVICE COMMITTEE

June 11, 1984

The meeting of the Salary Subcommittee of the Service Committee of the Iowa Legislative Council was called to order at 1:40 p.m. by the Subcommittee Chairperson, Representative Jean Lloyd-Jones, on Monday, June 11, 1984 in Committee Room 22 of the State House, Des Moines. Other Subcommittee members present were Senator C. W. (Bill) Hutchins and Representative Delwyn Stromer.

Also present were:

Mr. Serge Garrison, Director, Legislative Service Bureau  
Mr. Bill Angrick, Citizens' Aide  
Mr. Dennis Prouty, Director, Legislative Fiscal Bureau  
Mr. Joe O'Hern, Chief Clerk, House of Representatives  
Ms. Phyllis Barry, Code Consultant's Office  
Mr. Burnette Koebornick, Senior Legal Counsel, Legislative Service Bureau  
Ms. Diane Bolender, Senior Research Analyst, Legislative Service Bureau

Chairperson Lloyd-Jones noted that the legislative agency directors have submitted proposed salary increases for their employees commencing with the first pay period of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1984. Copies of the information distributed may be obtained from the Legislative Service Bureau.

Chairperson Lloyd-Jones called for an explanation of the proposal submitted by Mr. Garrison for employees of the Legislative Service Bureau. Mr. Garrison indicated that the Subcommittee members have received copies of a proposed revision of the Permanent Employee Classification Plan of the Legislative Service Bureau. He noted that the revision reflects the duties of the employees holding the specific positions. Mr. Garrison added that the revision had been circulated among the staff and suggested changes were made by specific staff members. Mr. Garrison added that new job descriptions were written for the Tour Guides and the Code Consultant since no descriptions had previously existed.

With regard to the proposed salaries, Mr. Garrison commented that he had in the past used both the clerical/support pay matrix and the professional/managerial pay matrix provided by the Merit Employment Department, but the proposed salary ranges are established using the proposed legislative pay matrix. He noted that the General Assembly has not established long-term salary

scales for its employees. Mr. Garrison commented that his proposed position classification plan has some changes in the pay grades and some positions are given a range of grades similar to that provided in the House and Senate position classification plan. He commented that in several cases he has lowered the grade for higher level positions in order that the salary differential between positions is not as great.

Mr. Garrison commented that he has recommended salary increases for most employees equal to 6.6 percent except those designated employees which he is reclassifying. Mr. Garrison expressed the belief that it had been a long time since his employees had had any salary increases and most of the effective dates for salary increases for his employees are on July 1. He commented that he circulated the salary proposal among his staff and had received some criticism from Mr. Gary Kaufman and from the tour guides. He commented that the tour guides believe that their position range should be from grades 11 to 13 rather than grades 9 to 11. They also believe there should be a dry cleaning allowance for cleaning uniforms. Mr. Kaufman believes that his computer skills should be reflected by an additional step.

Representative Stromer asked about whether two separate pay matrices are currently being used. Mr. Garrison responded affirmatively and stated that he assumed that the General Assembly would modify its legislative pay matrix by increasing salaries 4 percent at each grade level. He noted that providing a 6.6 percent increase for each of his employees means that many of the employees are not on a specific step in their assigned pay grade but they would be in the proper ranges of the legislative matrix.

Senator Hutchins asked about a comment of Mr. Garrison's with regard to reapportionment of school district director districts. Mr. Garrison indicated that Mr. Kaufman and he will provide a report to the Legislative Council about the work that has been done in redistricting school districts.

Representative Stromer commented that he believed the intent of the Merit Employment Department was to provide a 4 percent across the board cost-of-living increase for all employees and to provide a 4 percent merit salary increase for some employees, based on their anniversary dates. Mr. Prouty interjected that executive agencies that have all professional and managerial employees can grant 6.6 percent increases, but any employees who are not professional/managerial cannot be provided the 6.6 percent increase.

Representative Stromer asked what happens to Legislative Service Bureau employees when they are eligible for an additional step. Mr. Garrison responded that the granting of salary step increases is not automatic and any step increases must be approved by the Legislative Council. He commented that no step increases will be granted this next fiscal year.

Representative Stromer asked Mr. O'Hern for further comments about the policies for salary increases established by the Merit Employment Department. Mr. O'Hern responded that the salary increases will depend upon the types of employees that an agency has. He commented that those employees covered under the clerical/support salary matrix will have a range for each grade with definite steps. He explained that each executive agency will receive an amount equal to 6.6 percent of its total salaries from the salary adjustment fund. He commented that if the cost of providing 4 percent across the board increases plus additional steps for those eligible for additional steps exceeds the total 6.6 percent money available, the agency director must find the remaining moneys to fund the steps from the agency's appropriated budget. He added that if the cost for providing the across the board increases and the step increases is less than 6.6 percent of the salaries for the previous fiscal year, the agency will not draw the full amount from the salary adjustment fund.

Representative Stromer asked about the requirements for using the professional/managerial pay matrix. Mr. O'Hern responded that the decision is the agency directors. Mr. O'Hern added that the professional/managerial and clerical pay matrices are similar for each pay grade.

Representative Stromer summarized that Mr. Garrison granted 6.6 percent salary increases except for those employees due to be reclassified. Mr. Garrison commented in the affirmative and added that in no case would a salary increase bring an employee's salary above the ceiling for the pay grade to which the employee is assigned.

Ms. Barry indicated that she would like to provide salary increases in excess of the 6.6 percent. Representative Lloyd-Jones asked for specific percentage increases granted to employees of the Code Consultant's office. Ms. Barry commented that she has granted higher increases in order to bring the employees up to salaries commensurate with other legislative salaries. She commented that she has fewer employees this year and her budget for salaries is less than the last fiscal year's budget.

Representative Stromer expressed the belief that the legislative agencies should have recommended a 4 percent cost-of-living increase for each employee and a step increase at some point during the next fiscal year for employees eligible for step increases. He commented that he believes that those legislative employees who have been assigned higher pay grades should not have salary increases granted that will provide more than a two-step salary increase.

Mr. Garrison commented that he agrees that the Legislative Service Bureau employees are not on a specific step within their pay grade and this can cause confusion. He noted that most of his employees would be due for a step increase on July 1.

Representative Lloyd-Jones asked Ms. Barry whether she was attempting to bring the salaries of her employees up to a level that compared favorably with other legislative employees. Ms. Barry responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Angrick commented that he previously had employees on two separate pay matrices - the professional/managerial matrix and the clerical/support matrix. He commented that he has now moved his employees to the legislative matrix. Mr. Angrick stated that he is recommending that three of his employees receive additional money and these employees will then not be on a specific step within their grade. He also commented that one of his employees will not receive a merit pay increase. Mr. Angrick explained that the total increase for his office does not exceed the 6.6 percent of the salary level, since he has allocated funds from the employee who did not receive a merit increase and from his own salary. Mr. Angrick asked that his secretary/accountant be reclassified so that her position is a grade 16 and is equivalent to the other clerical employee in the office. He also commented that his intention next year is to bring those employees who are off step up to the next step level.

Representative Stromer commented again that he strongly believes in uniform grade and step salaries across the legislative positions. He asked Mr. Garrison what pay matrices he had been using. Mr. Garrison responded that he has been using both the professional/managerial matrix and the clerical/support matrix but he is attempting to get within the ranges in the legislative matrix. Mr. Garrison also commented that he believes that the salaries paid to research analysts in the House and Senate are low and should be increased.

Representative Stromer asked whether all the employees that Mr. Garrison was including under the professional/managerial matrix are actually professional/managerial employees. Mr. Garrison responded that the Merit Employment Department might classify some of his employees as clerical, but he would classify them as professional/managerial employees.

Representative Stromer asked about what may happen with regard to legislative salaries after January, 1985 when implementation of comparable worth begins. Representative Lloyd-Jones responded that she did not know. Representative Stromer expressed the belief that the General Assembly will have to comply since it has mandated that the executive agencies comply.

Mr. Prouty explained that he has redesigned his job classifications and is proposing to delete the fiscal analyst and program evaluation analyst classifications and establish legislative analyst classifications for both divisions. Mr. Prouty commented that he used a different approach than Mr. Garrison and Mr. Angrick. He explained that he first placed employees on the legislative pay matrix and gave each employee a cost-of-living increase as well as a merit increase, but the merit increases are

phased in over the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1985. He indicated that the salary increases remain within the 6.6 percent guideline except for reclassification. With regard to the reclassification, Mr. Prouty stated that he moved Mr. Freyer from a grade 30, step 3, to a grade 34, step 1, which is a two-step increase and Mr. Neiderback from a grade 24, step 2, to a grade 27, step 1.

Mr. Garrison commented that the Legislature may wish to address the issue of compensatory time for legislative employees since the policies vary among the agencies.

Chairperson Lloyd-Jones thanked the directors for their presentations and indicated that the Subcommittee would make a report to the Service Committee on June 12.

The Subcommittee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

DIANE BOLENDER  
Senior Research Analyst