

S B

104



NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN

Anchorage Chapter

P.O. Box 1722

Anchorage Alaska 99510

March 24, 1981

Senator Vic Fisher
Senate Staff
Pouch V, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Fisher:

On behalf of the Anchorage Chapter of the National Organization for Women, I wish to comment on Senate Bill No. 193, Senate Bill No. 104, and Senate Bill No. 248.

Senate Bill No. 193 entitled: "An Act amending the State Personnel Act (AS 39.25); and providing for an effective date."

A proposed amendment, change in language page 14, line 22,

...after the word age,... strike "or",

...insert "marital status, changes in marital status,"

...continue with "handicap,"

...insert "or any other non-merit reason."

Proposed language would be (line 21) "...discrimination due to race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, marital status, change in marital status, handicap, or any other non-merit reason." These changes would strengthen this non-discrimination statement. Employment status should not be inhibited by a persons marital situation or other reasons not effecting their work performance.

Senate Bill No. 248 is a good bill and will strengthen equal employment opportunities for both women and minorities within the executive branch. This bill has our support.

Senate Bill No. 104 is unacceptable. Historically veteran's preference legislation has proven to have a negative impact on women in the job market. The variation in numbers of women who qualify for veteran's benefits as compared to the numbers of men is an inhibiting factor to equal employment opportunities for women.

Your consideration of these comments is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Madeline G. Holdorf

Madeline G. Holdorf
President

cc: Labor Committee
Anchorage Chapter, National
Organization for Women

AMENDMENT

Page 2, Line 6: After the word "qualifications," insert "and all other things pertinent to position status"

Page 2, Line 8 through 10: After the word "veteran", delete remainder of the sentence and insert the following sentence: "If a veteran or disabled veteran desires to waive his additional preference points for an entry position into the classified service, he may, at his discretion, use those points at a later time for another position within the same job classification exclusive of an area of promotion."

Page 2, Line 12: Delete "90" and insert "181"

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. SB 104

Title An act relating to veteran's preference in State employment

Requested by Senator Bradley

Date January 28, 1981

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Administration

Program Category Affected General Government

BRU. Program. or Subprogram(s) Affected Personnel

(Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

| | FY 81 | FY 82 | FY 83 | FY 84 | FY 85 | FY 86 |
|--------------------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 100 PERSONAL SERVICES | | 9.8 | 54.8 | 60.3 | 66.3 | 72.5 |
| 200 TRAVEL | | | | | | |
| 300 CONTRACTUAL | | 8.1 | 8.9 | 9.8 | 10.8 | 11.9 |
| 400 COMMODITIES | | .6 | .7 | .7 | .8 | .9 |
| 500 EQUIPMENT | | 7.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 600 LAND & STRUCTURES | | | | | | |
| 700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC. | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | 65.5 | 64.4 | 70.8 | 77.9 | 85.7 |

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

| | FY 81 | FY 82 | FY 83 | FY 84 | FY 85 | FY 86 |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| GENERAL FUND | | 65.5 | 64.4 | 70.8 | 77.9 | 85.7 |
| FEDERAL FUNDS | | | | | | |
| OTHER (Specify Fund Source) | | | | | | |

POSITIONS

| | FY 81 | FY 82 | FY 83 | FY 84 | FY 85 | FY 86 |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| FULL TIME | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| PART TIME | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| TEMPORARY | | | | | | |

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

The statutory time requirement in proposed AS 39.25.185 (a) (3) and the necessary procedures to insure the proper executive of AS 39.25.185 (a) (4) and (5) requires the addition of a Personnel Technician to the Juneau certifications unit of the Division of Personnel and clerical support in both the Juneau and Anchorage Offices. FY 82 costs include initial equipment work stations. FY 83 and following are inflated @ 10%. Spaces costs at 2.7 per position are also included.

Agencies to which the Division of Personnel has delegate certification authority will also be effected.

IV. DATE 2/5/81 PREPARED BY Michael P. McMullen
 AGENCY Division of Personnel
 PHONE 465-4430

Original: Legislative Finance
 Budget and Management
 Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)
 Senator Bradley

gc

A Survey of Veterans' Preference Legislation in the States

By Charles E. Davis

FOR NEARLY 40 YEARS, the American military veteran has benefited from governmental personnel policies designed to provide compensation for services rendered and disrupted career plans.¹ The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, for example, boosted employment opportunities of veterans seeking jobs in the federal government by adding individuals honorably discharged from active duty in the armed services or their dependents to the list of those eligible for preference.

Benefits ranged from absolute preference for selected positions (e.g., guards, elevator operators, messengers and custodians) to the addition of five points to any nondisabled veteran achieving a passing score on a civil service exam. It also provided preferential treatment for veterans in any subsequent reductions-in-force. Under the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1956, these privileges were extended to peacetime veterans serving as little as six months of military service. The impact of these laws is illustrated by some recent statistics cited by Alan K. Campbell. Although veterans comprise only one fourth of the eligible workers in the United States, they make up 50 percent of the federal work force and hold 65 percent of the top civil service positions.²

Despite the continuing importance of veterans' preference legislation (hereafter referred to as VPL) in affecting the recruitment, selection, promotion and tenure of federal public employees, state-related developments have received little attention from personnel analysts or students of the administrative process. These trends merit a further look for two principal reasons. While much of the state veterans' preferential legislation is patterned after federal initiatives, there is, nevertheless, considerable diversity in the number and variety of benefits offered. For example, most states require reemployment rights for veterans in their premilitary vocation, preferred status vis-a-vis nonveteran public employees should reduction-in-force become necessary, and absolute preference for

selected jobs usually associated with a bureau or division of veterans' affairs. In addition, however, a few states have granted bonus points for promotional considerations or employment privileges for the spouse of a nondisabled veteran as well as various idiosyncratic practices scattered throughout the country.

It is evident that state policymakers will be faced with serious questions regarding the compatibility of already generous VPL with an increasing number of women and minorities seeking public employment. Information about the kinds of benefits available to veterans in various states would better enable public officials to balance such differing values as "reward for prior military sacrifice and/or service" with "equity" and "merit" in the process of making personnel-related decisions. The central purpose of this article is to provide a brief analysis of state laws affecting the employment prospects of veterans. Of particular concern is the relative generosity of each state in awarding preference benefits to veterans and the sociodemographic characteristics which differentiate more liberal states from those providing fewer benefits.

Findings

To make valid comparisons about the relative strength of veterans' preference legislation, an index was constructed for each state (see Table 1). The criteria used in the calculation of these indices included appointment or promotional preference for nondisabled veterans in selected jobs (1 point), absolute preference or bonus points for all or most jobs under classification (2 points), and bonus points for promotions in all or most civil service jobs (2 points). A like number of points were also awarded in each category if the spouse of a nondisabled veteran were granted similar privileges. The cumulative scores ranged from no points (Delaware) to six points (Indiana and New Jersey), and a slight majority of the states (26) emerged with a three-point total.

The next step was to determine whether states providing generous veterans' preference benefits had any distinctive political or demographic features. As Table 2

Charles E. Davis is Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Management at Suffolk University in Boston.

indicates, the strength of the state VPL index was somewhat more pronounced in the Midwest and Northeast, while Western states were least likely to provide veterans with statutory advantages for public employment. For example, Arizona and New Mexico give preference to veterans seeking employment in their respective bureaus of veterans' affairs, but do not extend these privileges to include jobs classified under state civil service. No Western states awarded absolute preference or bonus points for promotions within the state civil service, and only Montana permitted the addition of bonus points to the test scores of a veteran's family members. A small number of Northeastern and Midwestern states, on the other hand, were inclined to adopt these measures.

Of equal importance are the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of state governmental jurisdictions. States ranking high on the VPL index tend to be more populous, wealthier on a per capita basis, and less receptive to the influence of interest groups (see Table 2). These results would appear to contradict the more commonsensical view that military life and the well-being of its personnel have always been held in greater esteem in the more traditional parts of the country—i.e., the South and the West. One might presume that veterans would benefit not only from the good will and political support of Southern legislators wielding positions of authority in the armed services committees of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate, but also a favorable political climate which has resulted in the disproportionate allocation of federal military installations in the South.³ Under these circumstances, politically conservative state legislators would perceive veterans' preference benefits not as social welfare legislation but as the just rewards for individual military service or sacrifice.

A more plausible interpretation of these findings, however, directs attention to the perception of veterans by state legislators as a significant political constituency. The negative relationship found between interest group strength in the states and the provision of generous veterans' preference benefits suggests that legislative success does not result from the organizational or lobbying skills of veterans organizations, such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the Disabled Veterans. As Levitan and Cleary have indicated, these groups have tended to play a more passive role in the legislative process, preferring to rely on the judgment of elected policymakers for the appropriate level of benefits received.⁴ It thus appears that support for VPL may be less a function of group mobilization than the realization by individual political candidates of the electoral benefits to be gained from appeals to the interests of veterans and their families.

Discussion

The survey results indicate that the number and variety of veterans' preference laws in the states are affected by such demographic factors as population size, region, per

capita income and interest group strength. Veterans seeking employment in state government are likely to compete with relatively greater advantage in the more populous, wealthier states of the Midwest and the Northeast.

Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a detailed analysis of the interrelationships between veterans' preference and other personnel issues of concern to state decision-makers, a number of policy implications and suggestions for further research bear mention. Veterans' preference affects nearly all phases of personnel management, but it is obviously the selection of public employees which has provoked the most serious controversy. All states classified as "medium" or "high" on the VPL index gave nondisabled veterans at least a five-point bonus on civil service exams—a practice which is viewed with a measure of disdain by civil service reformers favoring strict adherence to merit principles as well as supporters of affirmative action programs who feel that minorities and women have long been excluded from responsible government jobs. An additional irritant to affirmative action proponents is the awarding of bonus points to veterans for promotional purposes by a few of the more generously inclined states. Clearly, more research on the impact of veterans' preference laws on the proportion of minorities and women hired by state government (in relation to their numbers in the general population or relevant labor markets) would be of interest to elected public officials as well as manpower analysts.⁵

To a lesser degree, state VPL is of concern to nonveteran members of public unions or employee associations. Any advantages enjoyed by ex-veteran public employees in regard to promotions or reductions-in-force may be viewed as contrary to the seniority principle, which is viewed by many labor officials as the fairest method of deciding who benefits (as well as who loses—a point often made by affirmative action proponents). Ultimately, policymakers hoping to achieve the allocation of human resources in an equitable and efficient manner will have to confront the necessity of trade-offs. The reconciliation of such diverse values as "reward," "merit," "equity," and "organizational tenure" into an integrated policy framework is an undertaking deserving a prominent place on the research agenda of the 1980s.

Notes

1. The most concise treatment of veterans' preference legislation in the federal government is found in O. Glenn Stahl, *Public Personnel Administration*, 6th ed. (New York, N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1971), pp. 137-43.

2. Alan K. Campbell, "Civil Service Reform: A New Commitment," *Public Administration Review*, 38 (March/April 1978), pp. 99-103.

3. Nicholas Henry, *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980), p. 420.

4. Sam Levitan and Karen A. Cleary, *Old Wars Remain Unfinished: The Veterans' Benefit System* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), p. 15.

5. The author has begun such a task in an exploratory fashion; see, e.g., Charles E. Davis, "Veterans' Preference, Affirmative Action, and Public Employment," a paper presented at the 1980 annual meeting of the Southwest Political Science Association in Houston.

Table 1
THE RELATIVE STRENGTH OF STATE VETERANS' PREFERENCE LEGISLATION

| States (a) | Veterans' Preference Benefits | | | | | | Total points (b) |
|----------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------|
| | Selected positions | | | Civil Service positions | | | |
| | Appointment preference or bonus points | Appointment preference or bonus points (veteran's relatives) | Preference or bonus points for promotions | Appointment preference or bonus points | Preference or bonus points (veteran's relatives) | Preference or bonus points for promotion | |
| Alabama | 1 | 1 | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Arizona | .. | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 2 |
| Arkansas | .. | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 2 |
| California | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Colorado | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Connecticut | .. | .. | .. | 2 | 2 | .. | 4 |
| Delaware | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 0 |
| Florida | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Georgia | 1 | 1 | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Idaho | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Illinois | 1 | .. | 1 | 2 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Indiana | 1 | 1 | .. | 2 | 2 | .. | 6 |
| Iowa | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | 2 | 5 |
| Kansas | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Kentucky | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Louisiana | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Maine | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | 2 | .. | 5 |
| Maryland | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Massachusetts | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Michigan | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Minnesota | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Mississippi | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Missouri | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Montana | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | 2 | .. | 5 |
| Nebraska | 1 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1 |
| Nevada | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| New Jersey | 1 | .. | 1 | 2 | 2 | .. | 6 |
| New Mexico | 1 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1 |
| New York | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | 2 | 5 |
| North Carolina | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | 2 | 5 |
| North Dakota | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Ohio | 1 | 1 | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Oklahoma | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Oregon | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Rhode Island | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| South Carolina | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| South Dakota | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | 2 | 5 |
| Tennessee | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Texas | 1 | .. | 1 | 2 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Utah | 1 | .. | 1 | 2 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Vermont | .. | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 2 |
| Virginia | .. | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 2 |
| Washington | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| West Virginia | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Wisconsin | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Wyoming | 1 | .. | .. | 2 | .. | .. | 3 |

Source: U.S. Congress, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, *State Veterans' Laws*, House Committee Print No. 6, 96th Congress, 1st sess., 1979.

(a) Alaska and Hawaii were excluded from the analysis. Their politics are imbued with cultural and ethnic strains not typical of the contiguous United States, and their experience with veterans' preference legislation is comparatively recent.

(b) The criteria used in the calculation of these indexes included appointment or promotional preference for nondisabled veterans in selected jobs (one point), absolute preference or bonus points for all or most jobs under classification (two points), and bonus points for promotions in all or most civil service jobs (two points). A like number of points was also awarded in each category if the spouse of a nondisabled veteran were granted similar privileges. The decision to assign one point or two for a given benefit was based on the number of people likely to be affected by such legislation; for example, a statute reserving the directorship of a state veterans bureau for military veterans would have little impact and thus be assigned one point.

Table 2

THE STRENGTH OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE LEGISLATION, INCOME RANK, POPULATION RANK, REGION, AND INTEREST GROUP LEVERAGE

| States | Strength of veterans' preference legislation (a) | Income rank (b) | Population rank (b) | Region (c) | Interest group leverage (d) |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| Alabama | strong | 46 | 21 | 3 | high |
| Arizona | weak | 26 | 32 | 4 | high |
| Arkansas | weak | 50 | 33 | 3 | high |
| California | moderate | 7 | 1 | 4 | high |
| Colorado | moderate | 12 | 28 | 4 | low |
| Connecticut | strong | 3 | 24 | 1 | low |
| Delaware | weak | 15 | 48 | 1 | medium |
| Florida | moderate | 14 | 8 | 3 | high |
| Georgia | strong | 37 | 14 | 3 | high |
| Idaho | moderate | 36 | 41 | 4 | .. |
| Illinois | strong | 8 | 5 | 2 | medium |
| Indiana | strong | 29 | 12 | 2 | low |
| Iowa | strong | 22 | 25 | 2 | high |
| Kansas | moderate | 20 | 31 | 2 | medium |
| Kentucky | moderate | 43 | 23 | 3 | high |
| Louisiana | moderate | 49 | 20 | 3 | high |
| Maine | strong | 44 | 38 | 1 | high |
| Maryland | moderate | 4 | 18 | 3 | medium |
| Massachusetts | moderate | 16 | 10 | 1 | medium |
| Michigan | moderate | 17 | 7 | 2 | high |
| Minnesota | moderate | 19 | 19 | 2 | high |
| Mississippi | moderate | 51 | 29 | 3 | high |
| Missouri | moderate | 33 | 15 | 2 | low |
| Montana | strong | 31 | 43 | 4 | high |
| Nebraska | weak | 27 | 35 | 2 | high |
| Nevada | moderate | 6 | 47 | 4 | medium |
| New Hampshire | moderate | 32 | 42 | 1 | .. |
| New Jersey | strong | 5 | 9 | 1 | low |
| New Mexico | weak | 12 | 37 | 4 | high |
| New York | strong | 11 | 2 | 1 | medium |
| North Carolina | strong | 41 | 11 | 3 | high |
| North Dakota | moderate | 9 | 46 | 2 | .. |
| Ohio | strong | 24 | 6 | 2 | medium |
| Oklahoma | moderate | 39 | 27 | 3 | high |
| Oregon | moderate | 21 | 30 | 4 | high |
| Pennsylvania | moderate | 30 | 4 | 1 | medium |
| Rhode Island | moderate | 25 | 39 | 1 | low |
| South Carolina | moderate | 45 | 26 | 3 | high |
| South Dakota | strong | 35 | 45 | 2 | medium |
| Tennessee | moderate | 42 | 17 | 3 | high |
| Texas | strong | 34 | 3 | 3 | high |
| Utah | strong | 38 | 36 | 4 | medium |
| Vermont | weak | 40 | 49 | 1 | medium |
| Virginia | weak | 18 | 13 | 3 | medium |
| Washington | moderate | 13 | 22 | 4 | high |
| West Virginia | moderate | 47 | 34 | 3 | medium |
| Wisconsin | moderate | .. | 16 | 2 | high |
| Wyoming | moderate | 23 | 50 | 4 | low |

(a) The following criteria were employed to classify states as "weak," "moderate," or "strong": the allocation of appointment preference to nondisabled veterans or their relatives for selected jobs (1 point), the allocation of preference or bonus points to nondisabled veterans or their relatives for promotions in selected jobs (1 point), the allocation of appointment preference or bonus points to veterans and their relatives for jobs classified under state civil service (2 points), and the allocation of preference or bonus points for promotions to nondisabled veterans for civil service jobs (2 points). States receiving a cumulative score of two points or less were classified as "weak," those with three points were termed "moderate," and the "strong" states had more than three points.

(b) These figures were obtained from the 1977 *City and County Data Book* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census).

(c) States were grouped into four regional categories: 1—Northeast, 2—Midwest, 3—South, 4—West. The classification scheme was adopted from studies conducted by the Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan.

(d) The measure of interest group strength used here is actually a composite index based on three variables—strength of party competition, legislative cohesion, and the socioeconomic variables of the urban population (including per capita income and the percentage of the population employed in occupations other than agriculture, forestry, and fishing). This index was adopted from L. Harmon Zeiper and Hendrick van Dalen, "Interest Groups in the American States," in Herbert Jacob and Kenneth N. Vines, eds, *Politics in the American States*, 2nd edition (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Co., 1971), p. 127.