

M I N U T E S

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS

June 24 and 25, 1975

Members Present

Senator Neil Arasmith, Chairman
Representative Lloyd Buzzi, Vice-Chairman
Senator Charles Wilson
Senator Arden Booth
Representative Eugene Gastl
Representative Paul Feleciano
Representative Carlos Cooper
Representative Joseph Mikesic
Representative Bill Morris
Representative James Ungerer
Representative Tom Slattery

Staff Present

J. Russell Mills, Jr., Legislative Research Department
Don Jacka, Legislative Research Department
Mary Torrence, Revisor of Statutes Office
Arden Ensley, Revisor of Statutes Office

Conferees

Susan Sutton, Office of Labor Relations, Kansas University
Laurel Wise, Affirmative Action Office, Kansas University
John B. Gehr, Kansas State Highway Commission, Topeka
Wanda Lichtenstern, Kansas State Highway Commission, Topeka
Dorothy Thompson, Kansas State University, Manhattan
Ladislado Hernandez, Kansas State University, Manhattan
Dr. Robert Harder, Department of Social and Rehabilitation
Services, Topeka
Lawrence Penney, Youth Center, Topeka

June 24, 1975

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 9:30 a.m., at which time he distributed copies of the minutes

of the previous meeting. He pointed out that the agenda showed a continuation of the hearing and discussion on Proposal No. 17, and displayed a letter which he had requested from Mr. Weltmer of the Department of Administration (Attachment No. I). He explained that the letter outlines some of the practices which have been initiated insofar as minority employment and the employment of women in state government are concerned.

The Chairman stated that the Director of Personnel, Mr. Long, has provided copies of applications, evaluation forms, application for examination, notice of examination results, and other forms which are now in use. He explained that these would be available for examination by Committee members and further explained that there had been some discussion as to possible changes in examination forms and procedures so that applications might better relate to the job involved.

Laurel Wise of the Affirmative Action Office at Kansas University offered a statement and salary chart (Attachment No. II), which she stated shows that there is a difference in education and experience requirements between predominately male and predominately female classifications within the same salary range.

Dorothy Thompson of Kansas State University of Manhattan, who had previously appeared before the Committee, offered a printed statement (Attachment No. III), and reiterated that she believed there are inequities in the state pay plan. She stated that she does not have any comprehensive answer but that she felt improvements need to be made, and in particular would like to see the veterans' preference law amended or revoked; that she can see validity in helping integrate recent veterans back into the work force but does not believe the law was intended to give preference to professional military people who are retired. Ms. Thompson displayed a copy of a study which was done at Kansas State entitled Kansas Manpower Utilization Study, and the Chairman asked Mr. Mills if he could obtain copies for the Committee members. Ms. Thompson stated that she has not seen the state Affirmative Action program and that it is possible it will remedy all complaints.

Representative Feleciano displayed a report which was prepared by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and stated he feels this December, 1974 report gets to the problem, and urged members to review it.

Mr. John Gehr of the State Highway Department was introduced to discuss some of the hiring policies of that agency, and in particular, the status of an employee, Linda Clardy. He explained that he had asked the Personnel Director, Wanda Lichtenstern, to come along because she dealt more directly with the hiring. He stated that the Highway Department has had an affirmative action program since 1969; that they have an area representative who is actively recruiting minorities; and that in the case of Linda Clardy, they had "gone all out" in an effort to help her.

The Chairman stated that something had been said about objections regarding promotions within the system as opposed to hiring new persons, and Mr. Gehr stated there had been no objections so far as he knew. He stated that the positions are advertised and anyone who is qualified can make application based on Civil Service. Upon examination, Mr. Gehr explained that individuals are notified if they are in the top five. Mr. Gehr agreed that the rule of five is probably restrictive to minorities and that he would welcome something less restrictive. He further explained that sometimes when they ask for the list of the top five they find that the applicants have taken other employment since the examination and do not want to make changes, but then they must go on down the list of applicants until the list is exhausted, and then in some cases they hire provisional employees who are required to take the examination when it is next given. He stated there are very few provisional employees in the department.

The Chairman stated that Mr. Mills has a copy of the Affirmative Action program of the Highway Department if members wished to look at it.

Ms. Lichtenstern explained to the Committee that the Department has a great number of classified positions which must be filled from the Civil Service register, but that there is a large work force of laborers and equipment operators which is unclassified; that each summer approximately 500 students are hired and of this group, about fifty are women and that they fill all kinds of jobs from road repair to mowing the right-of-way; that sometimes, especially in the rural areas, these young people become permanent employees. The only educational requirement is a high school diploma, a physical, and a driver's license. In this area, she testified, they have been especially successful in hiring minorities. After six months, if a vacancy occurs, preference is given to these people if they care to interview.

With regard to the hiring of Linda Clardy, Ms. Lichtenstern stated that the position is a "messenger" position; that it is stipulated to be for student employment. She explained that they have a cooperative program with Topeka High School in a commercial course for senior students who must work in a business office a portion of the year; that it is a credit course; that they had hired a young lady in August of 1974 who worked until October and had to leave for personal reasons; that Linda had made application for employment but did not have Civil Service Rating and was not on the register. She told the Department that she would be going to Kansas City after the first of the year, and because no student was available for this position, the job was offered to Linda. This is a part-time temporary position, but Linda was allowed to work full-time. Her attendance was, however, poor, and she was counseled about this. When the work was caught up, it was decided not to keep her and she was given notice. She felt that she was not given proper notice. Ms. Lichtenstern explained that they never let anyone gain permanent status in this position; that the students know this is a temporary thing and the job terminates at the end of the

school term. She made application to take the examination in March of 1975, but did not pass the test.

A member inquired about some indication that there had been inequities in regard to salary increases which were provided for at the last session of the legislature, and Ms. Lichtenstern stated that it appeared the Finance Council changed some job classifications and salary ranges, particularly in the Civil Engineering areas and also in the laboring areas, which might account for this; that she was told that they tried to benefit the skilled trades.

Afternoon Session

The Chairman stated that at the last meeting there had been a specific complaint concerning the State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, and introduced Dr. Robert C. Harder to discuss this and other matters with the Committee.

Dr. Harder displayed the Affirmative Action Plan which has been adopted by his Department. He explained that the policy statement sets forth the plan concerning minority hiring; that they have definite goals and intend to implement them. He pointed out that his Executive Committee at this time includes four females, two blacks (one of which is a woman), and that in the major program areas in public assistance and social services, they are headed by minority persons. (Copies of the Affirmative Action Plan are on file in the Legislative Research Department).

The Vice-Chairman asked Dr. Harder to discuss the situation which had been brought up by Representative Marshall at the last meeting concerning an employee at the Youth Center at Topeka. Dr. Harder introduced Mr. Penney who is the Superintendent at that institution.

Mr. Penney explained that he had the personnel files of Mr. Thayer B. Phillips, and would review his employment. Mr. Phillips started with this section in 1965 as a trainee and as a graduate student at Kansas University. He was a cottage social worker. In 1968 he left and went to KNI on a federal program, and came back a few months later when he did not find the job as rewarding as he had expected. He remained until 1972 and had in the meanwhile been promoted to a supervisory position. He left to become Chief Social Worker at the Reception and Diagnostic Center. At the time he left Mr. Penney told him that if he ever desired to return, they would be glad to have him. After less than a year at the Diagnostic Center, he came back to the center as a case worker, and in 1973 the Chief Social Worker

noted that "Mr. Phillips had had difficulty in adjusting to the work assigned to him." It was, however, noted that his work was satisfactory. Problems continued to occur during the following year, although Mr. Penney testified that he was not personally involved and only had statements from the Clinical Director that some of the people complained they were not getting the kind of supervision from Mr. Phillips they wanted. These matters were discussed with Mr. Phillips and when the evaluation period came in November, 1974, these matters were brought up. He was still rated "good" but there were adverse comments. Mr. Phillips asked for a review of the rating and a five-member committee from the staff was appointed. The rating was not changed and Mr. Phillips refused to sign it, and filed a reply. His reply makes no reference to "discrimination because of race".

Mr. Penney stated that the Youth Center has 179 employees -- 60 of which are minorities and 119 white. Of the minority makeup, there is 1 Indian, 4 Mexican, 5 Japanese, 43 black males and the rest black females. Eight of the 11 cottage parents are black.

Mr. Penney testified that Mr. Phillips has never been denied a pay increase nor promotion. He further stated that Mr. Knatt is the Equal Employment Opportunity officer for the Department and has investigated this particular situation.

A member asked Dr. Harder how he felt about the rule of five, and Dr. Harder stated his position is probably not very popular, but believed the merit system should extend to only those people traditionally considered non-professional and those in higher ranges should be unclassified. Dr. Harder stated that with the hiring of Mr. Knatt they have made more progress in an Affirmative Action Plan; that he has in mind going to some predominately negro colleges and trying to bring people into the state, but that it is difficult to compete salary-wise with the federal government.

A member inquired if the Personnel Department is offering help in this regard and Dr. Harder expressed the feeling that they do not seem to view themselves as a service agency to the other agencies but rather as a monitoring or "watch dog" agency and he does not feel this is appropriate. He stated that they adhere to the rule of five and he sees nothing wrong with this, although it may tend to discriminate against minorities.

A member inquired if Dr. Harder felt there are those below the top level where built-in biases become a problem and Dr. Harder replied that he believes there are individuals who would find it difficult to work with females and with minorities, but that SRS policy is clear and it has been fully circulated among all employees.

Mr. Ladislado Hernandez of Manhattan asked to appear, and stated that he had long been interested in the matter of discrimination toward minorities. He testified that he was employed at Kansas State University and would be terminated on June 30, 1975. He stated he believes Mexican-Americans have been caught between polarizing forces; that they are considered non-priority persons and that efforts to correct inequities has been met with lack of response. He stated that they are considered untrustworthy and lazy and they experience loss of employment if they fail to act humble and conform to standards not of their own choosing. He stated that there are federal, state and local agencies that are supposed to give equal opportunity but that they do not respond. He stated that Kansas State University is losing 75 percent of its Mexican-American staff this year; that Mexican-Americans are 3% of the population, and yet are under-utilized in government institutions which continue to perpetuate past discriminatory practices. Mr. Hernandez testified that he believes current civil procedures need to be updated; that statutory provisions need to be modified to permit affirmative action throughout the state; that all state agencies should adopt such a program and an auditor be employed to check the programs.

The Vice-Chairman inquired what position Mr. Hernandez holds, and he replied it was as "Trio Program Director" but that it was only in name. He testified that he was working under a federal program which was to recruit students but mainly blacks were recruited and no Mexican-Americans.

A member inquired if he was saying that the Civil Rights Commission had not given the same cooperation to him as they were to blacks, and Mr. Hernandez stated that they were not effective in their responses.

Mr. Hernandez testified that in 1969 he was employed by the Highway Commission as an equal employment opportunity officer; that he tried to get a program going but that a Mr. Leo Spurrier was the only person who offered any help; that he is convinced all of this is just "lip service".

The Vice-Chairman asked Mr. Hernandez to be more specific about his termination, and he explained he secured an appointment with his supervisor and discussed his lack of support. Mr. Hernandez stated he told the supervisor that he would not stay past June 30 if the situation did not improve, and the next day he received a letter relieving him of his responsibilities as of the end of June. He stated that he had given his supervisor twelve areas of his failure to communicate and received no response. The Chairman inquired if Mr. Hernandez felt it was discriminatory of the supervisor to release him when he had already told the supervisor he could not stay under the circumstances, and Mr. Hernandez stated he felt it was direct retaliation. The Chairman asked Mr. Hernandez if he could furnish the Committee members with a printed copy of his statement, and Mr. Hernandez agreed to do this.

A member commented that it seemed to be the consensus that some of the things discussed do exist; that the Committee needs to decide whether or not the corrections should be made administratively or legislatively; and urged members not to over-react so as to get in worse trouble than now exists.

Another member expressed concern about the rule of five and yet felt that there must be something in the way of control; that if the hiring of minorities is required for some kind of balance that does not make for efficiency in government; the public is entitled to the best they can get for the dollar spent; that if a minority is not in the top five that is not the fault of the Committee.

After continuing extensive discussion, the Chairman pointed out that the Governor is looking at an Affirmative Action plan and that the Committee should have an opportunity to look at that same plan and hear his recommendations and reactions before moving out on a proposal.

Staff was requested to secure additional comments from the Department of Administration, and the Governor's recommendations.

It was moved by Representative Cooper and seconded by Representative Buzzi that the Committee continue to monitor the action of the program to see that it is implemented and moving forward. After additional discussion, the motion carried without dissent. The Chairman stated that the Committee would look at what was happening at future meetings and take action if it seemed warranted.

The Chairman asked Mr. Mills if the Department of Administration had authority to scrap parts or all of any existing Affirmative Action programs (i.e., Highway Department and SRS) if they were so inclined, and Mr. Mills agreed to find out.

The Chairman announced that the Committee would start on the Housing Authority proposal tomorrow and that the meeting would be chaired by the Vice-Chairman since he had worked on the bill and served on the subcommittee. He stated that he and some staff would be attending a Housing Conference on July 23 in Chicago and that some new ideas may result from that meeting.

The meeting was recessed to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 24, 1975.

June 24, 1975

The meeting was reconvened at 9:30 a.m., and the minutes from the past meeting were approved.

Mr. Arden Ensley of the Revisor of Statutes Office appeared to discuss the proposed Kansas Housing Finance Authority Act - H.B. 2612. He distributed Version No. I which is the bill as it was returned to the Federal and State Affairs Committee. He explained that there are brief comments beside the pages which give some explanation of the particular sections. He stated this proposal would set up a state housing authority and would allow some financing for certain individuals; that the "low and moderate income" individuals had not been specifically defined. The agency would be to assist in financing and construction of housing. The House Committee made a number of amendments which are apparent in this particular version.

Mr. Ensley went through the bill as amended, section-by-section, with comments and questions by members. It was agreed that some people who have had experience in financing and developing should be invited to tell their experiences. It was established that both rural and urban areas had needs and the areas were not spelled out. Neither was the type of housing spelled out -- multiple, single, etc. -- but it was clear that a portion of the funds should be used for rehabilitation.

It was pointed out that the League of Municipalities is highly interested in this legislation. Mr. Ensley stated that the local units interested in utilizing the Authority would have to come up with a concrete plan before the financial institutions would be able to take an interest. He pointed out that the local communities and financial institutions would determine the need and put the package together -- that the state could not initiate the program.

In the continuing discussion, it was noted that members seem to be talking about philosophy rather than specifics. The Vice-Chairman stated that in addition to the amendments shown on this version, there are a number of proposed amendments from various individuals, groups, and legislators, and suggested that the second version (Version 2) be distributed so as to get directly to the consideration of some kind of a working proposal.

Mr. Ensley distributed Version 2 which incorporates the proposed amendments mentioned by Representative Buzzi. He urged that members continue to remember that this version is only a proposal and has not received endorsement as has Version I.

Representative Feleciano stated he would like to see an amendment on page 2, line 29, regarding public monies. Mr. Ensley explained that the original bill referred to private sales rather than public sales.

With regard to the proposed amendment concerning age and marital status on page 4, line 24, Mr. Ensley stated he did not think this would bind the financial institutions because it is a matter of practicality. On page 5, line 18 and 19, some inappropriate language has been stricken. Likewise, on page 6, it is proposed to strike some language. Representative Buzzi suggested that on page 7, line 6, it might be appropriate to

change the language to "experience in the construction industry", but after discussion, it was agreed this would not be appropriate.

Representative Feleciano stated he had a proposed amendment which would drastically change the make-up of the board, and would include the Governor, the Attorney General and the Treasurer; that this follows the Missouri law. It was agreed to "flag" this area and look at the Board make-up, but the consensus seemed to be that these three people would not have time to give to such an endeavor.

The proposed amendment on page 10, line 14, would keep the state from getting into the business of ownership. Representative Feleciano offered an amendment on line 23 concerning competitive public bids. Miss Torrence stated that the Purchasing Division informed her that, in the case of real property, some statutes require public bids while others do not. It was agreed to put this amendment into the working draft.

There is a proposed amendment on page 11, line 4, and Representative Feleciano proposed still another on line 10, inserting public bids. Mr. Ensley explained there is already a general requirement concerning insurance which takes care of it. On page 12, there is a proposed addition, and Representative Feleciano proposed an amendment on page 13, line 10, again concerning bidding. It was the consensus of the Committee that sometimes negotiations are the only way, and bidding might jeopardize the financial end, however, it was agreed to put this into the working draft. There is an additional amendment on line 29, spelling out eligibility. There was discussion concerning how "low and moderate" is determined and it was established that different federal agencies have different levels, with HUD setting it at \$7,000 to \$15,000.

Representative Buzzi pointed out a proposed amendment on page 16, which is a matter of policy and came from looking at the other states. The Chairman suggested some research be done to see how much need there is in the area. Representative Feleciano suggested some Wichita people be invited to discuss what had happened in an UR area.

The amendment on page 17 came from the lending agencies. Representative Buzzi suggested that maybe something should be done on page 16, line 31 concerning "revenue bonds" and strike "general obligations". Mr. Ensley agreed it was misleading.

Representative Feleciano suggested that (h) on page 19 be stricken. There was some comment concerning "2/3 of the Finance Council" as mentioned on page 16, and Mr. Mills agreed to research this before the next meeting.

Representative Feleciano stated that the proposed amendment on page 23 was one of his also. Representative Feleciano

stated he has mixed emotions about page 29, line 21, dealing with conflict of interest. Mr. Ensley stated it would not preclude an officer of a savings and loan from serving if he declared a conflict and declined to vote.

It was agreed staff would prepare a working copy and get it to members as soon as possible, and that it would be designated as Version III. The Chairman asked members to do some serious homework on this bill prior to the meeting on July 15 and 16. It was agreed that the Committee should have an informal session prior to hearing conferees, and Mr. Mills agrees to schedule conferees starting at 10:30 a.m. He also agreed to send out an agenda as early as possible. Mr. Mills was given permission to release the working draft to interested conferees prior to the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by J. Russell Mills, Jr.

Approved by Committee on:

7-15-75

(Date)

STATE OF KANSAS

Department of Administration



OFFICE OF THE

Secretary

STATEHOUSE—TOPEKA 66612 June 19, 1975

The Honorable Neil H. Arasmith
230 State
Phillipsburg, Kansas

Dear Senator:

At the recent committee meeting of the special committee on Federal and State Affairs, I was asked to inform the committee of the actions that I have initiated toward the elimination of discrimination in the state work force. As I commented at the meeting, the goal of elimination of discrimination will not be easily reached because it requires anti-discrimination education at all employee levels.

The following actions have been initiated:

1. Affirmative Action program in final draft. The Governor is expected to issue an Executive Order implementing a non-discriminatory plan in the near future.
2. Job specifications for all positions are being reviewed to insure that educational standards and work experience is, in fact, necessary for the position.
3. Civil Service tests are being reviewed to insure that the tests do not discriminate.
4. An improved recruiting program is being designed in an effort to reach all women and minority groups for the purpose of attracting qualified persons to the State work force.
5. Efforts are being made to insure that both males and females have an equal opportunity to qualify at all levels of State employment.
6. In the near future the staff of the State Equal Employment Opportunity Administrator's office will be increased and the staff will inaugurate an educational program for all State employees involved in the hiring process. This office will be transferred from the Personnel Division to the Office of Secretary of Administration where I will personally supervise its operation.

The Honorable Neil H. Arasmith
Phillipsburg, Kansas

- 2 -

7. In addition to women and minority groups, I am incorporating in the program a directive toward insuring that handicapped persons, within their capabilities, are not discriminated against.

Again, Senator, I would like to state to you and your committee members that I personally am dedicated to an equal opportunity employment program and that I will, during my tenure, expend the effort necessary to eliminate discrimination in Kansas State government.

If I can be of further assistance to your committee, please call me.

Sincerely,



W. KEITH WELTMER
Secretary of Administration

WKW:ba

Copies to: The Honorable Robert F. Bennett
The Honorable Arden Booth
The Honorable Edward F. Reilly
The Honorable Chuck Wilson
The Honorable Lloyd Buzzi
The Honorable Carlos Cooper
The Honorable Tom Slattery
The Honorable James L. Ungerer
The Honorable Eugene Anderson
The Honorable Paul Feleciano
The Honorable Eugene Gastl

Mr. Lowell Long, Director of Personnel

LAUREL WISE

Attachment II

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS OF THE LEGISLATURE

From: Classified Office and Clerical Workers Advisory Unit to the Affirmative
Action Office, University of Kansas

Subject: Differences in the State Classified Civil Service and Pay Scale

The Classified Office and Clerical Workers Advisory Unit has prepared a report which shows differences in education and experience requirements between predominantly male and predominantly female classifications within the same pay range. The basis of the comparison is a chart (pg.1) weighting education and experience equally, and averaging the job requirements within each salary range. As you can see, those classifications held predominantly by women require more education and more experience than those classifications held predominantly by men. Excluded from this report are classifications with equal numbers of men and women.

Enclosed also for your consideration are excerpts from a report done at the University of Kansas last Fall comparing Civil Service Wage Increases with the Consumer Price Index, and a comparison of University of Kansas Average Hourly Wages and Wages in Lawrence for Selected Occupations, December, 1973.

We hope the State will examine and revise the Civil Service System to overcome the underutilization of women and minorities in all classifications, assuring equal opportunity for all persons.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Affirmative Action Office

CLASSIFIED SALARY SCALE

June, 1975

PREDOMINANTLY MEN					PREDOMINANTLY WOMEN				
Salary Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	Exp. Req. Lev.	Salary Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	Exp. Req. Lev.
3 \$351-441					3 \$351-441	Clerk I	3	H	0 <u>2</u> 2
4 \$367-462					4 \$367-462	Clerk Typist I	18	H	0 2
						Domestic Worker	2	N	0 0
						Food Service Worker	23	N	0 0
									.67
5 \$384-484	Laborer I	19	N	0 <u>0</u> 0	5 \$384-484	Custodial Worker	146	N	0 <u>0</u> 0
6 \$402-507	Security Officer I	30	N	0 <u>0</u> 0	6 \$402-507	Addressograph Operator	2	H	B 4
						Clerk II	34	H	B 4
						Food Service Worker II	8	N	O 0
						Switchboard Operator I	11	H	B <u>4</u> 3.0
7 \$421-530					7 \$421-530	Clerk Typist II	191	H	B 4
						Key Punch Operator	8	H	A <u>3</u> 3.5

Requirement Weighting

EDUCATION

- 0 ----- N None
- 1 ----- J 8th Grade
- 2 ----- H High School Graduate
- 3 ----- H+ High School Graduate + College Hours
- 3 ----- T Technical School Graduate
- 4 ----- K 4 Year College Graduate
- S Special Qualifications

Requirement Weighting

EXPERIENCE

- 0 ----- O None
- 1 ----- A Some experience (6 mo.-1 yr.)
- 2 ----- B Experience (1yr.-3 yrs.)
- 3 ----- C Considerable experience (3 yrs.-5 yrs.)
- 4 ----- D Thorough experience (5 yrs. or more)
- 5 ----- E Extensive experience (8 yrs. or more)

* Total number of persons holding classification as of May 1, 1975

Salary Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	Exp.	Req. Salary Lev.	Salary Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	Req. Salary Lev.	
8 \$441-555	Auto. Mechanics Helper	1	N	O	0	8 \$441-555	Cashier	5	H	3	
	Automotive Driver	9	N	O	0		Clerk Steno II	51	H	4	
	Custodial Supervisor I	12	J	B	3		Cook I	5	N	0	
	Laborer II	46	N	O	0						
	Lab. Technician II	5	H	B	4						
					<u>1.4</u>					<u>2.3</u>	
10 \$484-611	Equipment Operator II	4	S	B	-	10-\$484-611	Account Clerk I	12	H+	B	5
							Clerk III	86	H	C	5
							Cook II	17	J	B	3
							Practical Nurse	1	S	O	-
							Secretary I	56	H	B	4
										<u>3.4</u>	
11 \$507-641	Florist	1	H	B	<u>4</u> 4	11-\$507-641	Medical Records Technician	1	S	B	-
12 \$530-673	Custodial Supervisor II	3	J	C	4	12-\$530-673	Food Service Sup. I	5	H	B	4
	Equipment Operator III	2	S	C	4		Switchboard Operator III-1		H	D	6
	Stationary Fireman	3	J	A	2						<u>3.3</u>
					<u>3.3</u>						
13 \$555-707	Maintenance Repairman	13	J	B	3	13-\$555-707	Account Clerk II	16	H+	C	6
	Nurseryman	1	H	C	5		Secretary II	15	H	C	5
	Patrolman	20	H	B	4						<u>5.5</u>
					<u>4.0</u>						
14 \$581-743	Auto Mechanic	4	J	A	2	14-\$581-743	Clerk IV	25	H+	D	7
	Laborer Foreman II	4	J	B	3						<u>7</u>
	Lock System Specialist	2	J	A	2						
	Machinist	4	J	A	2						
	Maintenance Carpenter	21	J	A	2						
	Maintenance Electrician	18	J	A	2						
	Maintenance Mason	3	J	A	2						
Storekeeper III	3	H	C	5							
					<u>2.5</u>						

Salary Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	Exp.	Req. Salary Lev. Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	Req. Salary Lev.		
15 \$611-780	Maintenance Eng. I	6	J	B	3	15 \$611-780	Computer Operator	6	H	A	3
	Patrolman Sgt.	7	H	B	4						
					3.5						
16 \$641-819	Chief of Custodial Services					16 \$641-819	Animal Caretaker III	1	H+	C	6
		1	H	D	6		Graduate Nurse I	13	S	O	-
	Electronics Technician	2	T	O	3		Radiological Tech.	3	S	B	-
	Instrument Maker	3	J	C	4		Secretary III	11	H	D	6
	Pressman	10	H	C	5						3.0
	Printer	10	H	C	5						
	Refrigerator and Air Conditioner Mech.	11	J	A	2						
					4.2						
17 \$673-860	Auto Mechanic II	1	J	C	4	17 \$673-860					
	Maint. Carpenter Foremen	2	J	C	4						
	Maint. Electrician Foreman	2	J	C	4						
	Maint. Painter Foreman	2	J	C	4						
	Maint. Plumber Foremen	2	J	C	4						
	Patrolman Lt.	4	H	C	5						
					4.2						
18 \$707-903	Maint. Eng. II	2	J	C	4	18 \$707-903	Clerk V	8	H+	E	8
	Stage Manager	1	K	B	6		Accountant I	10	K	O	4
					5.0		Transcript Analyst	2	K	O	4
						Library Assistant	22	K	O	4	
											5.0
19 \$743-948	Electronics Tech II	7	T	C	6	19 \$743-948	Graduate Nurse II	4	S	B	-
	Print Shop Supervisor I	1	H	B	4						
20 \$780-996	Nuclear Reactor Operator	1	S	B	-	20 \$780-996					
	Radio Supervisor	1	S	C	-						

Salary Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	Exp.	Req. Lev.	Salary Range	Classification	No.*	Educ.	E.	Req. Lev.
21 \$819-1047	Accountant II	2	K	B	6	21 \$819-1047					
22 \$860-1099	Comp. Operator Sup. II	2	H	E	7	22 \$860-1099	Medical Technologist II	1	S	B	-
	Dir. Security & Parking	1	H+	E	8						
	Print Shop Supervisor	2	H	C	<u>5</u>						
					6.7						
24 \$948-1212	Accountant III	2	K	C	7						
	Landscape Arch. II	1	K	C	<u>7</u>						
					7						
25 \$996-1272	Print Shop Supervisor III	2	H	D	<u>6</u>						
					6						
27 \$1099-1402	Accountant IV	1	K	D	<u>8</u>						
					8						
28 \$1154-1472	Superintendent Physical Plant	1	K	E	<u>9</u>						
					9						
30 \$1272-1623	Accountant V	1	K	E	<u>9</u>						
					9						

a) Inflation. Real wages for classified employees have declined during the past five years as the cost of living has increased more rapidly than wages. As shown in Table I there were no wage increases in 1971 or 1972, and in all other years since 1970 increases have been less than inflation. From 1970 to 1974 the average increase in wages was 11.3 percent while the Consumer Price Index increased by 25 percent. Thus, an immediate average increase of 12 percent would be necessary to restore real wages to their 1970 level. We are using the year 1970 as the appropriate base year since a comprehensive job evaluation study for state classified employees was conducted at that time.

TABLE I

Wage Increases for Classified Employees and the Consumer Price Index
1970 to 1974

Calendar Year	Range 5 ^a		Range 10 ^a		Range 15 ^a		Consumer Price Index, U.S.	
	Monthly Salary	Percent Increase	Monthly Salary	Percent Increase	Monthly Salary	Percent Increase	Percent Increase	Percent Increase
1970	432	2.0%	551	4.0%	704	4.0%	116.3	5.9%
1971	432	0	551	0	704	0	121.3	4.3
1972	432	0	551	0	704	0	125.3	3.3
1973	454	5.6	579	5.1	739	5.0	133.1	6.2
1974	<u>484</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>610</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>780</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>145.1</u> ^b	<u>9.0</u>
Total Increase 1970-1974	52	12.0	59	11.0	76	11.0	28.8	25.0

^aFor step F in State Salary Plan.

^bEstimated average CPI for 1974 assuming a 9 percent rate of inflation.

NOTE: Wage increases are indicated for the calendar year even though they were not effective until November 1 in 1970 and July 1 in 1973 and 1974.

Table II

Average Hourly Earnings of Production Workers on Manufacturing Payrolls in Kansas and the Consumer Price Index, 1970-1973

<u>Year</u>	<u>Hourly Wage</u>	<u>% Increase in Hourly Wage</u>	<u>Consumer Price Index, US</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
1970	3.25	5.9	116.3	5.9
1971	3.56	9.5	121.3	4.3
1972	3.76	5.6	125.3	3.3
<u>1973</u>	<u>3.92</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>133.1</u>	<u>6.2</u>
Total Increase 1970-1973	.67	21.0	16.8	14.0

Sources: Hourly wage data were provided by the Kansas Employment Security Division of the Department of Labor. The consumer price index is from Monthly Labor Review, April 1974, Table 25.

cost of living, and the State Civil Service Salary Plan it is evident that wages for classified employees not only lag behind the cost of living but also lag behind increases in the private sector. Real wages have increased in the private sector of Kansas but decreased in the State Civil Service. State employees have not benefited from gains in national productivity since 1970.

The major implication of this analysis is that the competitive position of the state has deteriorated since 1970. The state has less ability to attract quality employees and a greater difficulty in retaining such employees. Further, the decrease in wages relative to the private sector has undoubtedly increased the probability of unionization.

c) Comparisons with the Local Labor Market in Lawrence. Even though wages for classified employees have not kept pace with inflation or wage

trends in the private sector, the average wage for classified employees does not appear to be low in comparison to the Lawrence labor market. Table III suggests that classified employees' wages at the University

Table III

Comparison of K.U. Average Hourly Wages and Wages in Lawrence for Selected Occupations, Dec. 1973

	<u>Range Level</u>	<u>K.U. Avg. Hourly Wage</u> ¹	<u>Range of Wages in Lawrence</u> ²	<u>Mid-point in Lawrence Wage Range</u>
Auto Mechanic I	14	3.95	2.38-2.62	2.50
Clerk II	6	2.36	1.63-2.12	1.88
Clerk-Typist II	7	2.57	1.88-2.37	2.13
Custodian	5	2.35	1.88-2.12	2.00
Key Punch Operator	7	2.67	2.13-2.37	2.13
Laborer I	5	2.19	3.38-3.62	3.50
Licensed Practical Nurse	10	2.60	2.38-2.62	2.50
Machinist	14	3.88	4.13-4.37	4.25
Maintenance Mechanic	13	3.60	4.13-4.37	4.25
Secretary I	10	2.97	2.38-2.62	2.50
Truck Driver	8	2.79	1.88-2.12	2.00
Welder	14	4.09	3.62-4.13	3.88
Cook II	10	3.08	1.88-2.37	2.13

¹This figure was calculated by multiplying the number of workers in each step for the selected occupations by their respective wages; the totals were summed and divided by the total number of workers in that range.

²The ranges include what most experienced workers in an occupation are receiving. The source is the Kansas Wage Survey 1973, Kansas Department of Labor.

Table IV

University Comparisons by Monthly Salary¹
Entry Level Only

Job Title	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	<u>KU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>MU</u>	<u>ISU</u>	<u>OU</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mean</u> ²	K.U. Differential from <u>Median</u>	Differential % ³ from <u>Mean</u>
<u>Non-Construction Occupations</u>									
Messenger	304	458	456	NA	NA	456	457	(50%)	(50%)
Storekeeper I	389	481	566	458	347	458	463	(18)	(19)
Storekeeper II	451	543	NA	524	347	487	471	(8)	(5)
Nurseryman	521	645	NA	600	430	560	558	(8)	(7)
Gardner	408	557	NA	658	430	493	548	(21)	(34)
Florist	473	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baker	451	765	482	458	380	458	521	(2)	(16)
Cook I	408	469	NA	458	372	433	433	(6)	(16)
Cook II	451	517	482	548	580	517	532	(15)	(18)
Custodial	351	436	456	501	347	436	435	(24)	(24)
Domestic	334	386	NA	NA	347	347	367	(4)	(10)
Food Service I	334	395	396	420	347	395	389	(18)	(17)
Food Service II	370	436	430	439	356	430	415	(16)	(12)
Hospital Attendant	<u>370</u>	<u>415</u>	<u>413</u>	<u>401</u>	<u>347</u>	<u>401</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>(8)</u>	<u>(6)</u>
Unweighted Average:	401	500	460	497	356	452	513	(13)	(28)
<u>Construction Occupations</u>									
Welder	547	1115	740	831	504	740	797	(35)	(46)
Sheetmetalist	547	1065	722	831	NA	777	873	(42)	(60)

Machinist	547	628	740	756	NA	684	708	(25)	(29)
Auto Serviceman	370	492	482	NA	347	426	440	(15)	(19)
Refrig. A/C	604	1115	740	831	645	740	833	(23)	(38)
Auto. Mech. Helper	408	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Auto. Mech. I	547	485	697	792	504	547	619	0	(13)
Lock System Spec.	547	1035	697	792	480	697	751	(27)	(37)
M/Repairman	521	570	628	756	380	570	583	(9)	(12)
M/Carpenter	547	1035	697	792	580	697	776	(27)	(42)
M/Plumber	547	1115	740	NA	645	693	833	(27)	(52)
Steamfitter	547	1115	740	831	NA	785	895	(44)	(64)
M/Mason	547	NA	671	792	645	658	703	(20)	(28)
M/Painter	547	1000	671	756	538	671	741	(23)	(36)
M/Electrician	547	1090	740	831	645	740	827	(35)	(51)
Laborer I	351	436	NA	548	347	393	444	(12)	(26)
Laborer II	408	492	NA	NA	347	408	419	0	(3)
Auto Driver	408	469	516	NA	380	439	455	(7)	(12)
Equip. Op. II	408	570	NA	628	NA	570	599	(40)	(47)
Equip. Op. III	451	598	671	756	NA	635	675	(41)	(50)
Stationary Fireman	495	NA	722	756	430	625	636	(26)	(28)
Maintenance Eng.	<u>574</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>756</u>	<u>645</u>	<u>645</u>	<u>701</u>	<u>(12)</u>	<u>(22)</u>
Unweighted Average:	501	801	683	767	503	626	681	(25)	(36)

¹ Monthly salaries were calculated on a basis of hourly wage, 40 hours per week and 4.3 weeks per month.

² Salaries for the classified employees at K.U. were deleted in calculating the mean wage for the selected occupations at various Big 8 universities.

³ Figures in () indicate the percent that classified employees at K.U. are below the median and mean wages that were calculated from selected Big 8 universities.

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL AND STATE AFFAIRS
OF THE LEGISLATURE BY THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN,
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, June 24, 1975

SUBJECT: Sex-Based Inequities in the State Classified Civil
Service and Pay Scale

After the June 10 testimony before this Committee, at least one legislator asked for suggestions for legislative action to solve the problem of sex-based inequities in the State's Civil Service and Pay Scale. While we certainly do not claim to be able to answer that question, we would respectfully submit the following general proposals.

1. That legislation be adopted requiring that the placement of job classifications within salary ranges reflect their experience and education requirements. That necessary deviations from that requirement be supported by workforce data from the State of Kansas.

2. That the Committee's study of Proposal No. 17-Sex-Based Inequities in the State Classified Civil Service and Pay Scale include a review of the proposed State Affirmative Action Plan. This plan, which we have not seen, may provide a remedy for the problems of women in Civil Service and other State employment. To the extent that it does not, legislative action may be appropriate.

3. That somewhere in State Government there be established a focus for information on and improvement of the employment status of women in Kansas and particularly in state agencies. To the extent that there is such a focus in agencies such as

the Kansas Commission on Civil Rights, the State Department of Labor, the Division of Personnel, or other agencies, their information and efforts should be pooled and co-ordinated. We understand that the Kansas Commission on the Status of Women will probably not be reappointed by Governor Bennett.

4. That the veterans' preference law (Ks. 75-2955) be amended or revoked. Under this law any veteran, including retired military persons, receive ten points on their Civil Service ratings. We believe that the intent of this law was to help integrate recent veterans, such as those from the Viet Nam conflict, into the state's workforce. As now administered, it gives a preference to any person honorably discharged.