

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE / SUBJECT FILE 8672

1359 SCOMM 51: BLUE RIBBON COMN. ON STATE PERSONNEL ACT 1978-1983

whose domicile is within...Alaska... Domicile means the true and permanent home of a person, from which he has no present intention of removing and to which he intends to return whenever he is away...");

(b) Has submitted a signed application to the hiring official which stipulates a desire for appointment to a classification held in permanent/probationary status within the preceding three years;

(c) The DHSS servicing personnel officer has confirmed in advance of such job offer and hire that the applicant for temporary appointment was a permanent/probationary employee of the State in the applied for classification and was separated from such employment in good standing within the preceding three years.

CAUTION: The hiring official shall request that the DHSS servicing personnel officer make this determination prior to any job offer.

2. The DHSS Personnel Officer will determine, in coordination with DPLR, for DHSS servicing personnel officers at their request, whether (c) above is applicable.
3. The DHSS Form 06-5418 will be accompanied by the signed application of the appointee and will be annotated in the "Certificate" block as follows:

"In lieu of hire from a register this appointment is of a former permanent/probationary employee who meets the prerequisites of Section III, Paragraph G and Section IV, Paragraph D, P&P 210-2"

E. Temporary Appointment of Former State Employee Above Step A -

When a former State employee was separated in good standing from a given classification within the three years preceding the date that the former employee is to be hired on a temporary basis in the same class, an appointing authority has the option of hiring the former employee at A step, the highest step held, or any step in between A step and the highest step held in such classification.

F. Temporary Appointment When Register is Incomplete -

When a permanent position (PCN) cannot be filled because the register for the PCN has been found incomplete under Rule 5 03.5 and the prerequisites below have been met, the appointing authority may approve the hire of a temporary

for not to exceed ninety days, without the use of a register. The prerequisites to be met are as follows:

1. A request to subfill the PCN with a probationary appointment has been considered under Rule 5 03.7 and the appointing authority has determined that:

a. Such action would generate a genuine emergency by excessively delaying provision of essential program services (as contrasted with generation of a worrisome but non-critical work backlog); or

b. A subfill classification could not do enough of the duties of the PCN to adequately carry out the mission of the work unit for the time required by a subfill incumbent to achieve eligibility for the higher classification of the position. If an incomplete register is declined and a subfill register requested by the appointing authority, the Division of Personnel and Labor Relations (DPLR) will take action in the following order of priority:

i. If deemed feasible by DPLR, forward to the appointing authority a register with names of persons on registers for classifications related to the classification of the PCN but of the same range as the PCN to be filled; or

ii. Request the appointing authority for a written description of the job content of the lower classification and range to be used in subfilling the PCN to be filled. (DPLR needs such information to be assured that the subfill appointee will neither be expected nor required to perform duties other than those included within the class specification for the classification of the subfill. Time may be saved when requesting a subfill register if the description of the duties of the position when subfilled is forwarded with the request for such register.)

2. When it has been determined under Subparagraph 1a or 1b above by the appointing authority that subfilling a PCN for which there is an incomplete register would present a genuine emergency, the appointing authority may authorize a temporary appointment for not to exceed ninety days under Section III, Subparagraph A 3 above to alleviate "A critical situation [that] exists in the [the] BRU caused by...emergencies beyond the control of the BRU..."

3. Simultaneously with issuance of the authorization for appointment without use of a register, the appointing authority shall take the following action:

- a. Request, through the servicing personnel officer, that DPLR implement emergency recruitment procedures in the applicable classification and geographical area to obtain candidates to fill the PCN on a probationary/permanent basis. Attach to the Form 06-5418 the request for recruitment prepared as a memorandum to the Director of Division of Personnel and Labor Relations, through the servicing personnel office, and identify therein the requesting agency BRU and eight digit code against which the costs of advertisements are to be allocated. DPLR officials will expedite such a request to make a register available within sixty days listing the eligible respondents to DPLR recruiting action.
- b. Request the local Employment Center for referral of qualified applicants and make a selection from this source if possible.
- c. If a selection could not be made from among referrals from the local Employment Center, consider any other available sources for temporary hires;
- d. In addition to the narrative justification for the temporary hire required in Form 06-5418, include the date, PCN and classification of the applicable incomplete register and state "This temporary hire is authorized without a register for not to exceed ninety days or until PCN ____ is filled by a probationary/permanent appointee, whichever occurs first, and the individual hired as a temporary has been, or will be, informed of that fact".

G. Emergency Appointment for Thirty Days or Less -

1. Personnel Rule 5 07.0 governs emergency hire for not to exceed 30 days. Rule 5 07.0 is extremely limited in its application and must be carefully reviewed to determine whether it is applicable in a given case. When the division director or separate office head determines that Rule 5 07.0 is applicable, Form 06-5418 will be used to request the servicing personnel office to appoint an individual who meets the minimum qualifications of the classification without use of a register. Full justification to DPLR for the emergency hire as prescribed by Rule 5

07.0 must be attached to the properly completed Form 06-5418 when the servicing personnel office is requested to make the appointment. Also, the Form 06-5418 will be annotated under the subject to add "EMERGENCY under Rule 5 07.0".

2. Occasionally, the hire of a temporary for a period of 30 days or less is dictated by emergency circumstances which fail to meet the criteria of Rule 5 07.0 for emergency appointment but are of a degree of urgency which precludes selection from a register because the processing time required would impose an unacceptable delay in the appointment. In such a case, the division director or separate office head may request the appointment of an individual who meets the minimum qualification for the classification, without the use of a register. Such (quasi-emergency) temporary appointment will be for a period not to exceed 30 calendar days and will be authorized with the understanding that there will be no extension or repetition of such appointment of that individual in that work unit. To request an appointment under this provision, the appointing authority will submit, to the servicing personnel office, the properly completed Form 06-5418, citing "P&P 210-2, Section IV, Paragraph G" following the narrative justification, accompanied by a signed copy of the appointee's signed application for temporary appointment in the applicable classification. If the tasks to be performed that necessitate the appointment will require more than the authorized maximum of 30 calendar days to accomplish, the division director or separate office head shall, simultaneously with the submission of a request for such temporary appointment, also submit a request for a register from which to select an individual for temporary appointment under Paragraph A, above, or for permanent/probationary appointment.

- H. DHSS Servicing personnel officers will critically review each request for temporary appointment to insure that the provisions of Personnel Rule 6 06.0 and this Policy and Procedure are strictly followed. Personnel officers are authorized and required to return requests for appointment which are contrary to this P&P.

attachment
06-5418

TO: DHSS Personnel Officer

Date: _____

☐ SERO, Juneau

☐ SCRO, Anchorage

☐ NRO, Fairbanks

Subject: Authorization to Appoint
Temporary Employee

FROM:

Division Director/Separate Office Head

Under authority contained in Section III, Policy and Procedure 210-2, dated February 9, 1978, you are authorized and requested to issue an appointing Personnel Action for the following named individual:

1. Name _____	2. Soc. Sec. No. _____
3. Address _____	4. Days not to exceed _____
5. Classification _____	6. Range/Step _____
7. Duty Station Location _____	8. Effective Date _____
9. Collocation/Distribution Code _____	10. Project Ledger _____
11. BRU _____	12. Section/Office _____
13. Add to: BPR Page No. _____ dated _____	

NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION

(Describe tasks to be performed, why it is necessary to appoint a temporary employee in lieu of a permanent/probationary employee, and provide an estimate of work days required to complete tasks.)

CERTIFICATION

I certify the temporary appointee named above was selected from an eligible register as required by Personnel Rule 5.06.0. The register from which the named temporary appointee was selected is attached. Further, that sufficient Personal Services (Code 100) funds are available within the BRU/Component appropriation level to pay the salary of this temporary employee for the period authorized (not to exceed 6 months for Confidential, General Government and Supervisory or 120 days for Labor, Trades and Crafts) and that the Legislature did not disapprove or deny funding of a like type position in the current year budget.

Division Director/Separate Office Head

Attachment: Register dated _____



MEMO

Date: January 26, 1979
To: Members, Blue Ribbon Commission on the Personnel Act
From: Paddy Moriarty
Deputy Ombudsman *PM*
Subject: Ombudsman position on APEA's 1/22/79 proposal

At the meeting of the Subcommittee on Categories of Employees this morning, it was requested that Subcommittee members express their agreement or disagreement with an APEA recommendation of January 22, 1979, proposing specific statutory changes.

For the record, the Ombudsman is in support of this proposal (See Mr. Flavin's January 11 memo attached). Mr. Flavin would prefer that the APEA proposal #2 read: (6) the procedure for certifying eligibles to any position in state service other than interim or emergency positions.

The specific language in APEA's proposal #3 and #4 may need some further review, but in substance and intent it has Ombudsman support. Perhaps an administrative appeal mechanism could be devised to address those few exceptions mentioned at this morning's meeting which do not fall within language in #3 or #4. It will not be possible to draft these sections to encompass each set of meritorious special circumstances.

Attachment



mbudsman

MEMO.

Date: Jan. 11, 1979
To: Interested Folks
From: Frank Flavin
Subject: Eliminating the concept of temporary employees

- 1) add to AS 39.25.150 (6) so it reads:

(6) the procedure for certifying eligibles ^{to any} ~~for~~ positions
in the state service other than interim or emergency
positions.

OR

(6) the procedure for certifying eligibles for full-time,
part time, project or seasonal positions in state service.

- 2) Expand AS 39.25.150 (8) to read:

(8) emergency appointments to positions in the state
service for a period not to exceed thirty days, made
under conditions necessitating immediate action to provide
for carrying on work that must be continued in the
public interest. Successive emergency appointments
or more than three emergency appointments for one
person within one calendar year are prohibited.

- 3) Eliminate reference to temporary and seasonal appointments
in AS 39.25.150 (9) and replace it with an interim appointment
concept:

(9) interim appointments to positions in the state
service for a period not to exceed sixty days, made
where appropriate eligible lists are unavailable.
Successive interim appointments to the same position
are prohibited. No position in the state service shall
be filled through ~~an~~ interim appointments for a period
in excess of sixty days. Interim appointments may
be made without competitive examination.

- 4) Repeal AS 39.25.150 (10) dealing with provisional appointments.

Anch-
1/26/79

TBC

MEMO

TO: Blue Ribbon Commission - Subcommittee, Categories of Employees
FROM: Patrick E. Murphy, Executive Director, Alaska Public Employees Association
DATE: 1/22/79
SUBJECT: Recommendations for Subcommittee Adoption

In a memo dated November 24, 1978, titled Position on Temporary Employees, APEA set forth some of the problems felt to be of major concern as it related to temporary employees. APEA still feels the problems set forth in that memo are valid and that immediate measures should be taken to correct the inequities.

Therefore APEA makes the following proposal relating to the issue of temporary abuses:

④ Exempt Local 71 EE's; Marine Transport EE's

1. That two categories of employees exist within the classified state service system.
 - A. Permanent employee: to encompass the current categories of permanent full-time, permanent part time and permanent seasonal.
 - B. Interim employees: to encompass the current categories of temporary, short-term.
2. Amend AS 39.25.150(6) to read: (6) the procedure for certifying eligibles for permanent full-time, part-time, project or seasonal positions in state service.
3. Amend AS 39.25.150(8) to read: (8) emergency appointments to positions in the state service for a period not to exceed thirty days, made exclusively under conditions necessitating immediate action to provide for the public's safety and health. Successive emergency appointments or more than three emergency appointments for one person within one calendar year are prohibited.
4. Delete AS 39.25.150(9) as presently written and replace with: (9) interim appointments to positions in the state service, for a period not to exceed sixty (60) days, which are determined to be of a non-reoccurring, nature. Successive interim appointment to the same position are prohibited. No position in the state service shall be filled through an interim appointment for a period in excess of sixty days. Interim appointments must meet minimum qualifications and may be made without competitive examination.
5. Repeal AS 39.25.150(10) dealing with provisional appointments.

highly include
2000 2000

emergency education
fish
catchery

recurring short
term (3 hrs) 2-4 x
per month
DH - hourly per
part time -
have to have one
person for ea
position
P.W.
appointees

The following sections of Title 39 would also require modification to conform to the proposed changes in Chapter 25.

AS 39.20.270 Court Leave - change to read: shall be granted to an employee who is classified as delete, [full-time whether permanent or temporary] add a permanent employee

AS 39.20.310 Exceptions (7) delete [temporary employees hired for periods of less than 12 consecutive months] add: interim employees hired for periods of less than 60 days

AS 39.30.100 Definitions in § 90 of this chapter

- (1) "eligible employee means"
- (A) An employee who has served in permanent full-time or part-time employment with the same governmental unit for 30 days or more except an emergency or delete [temporary] add interim employee

It is the position of APEA that limiting the span of temporary employment to a maximum of 60 days provides adequate management flexibility in times of high work load, on set of new programs and provides lead time for personnel classifications. Most important the shorter time period emphasizes the need of the program planning, development of sound personnel administration and management. It will also serve to promote the identification of truly reoccurring seasonal position needs and encourage utilization of seasonal and part-time employment.

If action is taken to limit temporary employment to 60 days, the need to secure additional fringe benefits becomes moot.

Thank you for your consideration.

PEM/DSH/lb

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON THE STATE PERSONNEL ACT
CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES SUBCOMMITTEE
Legislative Information Office, Anchorage
November 30, 1978

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Representative McKinnon, Chairperson. Public testimony was invited. A summary of the points raised follows.

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Temporary employees working within a bargaining unit are required to belong to the appropriate union.
 - A. Temporaries have to pay the same union dues as permanent employees but do not receive the same benefits.
 - B. Employees who have philosophical disagreements with belonging to unions are required to join the appropriate union to hold a state job.

Discussion

Unions are required by law to represent all employees within the bargaining units which they represent. Union negotiating and lobbying efforts benefit both permanent employees and temporary employees, at least on the issues of salary levels. Recent APEA efforts resulted in securing holiday pay for temporary employees. Over half of the lobbying effort of APEA last legislative session was spent trying to persuade the legislature to extend to temporary employees the health and annual leave benefits provided to permanent employees of the state. The legislation passed the House but not the Senate.

- C. Have temporary employees been polled on the union's negotiating priorities?
- D. Have temporary employees ever been represented on the governing board of APEA?
- E. Can members of the union have a prioritized list of the union's bargaining positions?
- F. Has a temporary employee ever served as a member of the union negotiating team?
- G. There should be a board position for a temporary employee to represent directly the concerns of other temporaries.

Discussion

Before new contract proposals are drafted, APEA polls all of its members, including temporary employees, on negotiating priorities. The questionnaire indicates the employment status of the

person answering, so that issues can be identified according to class of employment. The union uses results of the questionnaire in preparing its proposals.

There is nothing to prevent a temporary employee from holding office in the APEA, although Ms. Howard is not aware of any temporary employee who has ever been elected to the board. Under the present by-laws, a temporary could be an active union member only during the time of employment for the state.

2. Benefits for temporaries.

- A. No medical leave or retirement benefits.
- B. No job security.
- C. Temporary employment does not apply to the probationary period, even if the temporary employee is hired as a permanent for the same job.
- D. Union contracts can address the inequities of benefits for temporary employees.

Discussion

Lack of medical, leave and retirement benefits can only be addressed through the legislature, and, as indicated above, APEA spent considerable effort last session attempting to have legislation passed to do so. By union contract, APEA members can have one-third of their time as a temporary applied towards the probationary period required of a permanent position provided that there is no break in service and that the jobs are the same.

Local No. 71, Public Employees union, has negotiated to increase the wages of temporary employees to compensate for the lack of benefits. Temporaries receive an additional \$1.32 per hour during the first 120 days they work as temporaries. If that period is extended by agreement, then the base salary of the temporary shifts from Level A of the wage scale to Level B. This system discourages the state from hiring temporaries for positions which should be classified as permanent. The union has found cases in which the state has ignored the union contract provisions about increased pay and has had to force compliance through arbitration.

3. Time limitations on length of temporary jobs.

- A. A limit of six months as a temporary was recently instituted for positions within the APEA bargaining unit. The limit used to be nine months.
- B. Local No. 71 has negotiated a 120-day limit to temporary employment, with extensions possible by mutual agreement between the union and the state.

Discussion

The new time limit for APEA members has caused a problem where supervisors were misinformed and therefore misinformed temporaries. The problem came about partly because there were a number of new supervisors in that particular job in a short period of time.

For discussion of the Local No. 71 system, see discussion under (2) above, Benefits for temporaries.

4. Promises to temporary employees about being hired for future permanent positions.

A. Division of Personnel does not always classify a new position as the program manager may have expected.

B. The better practice is to make no promises about permanent hire to temporary employees.

Discussion

If a program manager promises a permanent position to a temporary employee and then learns that the Division of Personnel has classified that position at a lower range than expected, then the temporary must wait while the position is reclassified. The time required for that process may extend beyond the time the temporary is permitted to work. That will cause the temporary to lose the cross-over of time served toward probationary period.

No promises should be made to temporary employees about permanent employment beyond a commitment to consider them as any candidate with similar experience and skills will be considered. This is to ensure that the program manager is not locked into a commitment and therefore unable to hire someone more qualified, should such an applicant appear on the register at the time of permanent hire.

5. Compensation for temporary employees who take time from work to testify before this commission.

Some supervisors are refusing to consider the time that their temporary employees spend testifying to the committee as time spent working for the state. Therefore, some temporaries were unable to attend the meetings. The APEA representative in Anchorage will work with the employees who did attend and with their supervisors to ensure that they are compensated for their time. If she is unable to do so, she will advise the commission.

6. None of the temporary employees who addressed the committee had been required to be on the register before being hired for their present positions.

7. The use of temporary employees in positions for which there are permanent funds available.

- A. Local No. 71 has identified some 500 unfilled permanent positions within the scope of its bargaining units which it believes should be filled or deleted from the budget.

Discussion

Local No. 71 believes that the state is hiring temporary employees rather than filling presently vacant permanent positions in significant numbers. The union secured from the Division of Personnel and Labor Relations a list showing vacant PCN's within its bargaining unit. It has identified some 500 such vacancies, some of which have been vacant since the early 1970's. (A copy of the list is available from the commission staff.)

Some of the 500 positions may be funded through the Capital Improvement Funds, and therefore, the statistics may be skewed to that extent. Sue Greene of the Governor's office indicated that perhaps 100 of the positions might be CIF positions.

Local No. 71 has received requests for temporary employees within the job classes covered by the permanent-position vacancies on the list.

The Legislative Budget and Audit Committee is programming a computer to provide information on all PCN's vacant for more than a reasonable length of time. The legislature can then delete the position from the agency's budget, should it wish to do so. There is presently a monthly list prepared by the Division of Personnel which shows all of the vacant PCN's in the state and indicates the date of vacancy. Mr. Kareen estimated that approximately 20% of the PCN's are vacant at any one time.

- B. Departments contract with private firms for work which could be performed by state employees. Contracting costs more to the state and increases the risk that public services will be jeopardized through a strike.

Discussion

Departments can contract with private firms for work which state employees could perform as well without any oversight by the Division of Personnel. In some cases, contractors with the state fail to fulfill all of the contract commitments, leaving the state to hire its own employees to pick up the slack. For example, one contract called for the private contractor to provide janitorial services. When the contractor failed to do so, the state had to hire a member of Local 71 to fill the gap. One private contractor submitted two bids for a construction job, one based upon using his own equipment, and the other, at about \$40,000 less, based on using the state's equipment. The higher cost bid was accepted, but then the contractor used the state's equipment to perform the work.

In some cases, the higher cost of subcontracting with private firms results from the higher wages charged by members of private industry unions.

Since state statutes place limitations on public service unions' right to strike, which are not placed on unions operating in the private industry field, there is greater danger that projects will be impeded by strikes when the state contracts with employers using private industry members than when the state hires its own employees.

Albert Baffone charged that the state of Alaska was following a policy of reducing the size of the Local 71 membership with the aim of drying up that union.

8. Problems with the use of CETA program employees within the Department of Corrections.

- A. As temporary employees, CETA's within the Department of Corrections are limited to a nine-month period of service and receive no benefits, as permanent employees do.
- B. CETA employees are taking the place of permanent employees within the Department, in violation of federal regulations.
- C. Some CETA's are placed in supervisory positions over permanent employees who are paid at a higher salary rate than the CETA's.
- D. CETA's are paid much less than permanent employees doing the same job.
- E. Because of the Department of Correction's reorganization of staff, the state has frozen the Correctional Officer I register, and CETA's cannot apply for permanent positions.

The Comprehensive Employment Training Act is a federal legislative program aimed at providing people who are members of groups which traditionally have difficulty finding jobs with experience to enable them to find permanent employment. Federal regulations prohibit replacing permanent employees with those paid through the CETA program. The federal government provides \$1,039 maximum per month in salary for those employed under the program. States using the program are free to supplement that salary if they desire.

The Division of Corrections has a number of CETA employees, classified as temporary employees by the state, who are paid at a salary range 9. The positions were meant to be Media Appreciation and Recreation Aides. However, because the Ridgeview

Correctional Center (where approximately 27 CETA's work) is severely understaffed, the CETA employees have been doing the work of Correctional Officer I's, who are classified at SR 13. These positions have just been reclassified from SR 11. CETA's are paid \$2.00 less per hour than Correctional Officer I's. Since CETA's are classified as temporary employees, they have no benefits or job security. There is nothing in the federal legislation requiring that CETA's be classified as temporaries. There are non-CETA temporary employees who are paid at the Correctional Officer I salary range. There are CETA employees working in supervisory roles over Correctional Officer I's who make substantially more than they do, which is bad management practice.

Niel Thomas suggested that the commission should consider recommending that the legislature provide a supplement to CETA funds so that departments are required to pay appropriate salaries for the CETA's they employ. The federal government could also be asked to provide a wage supplement to the salary money it provides to Alaska, since the Alaskan cost of living is so much higher than the cost of living in the lower 48 states.

Aggravating the other problems faced by the CETA's employed in the Division of Corrections is the fact that the Division is undergoing reclassification of Correctional Officer positions. No job applications are being accepted for the positions of Correctional Officer I, so CETA's whose period of temporary employment must end because the six or nine-month period has elapsed cannot get on the register for a permanent position in the field in which they have been working.

The Division of Corrections has answered these problems by deciding to employ no more CETA's rather than by trying to keep the program and provide an opportunity for the underemployed to gain skills and experience to make them employable by adjusting the inequities in the present system.

At one time, there were a number of CETA positions within the bargaining unit of Local No. 71. However, by contract, the state was required to pay each CETA employee the existing wage rate for any union member. The state no longer has any CETA positions within the bargaining unit.

The CETA regulations require that people employed under that program receive equal treatment with other employees similarly situated. That language has been interpreted by the state to mean treatment comparable to any other temporary employee. The Municipality of Anchorage, which has a substantial number of CETA's, treats them as permanent employees entitled to all the benefits provided other permanent employees.

9. Problems of Program Managers in staffing programs.

1. Time to get permanent positions filled from register and yet to meet legislative directives.

2. Treatment of temporary employees.

Discussion

Because creating new positions and hiring from the register takes a considerable amount of time, departments cannot use that system when given legislative directive to remedy a problem quickly. Last session, the legislature passed HB720, directing that by November 1, 1978, the Department of Natural Resources designate 30,000 acres of state land for disposal under the homesite entry program and the open-to-entry program. The act included other directions, and the legislature appropriated funds for 100 new positions for the department. By the time that the legislation had passed (it was approved by the Governor on July 18, 1978), enough time did not remain to both meet the legislative deadline and also to hire permanent employees from the register to fill the new positions. Temporary employees were hired and the department at the same time began the process of creating new permanent positions. (P402's had to be prepared for each new position describing the particular duties of the employee in this job, even though most fell within existing job classes.)

In order to allow the department to staff the program quickly, the Division of Personnel set aside all other tasks for four to six days to speed the paperwork. There was some delay in the Division of Budget and Management, which had to sort through four different appropriation bills affecting this program to ensure that proper authorization existed to establish these positions.

Departments may have short term projects to handle which require particular expertise. If the department lacks the time to be able to hire a permanent employee, it will hire a temporary while beginning the paperwork to establish a permanent position. The project may last beyond the six-month limit on the employment of a temporary, but it is quite possible that the permanent position may not yet be authorized. This hinders the department in the operation of its programs.

When hiring temporaries for professional positions, there is a problem using the register. Most professional people who are good candidates for a particular position are likely to already be employed and will be unwilling to leave a permanent job, with the benefits and protections it affords, for a temporary position, even if there will be a permanent position to replace the temporary one. Furthermore, it is bad management practice to advise any temporary employee that she or he will be hired for a future permanent position, since not only is there the possibility that the permanent positions will be established at a lower salary range than the department expects, but also, by the time that the department is authorized to fill the permanent position, there may be someone more qualified on the register whom the department will prefer to hire.

When filling a temporary position, the registers may be of some assistance in locating possible employees. Mr. Reed stated

that it was his practice to call for a register, to review the applications of those on the register and to contact those whom he did not know personally to inquire whether they were interested in the temporary position available. Those whose situation he knew, he would not contact unless he expected them to want a change.

WITNESSES

1. Barbara Eakin, temporary Administrative Assistant II with the Division of Lands of the Department of Natural Resources since July 31, 1978. The Division of Lands is in the process of seeking classification of a permanent position of Accounting Clerk III for which she expects to be "strongly considered."
2. Karen Holser, a temporary Water Technician with the South Central Division of Water Section of the Department of Natural Resources. She is working under a program created by HB720 to reduce the backlog in water rights applications. The legislature authorized 52 permanent positions, all of which have been filled. In addition, the department created temporary positions funded from money made available probable through the vacancy of permanent positions.
3. Ruth Moulton, a temporary employee of the Division of Planning and Classification of the Department of Natural Resources. She has held temporary positions with the state three times and prefers to work as a temporary employee.
4. Al Baffone, Business Manager of Local No. 71 of the Public Employees Union.
5. Helen Collier, a temporary employee under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), working as a Media Appreciation and Recreational Aide with the Department of Corrections.
6. Barbara Kelly, a temporary Accounting Clerk I with the Division of Lands of the Department of Natural Resources.
7. Steven Reed, Chief of the Planning and Classification Division of the Department of Natural Resources. He has held the position for one year.
8. Bob Dawkins, Journeyman Plumber with the state.
9. Eleanor Andrews, Field Representative with the Anchorage APEA.

INVITED WITNESS

Frank Flavin advised the Committee that he had invited Mike Smith, Assistant Commissioner/Director of Lands with the Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Smith was unable to attend.

Materials Distributed:

APEA Interoffice Memo on Categories of Employees

IN ATTENDANCE

Representative Joseph McKinnon
Representative Richard Eliason
Ombudsman Frank Flavin
Darlene Howard (for Pat Murphy)
Ken Humphreys (for Myrt Charney)
Ken Kareen (for Pat Hunt)
Lynda McCurry
Greg O'Claray
John Pugh
Ken Spray
Niel Thomas

MINUTES

CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING

November 16, 1978

The Subcommittee on Categories of Employees met at 9:00 a.m., Thursday, November 16, 1978, in Room 123 A of the State Capitol Building, Representative Joseph McKinnon, Chairperson, presiding.

Representative McKinnon suggested that the subcommittee identify short and long-term goals.

TOPICS IDENTIFIED

1. Use of Temporary Employees: The use of temporaries circumvents the merit system because departments are not required to hire from the register. Temporaries do not receive most state employee benefits and are therefore cheaper to employ. Departments can hire individuals as temporaries in order to allow them to fulfill experience or residency requirements and then hire them as permanent employees.
2. Contractual Employees: The same kinds of abuses (by-passing of tests, eligibility lists and minimum job qualifications) that occur in the use of temporaries can occur when departments contract out work that could be done by permanent employees.
3. Categories of State Employees: Is it appropriate for the state to have all of the categories presently in use--permanent full-time, permanent part-time, permanent seasonal, probationary, emergency, temporary and contractual?
4. Proliferation of Unique Job Classifications: Alaska has an excessive number of classifications when compared with other states having a similar number of state employees.
5. Equal Pay for Equal Work: Job categories which were created many years ago tend to be set at lower salary ranges than those created more recently, even though they may require the same kinds of training, experience and responsibilities. The salary ranges of some positions, such as secretarial, are tied to the salary range of the employee's supervisor rather than the requirements of the job.
6. Delays in processing applications to get on eligibility registers.
7. University of Alaska employees and court system employees are outside the state's merit system because of constitutional provisions.
8. Effect of the Rule of Five on Affirmative Action: Where EEO problems exist, affirmative action hiring can be accomplished by establishing EEO compliance as a justification for looking below the top five candidates.

9. The state's system of reclassifying positions.

SUGGESTIONS ON OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

1. The Committee Structure: Care should be taken that problems are not overlooked because they fail to fall within existing committee structure. After more public input, the committee structure should be examined to consider modifications. Is the Merit System/Collective Bargaining Subcommittee necessary?

2. Adequate input from program managers who have particular knowledge of problems in the state's personnel system needs to be gathered. The Commission should consider preparing a questionnaire for distribution to state employees.

3. A crash course or dictionary on the terminology and paper flow in the personnel system for commission members. Staff will work on this.

JOB CATEGORIES IN THE STATE PERSONNEL SYSTEM

1. Trainees are generally employed in short term, probationary positions in which the employee involved is trained for a particular permanent job classification. Individuals employed under a federal program in which there is no assurance of continued funding (for example, the CETA program) are also classified as trainees.

2. Permanent seasonal positions are used where the job is needed for less than the full year, and departments concerned expect the individual to return to fill that job from year to year. For example, Fish & Game has salmon counters who are permanent seasonal employees. If the department does not expect to have the same individual returning to the job from year to year, then the department lists the job as a temporary position. The Personnel Division encourages departments to use the permanent seasonal category, but since there are adequate applicants for temporary jobs, departments with budget limitations will use the temporary category.

3. Emergency employees are appointed by some departments only where there is danger to life or property. Others will use an emergency appointment where it saves them money. An emergency appointment is authorized for 30 days with three one-month extensions possible. The employee does not have to meet the minimum qualifications, and the department can appoint to any job classification it wishes. Division of Personnel is notified of the appointment after it has been made. There are two categories of recurring emergency appointments: escorts for mental patients and for prisoners.

4. The temporary employee category was designed to meet the short-term needs of an agency. It can be used where a permanent position becomes vacant, and the agency needs to have someone to do the work during the selection process. Temporaries usually do only part of the work assigned to the permanent position.

A temporary position lasts for a period of six months with a possible three-month extension. Unlike emergency appointments, temporary employees must meet the minimum qualifications of the job class to which they are appointed, and the duties they are to perform must be consistent with the duties of that job classification.

The Division of Personnel does a post-audit of the departments temporary positions. Presently, the division examines about 10% of the positions. The division has the authority to remove a person improperly filling a temporary position. It gives notice to the department involved, and the department has two weeks to correct the error (for example, by reclassifying the position to one for which the holder has the necessary minimum qualifications), or to let the employee go.

In making temporary appointments, the department is not required to consult the register for the job classification. The Department of Health & Social Services is the only department that has a policy of hiring temporary employees from the register. A system could be established to accommodate a requirement that departments hire temporaries from the register, though it would require some time to ensure that applicants on the temporary register were willing to be considered for temporary positions and to speed up the process of providing registers to departments.

Sometimes departments are put in a position of having to use temporaries because of a delay in receiving federal funds. The department makes timely application for a program to the federal government indicating, for example July 1 as the starting date of the state program. The department gets no formal response from the federal government until August 15--45 days into the program's life. In order to get the program going quickly, the department hires temporaries immediately, rather than take additional time to advertise and screen applicants for permanent positions. The department may have received verbal assurances that the funding would be approved prior to receipt of the formal approval. It could therefore have gambled on formal approval being granted, and could have begun hiring for permanent positions to permit program operation as soon as federal funds were received. However, if the federal money did not appear, the state would have to pay for salaries it had not intended to finance. Emergency appointments are not used in the same way, as an alternative to permanent appointments.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the use of emergency appointments could be expanded, but the requirements for temporary appointments should be tightened. If an agency had a vacant secretarial position, it could hire someone instantly for the five days it would take to hire a secretary from the register.

APEA has gathered information on the use of temporaries by the state, which show that many of the needs temporaries are

filling are permanent needs, either seasonal or full-time. Pat Murphy presented the following data:

	<u>TOTAL # OF TEMPS</u>	<u>DEPT. OF FISH & GAME</u>	<u>DEPT. OF LABOR</u>
July, 1978	1,701	522	93
July, 1977	1,863	508	158
July 1976	1,887	500	112

In answer to a question about whether those needs are year-long or seasonal, Mr. Murphy provided the following figures:

	<u>TOTAL # OF TEMPS</u>	<u>DEPT. OF FISH & GAME</u>
November, 1977	1,146	163
November, 1976	1,196	177
November, 1975	1,148	109

Mr. Murphy asserted that the Department of Fish & Game appears to have a recurring need for some 500 to 525 permanent employees each summer, and the Department of Labor some 100 to 150 permanent employees.

Mr. Kareen pointed out that a temporary position stays on the payroll, whether or not it is filled by an employee, until the department fills out papers indicating that position is no longer needed. Wages are drawn only according to the time sheets turned in to the Division of Finance. Mr. Murphy indicated that his figures were not checked for whether the position was actually filled.

Mr. Murphy stated that he had no problems with managers having discretion to hire temporaries for 45 to 60 days, but did have problems with 6 to 9 month terms.

Mr. Kareen asked whether there was anything that precluded APEA from negotiations on the length of time of a temporary position. Mr. Murphy explained that Mr. Hunt held the position that the length of temporary employment was statutory, and therefore non-negotiable.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Eileen Maki, a Public Health Nurse I (PHN I) working at the Juneau Health Center, spoke. She identified problems of concern to PHN's.

1.) Classification: At present, Public Health Nurse I's are classified at Range 14, Public Health Nurse II's at Range 15, and Public Health Nurse III's at Range 17. Public Health Nurse Trainees are at Range 12. In February, 1978, the Chief of the Section of Nursing requested that all PHN's prepare P402's describing their duties and justifying reclassification of those positions to higher salary ranges. The deadline for delivering the P402's to each nurse's supervisor was March 17. The forms were reviewed, and in early April, they were sent to the Section of Nursing for further review and for the development of a uniform job description for each job class. They apparently remained in the Section of Nursing for about six months, until the end of October or the beginning of November.

On November 3, Ms. Maki and another PHN I from the Juneau Health Center, Constance Trollan, met with Mike McMillan, a Personnel Analyst with the Division of Personnel. Mr. McMillan told then that he had just received the requests for reclassification and that he would not be able to perform his evaluation until after the Division of Budget & Management had identified funding for the potential increase of the Health & Social Services budget.

At the November 3 meeting, Ms. Maki and Ms. Trollan discussed with Mr. McMillan the discrepancy between the salary ranges assigned PHN's and those assigned other positions in state employment, such as institutional nurses. In particular, they questioned Mr. McMillan about the classification of Physician's Assistants to Range 17, while PHN I's are at Range 14.

The justification for classifying Physician's Assistants reads, in its entirety:

This new class aligns internally with the class of Associate Attorney I at SR-17. It also aligns with SR-17 pay-wise for similar jobs in private industry. (Memo from Daniel H. Morrissey, Chief, Classification and Employee Development, Division of Personnel & Labor Relations, and Lee Antrim, Personnel Analyst, April 15, 1976)

Mr. McMillan checked the PHN files kept by the Division of Personnel for a classification analysis for PHN I's to compare with that of the Physician's Assistant. Apparently, none exists, since Mr. McMillan was unable to find one.

Ms. Maki explained the educational and training requirements for PHN I's and Physician's Assistants. A PHN must have a B.A. in Nursing from a school accredited by the National League of Nursing, with course work in the public health field. She or he must be licensed as a Registered Nurse by the State of Alaska. A PHN is authorized to practice within her area of expertise without the supervision of an M.D., including diagnosis and treatment of some conditions. In addition, she or he is responsible for nursing kinds of care for some of the patients, beyond the responsibilities of Physician's Assistants. Physician's Assis-

tant is required by the state to have a Certificate of Competency from an Physician's Assistants Program. The state does not examine the source of the certificate to evaluate its program nor is a college degree required. Some have been military medical programs, others have more extensive training. The state does not have an examination and licensing program for Physician's Assistants, as it does for Registered Nurses. Physician's Assistants are allowed to diagnose and treat conditions within the level of their training and are required to be supervised by an M.D.

Some discrepancy in range assignments may result from the fact that the PHN classification has existed since statehood, while the Physician's Assistant classification was only recently created. Of more concern is the fact that apparently all of the Physician's Assistants employed by the state are men, and all of the PHN's are women.

2. Career Ladder: At present, there is no career ladder in the PHN's field, since there are only a limited number of supervisory positions and the itinerant PHN is located only in rural areas. To advance beyond the PHN I level, an employee is forced to relocate.

The Trainee position cannot be considered an entry-level position for PHN I, since advancement to that level requires a B.A. with public health course work. Experience cannot be considered a substitute.

There is a PHN Trainee in Ketchikan who has just completed a training program in Women's Health Care, but despite the added skill she brings to her job, she remains a PHN Trainee because she lacks a four-year degree.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

1. Reclassification procedures: Mr. Kareen explained that the Division of Personnel policy requiring identification of funding sources before proceeding with a review of the reclassification requests was established when Joe Henry was Commissioner of the Department of Administration. Because of the magnitude of the reclassification of PHN's, the Division of Personnel can only proceed after it receives approval from the Governor's Division of Budget & Management, which will first get approval from the department in question. This ensures that the Governor is informed of the fiscal impact of proposed changes. Given its present level of staffing, the Division of Personnel can only afford to do a limited number of reclassification studies, and this system provides some insurance that those on which further action will be taken receive priority. The Division of Personnel does not have the authority to change this system unilaterally.

A member of the audience pointed out that a budget document justifying the requested reclassifications should be prepared by the department and sent with the P402's to the Division of Per-

sonnel for transmittal to the Division of Budget & Management and that if this were not done, that Budget & Management might refuse to act. Mr. Thomas pointed out that in private industry, this kind of insistence on paper flow would not hold up a valid personnel action.

Representative McKinnon asked whether a department could reclassify a position to become effective at the beginning of the next fiscal year if funding were approved by the legislature. Mr. Murphy answered that that was proposed for the position of Pioneer Home Aides, but the Commissioner of Administration refused to allow it.

It was proposed that the system be changed to provide that the Division of Personnel have the responsibility for initiating reclassifications where inequities exist. Personnel should make its recommendations to the Division of Budget & Management, which would have the responsibility for identifying funding needs. If Budget & Management determined that sufficient funds were not available in the department, then it would prepare a supplemental appropriation for submission to the legislature. Once the Division of Personnel decides that a reclassification is valid, the those positions should have to be appropriately reclassified.

At a minimum, the Division of Personnel should make recommendations on all reclassification requests submitted to it so that the Division of Budget & Management has sufficient information on which to make its decision. APEA has found a number of instances in which Budget & Management refused to ask for additional funding for what were valid reclassifications, and therefore, the legislature was never presented with the question on funding for its consideration.

2. Potential State liability for failure to reclassify: If the PHN's of the state choose to bring suit under the Federal Equal Pay Act, the state would face a potential liability in the neighborhood of \$2.5 million. Assuming 50 PHN's at Range 14 earn an average of \$20,000 annually, the total present salary of PHN's is \$1 million. If PHN's were reclassified to Range 17 (the Physician's Assistant range) averaging \$26,000 annually, the total salaries would be \$1.3 million. The Federal Equal Pay Act allows consideration of the salary levels of the past two years, and if the plaintiff/employee proves willful misconduct, damages may be awarded for the past three years. In addition, the court may award attorney's fees and interest to successful litigants. In some cases, attorneys will work on a contingent-fee basis. Instead of charging clients by the hour for time spent on the case and requiring payment as the case progresses, an attorney will charge clients a predetermined percentage of the judgement in the event the case is successful. This enables clients who cannot afford to pay attorney's fees in advance to bring suit.

The state should recognize that there is a chance that if suit were brought, the state could lose. In private industry, that kind of potential liability is enough to cause the employer to ensure that appropriate changes are made so that the employees affected do not choose to sue.

One of the reasons that the state does not respond in the same manner is the budgetary system of paying for judgements. Payment for judgements against the state is proposed by an Attorney General's bill, which the legislature rarely scrutinizes. On the other hand, increased funds for reclassifications of positions within a department become part of the department's operating budget, which the legislature may examine and question in some detail. The system therefore makes it easier to pay a more expensive judgement than for the department to act on its own initiative at a lower overall cost.

Pat Murphy pointed out that the legislature appropriates money for permanent positions (PCN's) as part of the general appropriation. Therefore, permanent positions do not decrease the funds available for departmental programs. However, temporary positions are not part of that general appropriation, and funding for temporary employees may have to come from program funds.

3. Legislative budgetary process: Representative McKinnon noted that the House automatically, in most instances, adds the necessary funds for reclassifications to the maintenance budget. Legislative oversight should not hinder valid reclassifications.

Senator Ray cautioned that a decision by a department to reclassify positions does not bind the legislature to fund all of those positions. The legislature cannot reclassify the positions, but it can refuse to fund some of them, causing the department to have to decrease the number of its employees in order to pay the increased amount.

4. Letter to the Governor: Representative McKinnon, as Chairperson of the subcommittee, will write Governor Hammond requesting his position on the reclassification difficulties experienced by the PHN's. The staff will assist in drafting the letter.

5. Future subcommittee meetings: The next subcommittee meetings will focus on temporary employees. Later meetings will consider the reclassification question.

IN ATTENDANCE

Senator Bill Ray
Representative Joe McKinnon
Ombudsman Frank Flavin
Niel Thomas
Linda McCurry
Ken Kareen (for Patrick Hunt)
Patrick Murphy
Darlene Howard (Alternate for Patrick Murphy)
Ken Humphreys (for Myrt Charney)

LOCATION	CLASSIFICATION	PCN	VACANT SINCE
Anchorage	Compliance Officer, WG IA	072004P	5/30/78
Anchorage	Compliance Officer, WG IA	072006P	7/27/78
Anchorage	Compliance Officer, WG IA	072033P	1/10/78
Anchorage	Compliance Officer, WG IA	072051P	6/9/78
Anchorage	Bldg Maint Foreman, WG I	252556P	9/27/77
Anchorage	Electrician, WG II	252790S	8/11/78
Anchorage	Electrician, WG II	253733P	8/11/78
Anchorage	Electrician, WG II	252517P	7/27/77
Anchorage	Electrician, WG II	252518P	7/27/77
Anchorage	Electrician, WG II	252519P	5/10/76
Anchorage	Electrician, WG II	252522P	5/10/76
Anchorage	Maint Mechanic WG II	105050P	10/28/77
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252760S	5/10/77
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252866P	6/9/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	253740S	8/11/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	253744S	8/11/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252524S	5/10/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252525S	5/10/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252526S	4/27/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252527P	8/10/77
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252529S	5/10/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252531S	4/12/77
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252533S	7/11/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252535S	4/12/77
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252536S	5/10/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252537P	1/10/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252538S	4/12/77
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252539P	5/10/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252542P	7/27/77
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252543S	5/10/78
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG III	252547S	4/12/77
Anchorage	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	252826P	8/9/76
Anchorage	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	253747P	11/28/77
Anchorage	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	252921P	6/9/78
Anchorage	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	252922P	8/11/78
Anchorage	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	253557P	7/1/76
Anchorage	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	253558P	7/1/76
Anchorage	Trades Leadman, WG III	253741P	8/11/78
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG III	242999P	10/10/77
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG III	243900P	10/10/75
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG III	243902P	7/27/78
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG III	243907P	4/10/76
Anchorage	Party Chief, WG III	243905P	10/28/77
Anchorage	Party Chief, WG III	243906P	8/1/74
Anchorage	Party Chief, WG III	243908P	7/26/76
Anchorage	Mechanic, WG IV	252925P	12/12/77
Anchorage(Kulis)	Maint Man, WG IV	090016P	9/10/77
Anchorage	Maint Man, WG IV	105015S	6/9/78
Anchorage	Maint Man, WG IV	252570P	6/11/76
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG IV	105034S	10/28/77
Anchorage	Instrumentman, WG IV	242752S	7/10/76
Anchorage	Instrumentman, WG IV	063910P	10/28/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242745P	4/10/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242746P	7/9/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242747P	1/10/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242753P	12/10/75
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242759P	10/10/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242764S	6/9/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242769P	11/11/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	243706J	6/9/78
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	243911P	5/28/75
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	243912P	4/10/76
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	243914P	11/11/76
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	243916P	8/10/77
Anchorage	Painter, WG IV	252890S	1/12/73

LOCATION	CLASSIFICATION	PCN	VACANT SINCE
Anchorage	Storekeeper, WG IV	025092P	2/25/75
Anchorage	Driller, WG V	243730P	9/27/72
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG V	253917P	9/26/75
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG V	253919P	10/10/75
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG V	253922P	10/10/75
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242750S	5/30/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242772S	12/10/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242775P	4/10/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242777P	4/26/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242779S	6/19/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242780P	1/10/79(?)
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242781S	10/28/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242783S	11/11/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	242785S	9/27/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	243708P	9/10/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	243729S	5/27/77
Anchorage	Housekeeping Spvrs, WG V	027463P	3/10/77
Anchorage	Labor Foreman, WG VI	103561P	7/27/77
Anchorage	Cook WG VI	064573P	8/11/78
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG VI	243732P	10/10/77
Anchorage	Head Chainman, WG VI	242826S	6/9/78
Anchorage	Head Chainman, WG VI	243924P	4/26/76
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG VII	105056S	10/10/76
Anchorage	Equip Operator, WG VII	242808P	4/26/76
Anchorage	Trades Helper, WG VII	105035S	9/10/76
Anchorage	Trades Helper, WG VII	242811P	4/16/76
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	027482P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	027483P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	027484P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	027517P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	027518P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	027519P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	027520P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Cook, WG VII	065099P	12/29/77
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG VII	248928P	11/11/77
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG VII	248929P	4/12/75
Anchorage	Engineering Tech, WG VII	248931P	10/28/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	242794S	11/11/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	242787S	10/10/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	242799S	7/11/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	242800P	10/28/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	242801S	10/10/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	242806S	9/1/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	243733S	5/27/77
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG VII	240798S	4/26/76
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG VII	243926P	10/10/77
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG VII	243927P	4/26/76
Anchorage	Stockhandler, WG VII	025094P	6/5/76
Anchorage	Rear Chainman, WG VII	242786S	10/10/77
Anchorage	Rear Chainman, WG VII	243925P	4/10/76
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	105017S	8/27/76
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	105018S	9/10/76
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	105037S	9/9/74
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	105054S	11/26/74
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	252734P	8/11/78
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	252893S	3/31/73
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	252894S	1/10/75
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	252895S	11/15/74
Anchorage	Laborer, WG VIII	252896S	1/26/75
Anchorage	Custodial Worker, WG VIII	090140P	5/30/78
Anchorage	Custodial Worker, WG VIII	252735P	2/11/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG VIII	027464P	3/10/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG VIII	027503P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Cook, WG IX	027485P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Clothing Clerk, WG IX	064295P	6/9/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242790S	6/9/78

LOCATION	CLASSIFICATION	PCN	VACANT SINCE
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242815S	6/27/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242816S	9/27/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242818S	7/10/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242819S	7/27/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242821S	9/1/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242822S	7/27/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242823S	9/10/77
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242827S	6/9/78
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242828S	12/10/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	242829S	12/10/76
Anchorage	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	243740S	10/28/77
Anchorage	Sr. Food Service Wkr, WG IX	027521P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Sr. Food Service Wkr, WG IX	027522P	3/1/78
Anchorage	Sr. Food Service Wkr, WG IX	065228P	7/27/77
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IX	242817P	4/26/76
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IX	243731S	10/10/77
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IX	243736S	10/28/77
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IX	243737P	5/24/76
Anchorage	Matls Lab Tech, WG IX	243742S	5/27/77
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	027451P	6/27/78
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	027454P	5/27/77
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	027500P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	027501P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	027502P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253562P	8/27/77
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253563P	7/27/78
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253569P	1/10/78
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253571P	8/9/76
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253576P	11/28/77
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253578P	11/11/77
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253579P	8/27/77
Anchorage	Janitor, WG IX	253587P	8/9/76
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027465P	3/10/77
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027466P	3/10/77
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027467P	3/10/77
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027504P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027505P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027506P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027507P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027508P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027509P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027510P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027512P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027513P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027514P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027515P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027516P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027489P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027490P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027491P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027492P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027493P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027494P	5/10/77
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027523P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027524P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027525P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027526P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027527P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027528P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG X	027529P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027511P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG XI	027530P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG XI	027531P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG XI	027532P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG XI	027533P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG XI	027534P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG XI	027535P	8/1/78
Anchorage	Food Service Worker, WG XI	027536P	8/1/78

LOCATION	CLASSIFICATION	PCN	VACANT SINCE
Barrow	Equip Operator, WG III	255871P	8/16/78
Bethel	Equip Operator, WG III	253746P	8/11/78
Cantwell	Equip Operator, WG IV	255832S	1/26/75
Cape Rodney	Electrician, WG II	252757P	8/25/75
Cold Bay	Maint Man, WG IV	115131P	7/16/78
Cordova	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	249794S	10/10/77
Craig	Equip Operator, WG III	257805S	1/10/75
Craig	Rear Chainman, WG VII	247809S	8/27/77
Dillingham	Equip Operator, WG III	252828S	7/16/78
Dillingham	Maint Man, WG IV	115130P	6/27/78
Ernestine	Equip Operator, WG III	259739P	8/11/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Maint Foreman, WG I	255779P	4/28/77
Fairbanks	Maint Mechanic, WG II	255788P	1/28/78
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255853P	11/10/76
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255854P	11/10/76
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255855S	11/10/76
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255856S	11/10/76
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255857P	11/10/76
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255558S	6/25/75
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255559P	7/11/78
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255564S	4/10/76
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG III	255565S	5/10/78
Fairbanks	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	255782P	9/24/76
Fairbanks	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	255944P	6/16/78
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG III	240778P	4/10/78
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG III	240779P	5/10/78
Fairbanks	Matls Lab Tech, WG III	245915P	11/28/77
Fairbanks	Matls Lab Tech, WG III	246709P	10/27/76
Fairbanks	Matls Lab Tech, WG III	246712P	5/12/75
Fairbanks	Mechanic, WG IV	255917P	6/9/78
Fairbanks	Mechanic, WG IV	255924P	5/30/78
Fairbanks	Mechanic, WG IV	255945P	6/16/78
Fairbanks	Mechanic, WG IV	255946P	6/16/78
Fairbanks	Maintenance Man, WG IV	064528P	10/28/77
Fairbanks	Maintenance Man, WG IV	255790P	7/11/78
Fairbanks	Maintenance Man, WG IV	255791P	2/11/78
Fairbanks	Maintenance Man, WG IV	255569P	10/28/77
Fairbanks(College)	Equip Operator, WG IV	240737P	7/26/76
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG IV	255715S	11/15/74
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG IV	255742S	7/11/78
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG IV	255759S	7/11/78
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG IV	255783P	2/11/77
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG IV	255859S	5/10/77
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG IV	255860S	1/10/75
Fairbanks(College)	Driller, WG IV	240736P	10/10/76
Fairbanks	Carpenter, WG IV	255731P	11/11/77
Fairbanks	Stationery Fireman, WG IV	255925P	4/13/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245749S	2/26/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245754S	6/11/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245760S	6/10/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245761S	10/27/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245763S	10/10/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245765S	10/10/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245767S	9/11/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245771S	8/10/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245772S	10/10/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245755S	6/11/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245879P	6/25/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245881P	8/27/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	245882S	5/30/78
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	240780P	1/10/75
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	240781P	7/12/75
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	240785S	5/30/78
Fairbanks	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	245919P	8/11/78
Fairbanks	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	246715S	9/27/77

LOCATION	CLASSIFICATION	PCN	VACANT SINCE
Fairbanks(College)	Hwy Enr Tech, WG V	240739P	3/26/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Enr Tech, WG V	245883S	9/26/75
Fairbanks	Hwy Enr Tech, WG V	245770S	6/9/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Enr Tech, WG V	245773S	4/10/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245774S	9/10/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245776P	3/10/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245778S	9/10/75
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245780P	2/26/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245783S	10/28/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245785S	6/11/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245787P	6/11/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245884S	5/30/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245885P	9/11/71
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	245887S	4/28/77
Fairbanks	Cook, WG VI	065889P	11/1/72
Fairbanks	Cook, WG VI	255784S	11/28/72
Fairbanks	Matls Lab Tech, WG VI	245992P	10/28/77
Fairbanks	Matls Lab Tech, WG VI	246716P	11/28/77
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG VI	240840P	8/16/78
Fairbanks	Storekeeper, WG VI	255608P	7/11/78
Fairbanks	Equip Operator, WG VII	255785P	1/26/75
Fairbanks	Trades Helper, WG VII	245931P	8/11/78
Fairbanks	Engineering Tech, WG VII	245923P	7/27/78
Fairbanks	Rear Chainman, WG VII	245925P	10/28/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	245789S	9/27/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	245794S	9/10/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	245799S	5/30/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	245811S	11/26/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	245892P	2/26/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	245895S	2/26/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	246714S	12/12/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	246717S	10/10/77
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG VII	240784S	9/10/77
Fairbanks(College)	Matls Lab Tech, WG VII	240786S	3/10/77
Fairbanks	Laborer, WG VIII	255867P	7/27/77
Fairbanks	Engineering Tech, WG IX	245928P	4/16/74
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245766S	6/27/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245800S	10/10/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245810S	9/10/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245815S	10/10/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245820S	8/11/78
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245821S	4/28/77
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245826S	6/11/76
Fairbanks	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	245828S	9/27/77
Fairbanks	Food Service Worker, WG X	027292P	8/11/78
Gardiner Creek	Equip Operator, WG IV	255858S	12/11/74
Girdwood	Equip Operator, WG VII	253701P	8/10/77
Glennallen	Maint Man, WG V	259789P	5/10/78
Glennallen	Equip Operator, WG VII	259708S	6/28/73
Glennallen	Custodial Worker, WG VIII	090143P	7/9/77
Haines	Rear Chainman, WG VII	247782P	11/28/77
Haines	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	247804P	11/11/77
Homer	Mechanic, WG IV	252954P	11/26/76
Homer	Maint Man, WG IV	115132P	7/16/78
Hyder	Hwy Maint Foreman, WG I	257784P	10/10/77
Juneau	Bldg Maint Foreman, WG I	257756P	1/10/73
Juneau	Equip Operator, WG III	257755P	5/30/78
Juneau	Equip Operator, WG III	257758S	7/27/78
Juneau	Maint Man, WG IV	090149P	8/1/78
Juneau	Matls Lab Tech, WG IV	247779P	8/10/77
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247772P	11/10/76
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247783P	1/28/78
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247787P	4/10/76
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247828P	10/27/76
Juneau	Storekeeper, WG IV	121197P	5/10/78
Juneau	Equip Operator, WG IV	257761S	7/27/77
Juneau	Instrumentman, WG IV	067813S	10/10/77
Juneau	Instrumentman, WG IV	067786P	7/27/77
Juneau	Instrumentman, WG IV	067784P	10/28/77
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	247805P	11/11/77

LOCATION	CLASSIFICATION	PCN	VACANT SINCE
Juneau	Storekeeper, WG VI	071505P	10/28/77
Juneau	Head Chainman, WG VI	247799P	11/28/77
Juneau	Head Chainman, WG VI	247797P	11/11/77
Juneau	Head Chainman, WG VI	247803P	12/10/76
Juneau	Head Chainman, WG VI	247807S	10/28/77
Juneau	Matls Lab Tech, WG VII	247829P	11/10/76
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	247789S	9/10/77
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	247808P	12/12/77
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	247811P	9/27/77
Juneau	Laborer, WG VIII	257772P	8/11/78 —
Juneau	Laborer, WG VIII	257734P	7/11/78 —
Juneau	Bldg Custodian, WG VIII	257736P	12/12/77 —
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	247815P	7/11/78
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	247816S	10/10/77
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	247820S	10/28/77
Juneau	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	247830P	10/10/77
Juneau	Engineering Tech, WG IX	247742P	3/11/74
Juneau	Janitor, WG IX	071504P	10/10/77
Kenai	Compliance Officer, WG IA	072021P	5/10/78
Kenai	Compliance Officer, WG IA	242766S	6/9/78
Ketchikan	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247773P	10/27/76
Ketchikan	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247774P	4/26/76
Ketchikan	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247792P	11/11/77
Ketchikan	Equip Operator, WG IV	257783P	8/11/78
Ketchikan	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	247806S	10/10/77
King Salmon	Equip Operator, WG III	252758S	8/25/78
King Salmon	Equip Operator, WG III	252772P	5/10/78
King Salmon	Equip Operator, WG III	252775P	7/27/78
Kodiak	Equip Operator, WG III	252813S	4/28/77
Kodiak	Equip Operator, WG III	252817S	8/11/78
Kodiak	Equip Operator, WG VII	252819P	2/11/78
Kotzebue	Heavy Duty Mech, WG III	258710P	5/10/78
Manley Hot Springs	Hwy Maint Foreman, WG I	255806S	8/11/78
Minto	Equip Operator, WG III	255780S	8/27/77
Moose Pass	Equip Operator, WG III	253725P	7/27/78
Naknek	Mech Leadman, WG III	252759P	8/1/76
Nelchina	Equip Operator, WG VII	259755S	12/10/71
Nenana	Equip Operator, WG IV	255771P	2/27/78
Ninilchik	Equip Operator, WG VII	252830S	9/10/73
Nome	Mech Leadman, WG III	258903P	8/9/76
Nome	Equip Operator, WG IV	258729S	11/11/77
Nome	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	248716S	9/27/77
Nome	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	248720S	9/10/76
Palmer	Storekeeper, WG VIII	027381P	12/23/76
Palmer	Food Service Worker, WG X	027383P	4/13/78
Palmer	Custodial Worker, WG X	027355P	4/12/77
Paxson	Equip Operator, WG III	259765P	8/11/78
Petersburg	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	247800P	6/9/78
Petersburg	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	247817S	9/27/72
Ruby	Hwy Maint Foreman, WG I	255844S	3/13/75
Seward	Equip Operator, WG III	253759P	7/27/78
Seward	Cook, WG VII	051099P	5/10/78
Sitka	Matls Lab Tech, WG III	247983P	10/28/77
Sitka	Mechanic, WG IV	257924P	1/10/78
Sitka	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	247778S	11/26/76
Sitka	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	247814S	10/28/77
Sitka	Engineering Tech, WG VII	247905P	8/27/74
Sitka	Custodial Worker, WG VIII	027155P	8/11/78 —
Sitka	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	247818S	9/10/77
Sitka	Housekeeping Aide, WG X	027168P	8/9/76 —
Slana	Equip Operator, WG IV	259777S	7/9/77
Soldotna	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	242763P	3/26/77
Tazlina	Equip Operator, WG IV	259754S	9/28/73
Tazlina	Mechanic, WG IV	259917P	6/9/78
Tazlina	Equip Operator, WG VII	259756S	12/27/74
Tazlina	Trades Helper, WG VII	249928S	4/28/77
Tazlina	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249741P	12/20/71
Teller	Equip Operator, WG IV	258733S	10/10/77

LOCATION	CLASSIFICATION	PCN	VACANT SINCE
Thompson Pass	Equip Operator, WG III	259728P	5/10/78
Thompson Pass	Equip Operator, WG III	259729S	5/10/78
Thompson Pass	Equip Operator, WG IV	259734S	7/27/77
Thompson Pass	Equip Operator, WG IV	259732S	5/10/78
Thompson Pass	Equip Operator, WG IV	259731S	5/10/78
Thompson Pass	Equip Operator, WG IV	259730P	5/10/78
Thompson Pass	Cook, WG VI	259735S	5/10/78
Thompson Pass	Cook, WG VII	259737S	5/10/78
Thompson Pass	Equip Operator, WG VII	259736S	5/27/77
Thompson Pass	Equip Serviceman, WG VII	259923S	4/27/78
Tok	Mech Leadman, WG III	255940P	7/11/78
Tok	Mechanic, WG IV	255942P	8/11/78
Valdez	Equip Operator, WG III	249831P	10/10/76
Valdez	Equip Operator, WG III	259780P	3/16/78
Valdez	Maint Man, WG IV	259784S	8/27/72
Valdez	Equip Operator, WG IV	249821P	7/27/72
Valdez	Equip Operator, WG IV	249834S	4/10/76
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	249725P	11/28/72
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	249779S	6/27/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	249791S	7/27/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	249799S	7/11/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IV	259618P	6/27/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	249727S	4/10/76
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	249728S	3/27/76
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	249776P	7/6/70
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	249777P	5/30/72
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	249784S	7/27/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	249796S	5/30/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG V	249801S	7/11/78
Valdez	Matls Lab Tech, WG VI	249820P	5/8/71
Valdez	Equip Operator, WG VII	259781P	3/16/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	249730S	11/10/76
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	249781S	9/10/77
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	249797S	7/11/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	249812S	7/9/77
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG VII	249822S	10/28/77
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	249731S	9/9/74
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	249808P	11/14/71
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	249809P	12/10/71
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	249810P	12/10/71
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	249835S	11/28/72
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	259782P	3/16/78
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	259785P	3/16/78
Valdez	Laborer, WG VIII	259786P	3/16/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249732P	9/14/72
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249733S	9/10/75
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249734S	12/10/71
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249740S	10/16/71
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249742S	11/14/71
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249774S	7/27/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249792S	8/11/78
Valdez	Hwy Engr Tech, WG IX	249825S	5/27/77
Yakutat	Equip Operator, WG III	257744S	4/13/78
Yakutat	Equip Operator, WG VII	257794S	3/10/77
Yakutat	Equip Operator, WG VII	257793S	4/13/78



RECORDS CERTIFICATION



I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

James O. Smith
Signature of Camera Operator

12/15/89
Date

SCOMM

#51:5

TABLE OF CONTENTS
CLASSIFICATION, CERTIFICATION & RECRUITMENT ISSUE SUMMARY

1. Centralization or Decentralization of Personnel Administration.....	1
CLASSIFICATION.....	3
2. Classification Process.....	3
3. Division of Personnel Recommendations to Division of Budget and Management on Reclassification.....	4
4. Sturcture of Classes of Positions.....	4
a) Consolidation of job classifications.....	4
b) Minimum qualifications for positions.....	4
c) Career ladders.....	5
CERTIFICATION.....	6
5. Certification Process.....	6
a) Open recruitment.....	6
b) Unreasonable departmental requirements.....	6
c) Evaluation of applicant's experience..	6
d) Location.....	7
e) Data processing.....	7
6. Multiple Applications Within Job Series.....	8
7. Veteran's Preference.....	8
8. Promotional Lists.....	9
9. Hiring From The Lists of Eligibles.....	9
a) Program managers.....	9
b) Qualifications of top five applicants on registers compared with qualifications of those following.....	10
c) Interviews for top five applicants.....	10
10. Auditing Role of the Division of Personnel.....	12
11. Audits of the Division of Personnel.....	12
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION - OTHER.....	12
12. Violation of the Personnel Rules.....	12

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Page 2

13.	Training Programs.....	13
14.	Personnel Rules.....	13
15.	Use of Employees in Tasks Above Job Specifications....	14
16.	Flex Time.....	14
17.	Job Performance Evaluations.....	14
18.	Personnel Act.....	15
19.	Criminal History Check.....	15

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON THE STATE PERSONNEL ACT
Pouch AG
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-4442

TO: Blue Ribbon Commission Members

FROM: Teresa B. Cramer, Administrative Assistant

DATE: January 21, 1979

RE: Issues Summary, Certification, Classification & Recruitment Subcommittee

CENTRALIZATION OR DECENTRALIZATION OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

1. A thread throughout many of the issues presented below is whether the personnel functions of the state should be centralized in the Division of Personnel or decentralized to the separate departments. Decentralization of the certifying of eligibles for unique job classes could result in more accurate classification of positions and evaluation of applicants and take less time than Division of Personnel now requires, leaving the Division with more time to handle the general job classes and fulfill its audit and service roles. The audit role would be more important under a decentralized system because there would be need of insuring consistency among departmental decisions.

Decentralization could result in confusion for applicants if there were no central locations for applying for jobs. It would be possible to have the Division of Personnel serve the public by establishing offices for information about jobs. These offices could be coordinated with Department of Labor's Job Service Centers and could accept applications and forward them to the appropriate departments.

On the other hand, it would be possible to have all personnel officers be employees of the Division of Personnel. This might insure better communication between the Division and the departments, and better control by the Division over personnel decisions within the departments. Testimony was presented to the commission indicating that a centralized system could result in considerable friction between the Division and the department in question and that this friction could hinder the effectiveness of the personnel officer.

Some departments have statutory authority for hiring their own personnel officers who are also empowered to adopt regulations for those classes of employees which are unique to that department. The departments include the departments of highways, fish and game, education, labor and health and social services. AS39.25.160.

QUESTIONS:

a) Is communication and control of personnel functions increased if personnel officers are employed by the Division of Personnel?

b) Does centralization create more problems than it solves by creating friction between departments and the Division?

c) Will the state be able to find and hire better people faster if the departments are responsible for all phases of the filling of positions in unique job classifications? Components of filling jobs include recruitment, application evaluation, writing exams, evaluating exams and establishing registers.

d) Will having personnel decisions decentralized lead to greater abuses of the merit principles? Can the Division audits prevent such abuses?

e) Will there be added expense in a decentralized system resulting from having to increase departmental personnel staffs? Could the money involved (if any) be better spent increasing the staff of the Division of Personnel or its operational budget?

f) If unique job classifications are decentralized, how should the system of applying for a state job be structured to insure that applicants receive knowledge of vacancies for which they might wish to apply?

g) Would job classifications be combined so as to be unique to each department, or would a single list be maintained by all of the departments using that general classification? For example, would engineering classes be made unique to the departments and separate lists maintained according to the type of engineering skills involved: Department of Environmental Conservation (Environmental Engineer), Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (Civil and Architectural Engineers), Health and Social Services (Sanitary Engineers); or would there be a single list for all engineers through which departments would search for those with specialties in the areas required for a particular vacancy?

CLASSIFICATION

2. Classification process. The process used for classifying new positions differs little from the process used for reclassifying existing positions. Testimony has indicated that both can be slow and cumbersome. The process includes:

- a) Preparation of job descriptions (P402's) describing the duties of the position and justifying the requested title and salary range. For new positions, the P402 is prepared by the immediate supervisory of the position. For reclassifications, the present job holder prepares the form.
- b) Departmental review varies widely among the departments.
- c) Review and approval by the Division of Budget and Management, if the classification or reclassification requires an increase to departmental budget.
- d) Classification study by the Division of Personnel and Labor Relations, including a comparison to similar positions in other departments, other states, and in private industry.

While most time is spent in the classification study, the process of classifying positions can develop delays at any of the steps. The time required leads program managers, who must meet legislative deadlines for programs and handle the normal work of the department, to hire temporary employees, which often leads to circumvention of the controls of the merit system.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that responsibility for handling classification of positions in unique job classifications be delegated to the user departments? If so, do the departments have adequate staff in their personnel offices to accept the responsibilities delegated? What would be the net cost difference?

Discussion: New job classification or existing positions' reclassification could be done by the user department's personnel section. The department would prepare Budget and Management forms and submit them directly to the Division of Budget and Management for budget authorization. The Division of Personnel would be given a copy of the entire submittal and would have a limited time to approve or veto the proposed classification action. If no response were received from Personnel within the time set, then the action would stand, subject to post-audit review, which would be limited to changing actions found to be contrary to established rule or law.

This concept makes the classification time responsive to

management at the departmental level, which can set priorities for action by its personnel section. Division of Personnel would retain an oversight role to insure consistency in classification standards throughout the state. This process could also be more responsive to applicants.

3. Division of Personnel recommendations to Division of Budget and Management on reclassifications. Testimony received indicates that the Division of Personnel evaluates and makes recommendations on proposed reclassifications only after the Division of Budget and Management has authorized funding for the change.

Federal law requires that employees be paid on the principle of equal pay for equal work, as does state law. Under federal law, employees who have been underpaid may be entitled to back pay with interest and attorney's fees in case of litigation. The present system of approving reclassifications gives Budget and Management a veto over reclassifications before Personnel has established the merit of the proposed change.

REMEDY: 1. Does the Commission wish to propose that the Division of Personnel place more emphasis on initiating reclassification studies? 2. Does the Commission wish to propose that where the Division has found that a reclassification should be made, that those positions must be reclassified, regardless of funding available? If funding is not available, and if the legislature decides against a supplemental appropriation to the departmental budget, then this policy would require a decrease in the number of positions to pay for the higher salaries of those remaining. 3. Should the Division of Personnel perform evaluations on all reclassification requests before Budget and Management makes recommendations and authorizes funding?

4. Structure of classes of positions. The Commission heard testimony on several components of the structure of the state's job classes.

a) Consolidation of job classifications. At present, there are 1,600 job classifications in the state, which is a larger number than other states with similarly-sized work forces. Reducing the number could speed the classification process and could help to prevent some of the inequities in salaries assigned to different classifications. At the same time, the consolidation could help to develop rational career ladders within classes.

b) Minimum qualifications for positions. Testimony was presented that minimum qualifications for some positions overemphasize educational requirements, which then eliminate candi-

dates who could perform the work satisfactorily but who lack the educational background specified. This is a particular problem for filling positions in the bush. On the other hand, one witness thought that more stringent educational standards should be required for social workers employed by the state.

STATUTE: AS39.25.155 requires establishment of vocational standards as alternatives for education or experience levels now required for non-professional occupational areas. Applicants will be placed on eligible lists for the vocational classification indicated on their applications, ranked by assessment of their technical ability and place of residence, without written examination. The purpose of the vocational substitution program is to establish a liberal system under which Alaskan residents not employed by the state may demonstrate their abilities and be hired. It is intended for use primarily in remote or underemployed areas where there is a local need for employees with certain vocational skills.

c) Career ladders. Two problems with career ladders were brought to the Commission's attention:

1) In the Public Health Nurse class, there is no viable career ladder system. There are a number of PHN-I's in the state, only a handful of PHN-II positions and a few PHN-III positions. PHN-III's are itinerant health nurses, located in rural areas and traveling throughout a wide area. Nurses working as PHN-I's have no realistic opportunity of remaining with the state in their field and receiving a promotion to another job classification.

2) In the Chemist class, there is no position available to chemists just out of college. The Chemist I position requires the applicant to have a master's degree or one year's experience as a chemist. There is no typical entry-level chemist classification which requires a college degree in chemistry and no additional experience.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that a comprehensive review of the present job classifications be undertaken by the Division of Personnel and the departments to reduce the number and provide consistency between positions; to provide career ladders within all classes; and to provide for entry level positions with minimal educational requirements in each field? Should the policy set out in AS39.25.155 be extended? Should experience substitute for education except where educational requirements are necessary for licensing in that occupation? What are the equal employment opportunity implications?

CERTIFICATION

5. Certification process. The process for certifying applicants and placing them on registers takes in the majority of cases between three to eight weeks which is too long. There are several components to this problem:

a) Open Recruitment. The state's policy of open recruitment of applicants has led to a substantial increase in the number of applications submitted to the Division of Personnel. This increased workload has added to the time taken for evaluation, testing (where required) and placement on the register. The Legislative Auditor suggests in Recommendation No.2 of his report of January 27, 1977, that the Division should accept applications based on forecasted turnover of positions rather than continue accepting all applications submitted. The Division replied that the state would have to have a greater pool of employees before it could accurately forecast future staffing needs.

Applicants may be encouraged by the fact that the state has accepted an application to believe that there is expected to be a vacancy in that position. If no vacancies occur for a considerable time, the applicant may become frustrated and feel that he is being unfairly treated by the Division of Personnel. On the other hand, if recruitment is closed for a period of time, then the state could not accept applications for any position within that classification. This could present a severe handicap particularly for classes with a number of specialized positions.

b) Unreasonable departmental requirements. One applicant found the application process for the position of Correctional Officer I to be unduly cumbersome and overly technical. The Division required that he be fingerprinted at a particular state office within a limited time, although fingerprints do not change and there were other more convenient state locations for being fingerprinted.

c) Evaluation of applicant's experience. It can take longer for the Division of Personnel to evaluate an applicant's experience than to administer an examination, even though the testing process is lengthy. For unique job classes and for professional level positions, the personnel analyst in the Division may lack the knowledge of the field necessary to perform an accurate evaluation. If the responsibility for filling positions in unique job classifications were delegated to the user department, this problem would be avoided.

d) Location. All application evaluation is done in the Juneau office. Applications from people in other areas of the state must be delivered to Juneau. Mail delivery time and frequent mail delays add to the time before action can be taken on the application. Applicants in other locations do not have ready access to the person making the evaluation and therefore are less able to challenge the results, should they feel that the evaluation is incorrect. The Division's field offices in Anchorage and Fairbanks are not authorized to process applications submitted to them.

e) Data Processing. The Legislative Auditor, in his report, recommended that the Division adopt an automated application processing system. The Division indicated in its response that progress was being made on the implementation of that system. The Auditor also recommended that files be kept by social security number and that employee records should be automatically interfaced with the Payroll Section for immediate and constant updating. The Division replied that because of considerable public and legislative concern about the expanding use of social security numbers as identity numbers, a social security based filing system did not appear advisable.

REMEDY:

a) Open recruitment. Should the state's policy of open recruitment be limited?

b) Experience evaluation. Should the department's be responsible for the evaluation of applications for positions in job classes unique to that department?

Could the application be structured differently to assist the applicant in directly presenting his or her skills, training and experience to assist the rater in making an accurate evaluation?

c) Location. Does the Commission wish to recommend that regional offices of the Division of Personnel in Anchorage and Fairbanks be authorized to evaluate applications and grade examinations and maintain regional master personnel records?

Should eligible lists for positions assigned to salary range 10 or below be kept on a regional basis according to the location in which the applicant will accept work? If so, how should the regional boundaries be drawn? (See also discussion on Lists of Eligibles, issue number 9, page 9).

d) Data processing. Does the Division of Personnel have sufficient funds to fully implement the data processing of appli-

cations? Should the Commission recommend additional funding for that purpose?

If the Commission chooses not to recommend decentralization of the classification process for unique job classifications, does it wish to recommend that the user departments evaluate the training and experience of applicants for unique job classifications?

6. Multiple applications within a job series. The Division of Personnel now requires an application for each job classification within a series. Applicants are therefore required to file several applications and to take several tests if they wish to apply for different levels within the series.

For example, accountants must take different examinations for the different levels within the accounting field. The Division of Personnel has found that giving multiple examinations within a job series is necessary since different levels of a series may require different kinds of skills. Furthermore, performance on an examination for one level does not accurately predict the applicant's performance on an exam for a different level.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that the Division of Personnel require a single application for several classifications within a series - e.g. a Clerk Typist application would cover the positions of Clerk Typist I, II and III - or that the Division require only one application for all positions for which an applicant wishes to be considered?

7. Veteran's preference. One witness testified that he and his subordinate each applied for a vacancy outside the classification series of their present positions, but closely similar to them. His subordinate received the job because he was slightly higher on the register as a result of the five points added to his score because he was a veteran.

STATUTES: AS39.25.150(23) provides for the granting of preference to veterans each time they apply for non-promotional employment. In determining the qualification of applicants for entrance into the classified service under the merit system examination, five points are added to the passing grade of a veteran and ten points are added to the passing grade of a disabled veteran.

REGULATIONS: PR3 07.3 implements that statute.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that the employment preference given to veterans be limited by requiring

that it be available only within a limited time after separation from the service (e.g. 10 or 15 years) or that each veteran may receive a bonus a specific number of times?

8. Promotional lists. Because the state's policy is to fill vacancies from promotional lists whenever possible, applicants who are on the competitive (rather than the promotional) register may never be considered for vacancies. This may lead to the applicant on the competitive register becoming frustrated with the state's hiring system.

In being considered for promotion, one correctional officer learned after the fact that his experience outside of the state's employment was not considered in his evaluation. He was advised that he should have specifically requested that it be considered, but such advice was given only after he questioned the rating he received.

STATUTES: AS39.25.150(4) provides that vacancies be filled by promotion whenever practicable and in the best interest of the state service.

REGULATIONS: PR3 01.3 provides for promotional examinations.

PR5 02.3 When hiring from a promotional list, selection shall be from among the top five available eligibles.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that the policy of the state be changed to eliminate the preference for hiring from promotional lists?

Does the Commission wish to recommend that the Division of Personnel audit the use of promotional lists to insure that no abuses occur?

9. Hiring from the list of eligibles. Both program managers and applicants have concerns about the lists of eligibles.

a) Program managers. Program managers have found that some eligibility lists are not current. This occurs sometimes because of regional preferences of applicants and sometimes because the applicant has become unavailable for work or has accepted another position with the state and is no longer seeking the same level of placement.

An applicant may remain on an eligibility list for a period of two years. There are procedures for supervisors to indicate that an eligible should be removed from the register, but apparently, there is some confusion about how to do so. The Division of

Personnel puts a lower priority on updating the eligible list for this kind of information.

b) Qualifications of top five applicants on registers compared with qualifications of those following. For regions with a large number of applicants, the top five eligibles may not be significantly more qualified than those who follow. Federal regulations used to require that the state hire from the top five interested eligibles for programs funded by federal money, but that may have been changed by federal civil service reforms.

c) Interviews for top five applicants. Departments are required to hire within the top five on the register (except where they justify not doing so) but they are not required to interview each applicant within the group.

Supervisors may be prejudiced against an applicant because he or she has been on the register for a considerable length of time, and be less willing to hire him or her for that reason. The failure to interview all of the members of the group rewards those who are aggressive in seeking interviews with program managers and those who are in the location in which there is a vacancy. A prospective employer will have much better knowledge of an applicant after an interview than he or she could glean from reading the written application.

The Department of Administration is in the process of preparing regulations for a pilot project which would require that all of the top five interested applicants have an opportunity for a meaningful interview before a position was filled. The interviews should be scheduled long enough in advance to insure that the applicant will receive notice and be able to attend. Supervisors may wish to ask departmental staff in the applicant's area to conduct the interview, if the applicant prefers not to travel to the office with a vacancy. Interviews might also be conducted by telephone. Either of these methods is less desirable than an interview between the applicant and the person hiring.

The applicant would be responsible for any transportation costs to the interview.

REGULATIONS: PR4 02.0 Eligibility lists are statewide in scope except where Rules or action of the Director call for establishment of lists by geographical area, agency, or organizational unit.

PR4 03.0 Duration of eligibility lists (not to exceed 2 years)

PR4 04.0 Removal of names for specified reasons

PR4 05.0 Eligibles' right to restrict the conditions under which he will be available for employment

PR5 03.14 If an eligible is passed over three times by a department for the same classification, that department can request that the eligible's name not be certified to them again.

PR5 03.3 Concurrent certification of eligibles. The Rules do not require the simultaneous certification of the same name on different certifications made concurrently. This means that even though two certification lists (registers) are issued at the same time for the same classification, they will not necessarily contain the same names.

RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Does the Commission wish to recommend that eligible lists for positions assigned to salary range 10 or below be kept on a regional basis according to the area in which the applicant will accept work? (See also discussion on Location of Certification, issue number 5, page 7). 2. Does the Commission wish to recommend that the state adopt a different merit system selection process? In his memorandum on "Merit Systems in Other Jurisdictions", Ken Humphreys provides a list of some of the options:

a) Rule of the List. Under this method, eligibles are certified on a pass/fail basis. All who pass are certified as eligible for appointment. This is the most open alternative.

b) Zone or Category Scoring. Individuals are ranked within specified ranges. Such categories might be called outstanding, well qualified, qualified or not qualified. Selections would be from the highest category unless the number of eligibles in it fell below a certain level, in which case the next category would become eligible. This is the method under the new federal law. It is worth noting that zones or categories may be tailored to suit different job classes.

c) Block Scoring. All candidates within a specified block of scores are certified.

d) Rule of _____. Any arbitrary number such as one, seven or ten may be inserted.

3) Does the Commission wish to recommend that in filling a vacancy, departmental staff be required to provide the top five applicants on the register with the opportunity for a meaningful interview? If so, should the Commission recommend that this requirement be accomplished by statutes or by regulations

only?

AUDITING ROLE OF DIVISION OF PERSONNEL

10. If the Division of Personnel increased its review of personnel actions taken by departments, abuses of the personnel system would decrease. Testimony has indicated that one of the major areas of abuse is in departmental hiring practices. In order to avoid unfair treatment of individuals who are hired because of improper departmental actions, the division should be able to respond quickly upon notification of a problem. To insure that the division learns of improper actions, applicants for state employment should be provided with the name of the person responsible for investigating and resolving abuses.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend the creation of a position of trouble-shooter within the Division of Personnel who would be responsible for investigation and resolution of problems? If so, what authority should the trouble-shooter have for requiring departmental compliance with his or her findings in each case? What authority should the trouble-shooter have for initiating investigations prior to receipt of a complaint?

AUDITS OF THE DIVISION OF PERSONNEL

11. At the October 3 meeting of the Commission, the Commission voted to "recommend legislation which would provide for periodic external audits of the personnel system like the one carried out (by) the (sic) Division of Legislative Audit in 1977." Minutes, Full Commission, October 3, 1978, page 2.

The Commission should consider who it wishes to recommend to perform this audit - Legislative Audit, Internal Audit or an outside firm? In addition, who would the auditor report to and who would establish the scope of each audit?

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION - OTHER

12. Violation of the personnel rules. There is no workable system to penalize supervisors who circumvent the personnel rules or who disobey equal employment opportunity laws in the decisions they make. In the Prohibitions and Penalties section of the rules, there is a provision making any person who violates the personnel rules guilty of a misdemeanor and providing that any state employee who is convicted of that misdemeanor shall immediately forfeit his office or position. PR13 18.0. This is a harsh remedy, and therefore likely to be used only in extreme circumstances.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that an

Ethics Committee be established to hear obvious abuses by supervisors and other state employees of the Personnel Rules and state and federal statutes?

Composition of committee - criteria for selection, who selects
Scope of authority
Powers to compel testimony, authority to obtain records, etc.
Effect of decision - recommendation to department or mandatory upon department
Remedies available

13. Training programs. The Division of Personnel has limited staff to provide training programs to state employees. Training needs might include introduction to new state employees on the state's unique ways of doing things, EEO and Affirmative Action information, better management practices, introductory budget and financial management information to non-fiscal program managers, explanation of state's personnel system - classification and reclassification processes and standards, the hiring system, labor relations information and the like.

One problem identified was the reluctance of supervisors to fire unsatisfactory employees. This reluctance may result from lack of training in the state's standards, processes and some skill developments. But there may be other obstacles or reasons why supervisors fail to fire employees, such as concern with union procedures, which training will not address. (Local 71 representatives testified that they always file a grievance when an employee is fired, but that they dismiss those grievances where their investigation indicates that the action was justified).

14. Personnel Rules. There are a number of problems with the Personnel Rules. For example, there is no specific rule on whether temporary employees may use the appeal procedures set out in the rules. The Division has analogized from the rule for probationary employees that temporary employees may not use the appeal procedures except in limited circumstances, but it would be clearer if there were a specific provision in the rules concerning the rights of temporaries.

Little or no attempt has been made to reconcile the Personnel Rules with the several bargaining unit agreements; the rules and the standard operating procedure and memoranda implementing or changing them are not cross-indexed, and there is no one source for all the standards which need be applied to resolve a question: Personnel Rules are in some instances vague, leading to different applications by departments and inconsis-

tent treatment of state employees, depending only on which department they work in;

STATUTE: AS39.25.140 sets out the procedures for amendment of the rules and AS39.25.150 sets out the scope of the rules.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that the Department of Administration prepare a comprehensive revision of the rules for submission to the personnel board?

Does the Commission wish to recommend that the Division of Personnel study the rules and establish personnel rules which would apply to all employees, regardless of whether or not they were members of a union? Should the state have personnel rules beyond the scope of those general rules which would complement each union contract?

Since the Personnel Rules are out-of-date, does the Commission wish to recommend that there be a periodic review of the rules? Should the Personnel Board retain jurisdiction over the rules or should this function be given to an Ethics Committee?

15. Use of employees in tasks above job specifications. Supervisors are unwilling to document the performance by their staff of duties above the job classification to which the employee is assigned. This denies to the employee credit for work done - either when being considered for promotion or for employment elsewhere - as well as for extra pay for the task in question. There are procedures available for documenting work above grade.

QUESTION: Does the Commission wish further review of this problem?

16. Flex time. The use of flex time should be encouraged as a way of responding to individual employee needs while also better meeting the public's needs for services during lunch hours and after regular state hours. PROBLEM: Experience has shown that having people work at odd times will result in unions demanding extra pay for those odd hours, increasing the cost to the state.

QUESTION: Does the Commission wish further review of this problem?

17. Job performance evaluations. At the October 3 meeting, this topic was raised. The Commission decided to leave development of it to the individual members.

1. Excellence or substandard performance
2. EEO
3. Dress codes
4. Training and job performance assessment

18. Personnel Act. As indicated in issue number 2 of the Merit System/Collective Bargaining Committee Summary, there has not been a comprehensive review of the Personnel Act since the adoption of the Public Employees Relations Act in 1972. This has led to considerable confusion about how the two systems should be integrated. Furthermore, the Personnel Act is considered by some to be poorly constructed.

REMEDY: Does the Commission wish to recommend that the Code Revision Commission be directed to recodify the Personnel Act so that it is well structured and written in plain language?

19. Criminal history check. The application form for state employment asks applicants to indicate whether they have been convicted of a felony within the past ten years. Federal law may now prohibit requiring that an applicant respond to that question. The only way to check the truth of an applicant's answer, should one be provided, is to make a personal complaint with the Department of Public Safety. They will then search their computers to learn whether there has been a conviction.

Some supervisors believe that it is important to know about an employee's criminal background when hiring for positions in which the employee would have access to funds or to supplies which might prove to be too tempting to resist.

QUESTION: Does the Commission wish to pursue this topic further?

CERTIFICATION, CLASSIFICATION & RECRUITMENT
Capitol Building, Juneau
October 17, 1979

MINUTES

Senator Bill Ray, Chairman, called the meeting to order and referred to the memo on partially exempt employees prepared by Terry Cramer. She explained that partially exempt employees do not belong to collective bargaining unions because they have never petitioned for representation. Under current statutes, all employees in the Governor's Office are in the partially exempt service, unless their positions are federally funded.

The subcommittee reviewed the list of partially exempt positions in the memo and raised questions on the following:

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

Revenue Hearing Examiners
Investment Officers I-III

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES

Staff Psychiatrist

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Executive Officer of the Nursing Board
Executive Secretary of the Real Estate Commission
Regional Loan Manager

DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME

Special Assistant

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Administrative Officer I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & PUBLIC FACILITIES

Special Assistant

Senator Ray stated that he would discuss with Governor Hammond the possible removal of some partially exempt positions from his office and the addition of policy-making supervisors to the partially exempt service. Pat Murphy pointed out that it is possible for employees to have the protection of the classified service while being excluded from collective bargaining. Employees in this special class are not subject to termination each time a new Governor is elected. Mr. Murphy added that he is sure there will be a bill introduced next session to remove Deputy and Assistant Directors from bargaining units. Senator Ray pointed out that Deputy and Assistant Directors should be in the par-

tially exempt service because they make policy decisions. If they were placed in the classified service as career employees, they would be less sensitive to implementing the Governor's policy.

Lois Jund cited her experiences in being offered a partially exempt position and her reluctance to accept it because of the possibility of making unpopular policy decisions and the unsure tenure of the partially exempt service. She believes that Deputy and Assistant Directors should be part of the career ladders in the classified service, but should not be part of the collective bargaining process. Ms. Jund recommended that these employees be moved into the special class Mr. Kareen referred to. Ken Kareen explained that the Governor has already proposed that these positions be removed from the collective bargaining process.

Senator Ray mentioned that he had received a complaint regarding APEA representatives being employed in policy-making positions with the state. Pat Murphy commented that this has not been a problem, but John Pugh, for example, resigned as President of APEA because the Commissioner of the Department of Health and Social Services felt that the office might conflict with his job responsibilities.

Ken Kareen stated that because of unique requirements, he feels that the Governor's staff should remain in the partially exempt service. However, there is a question about why some agencies are placed in the Governor's Office. Lois Jund pointed out that the public sector often applies pressure to have certain functions placed under the Governor's Office for visibility purposes. Ken Kareen added that there are instances when there is no logical place to put agencies other than in the Office of the Governor.

Senator Ray addressed the issue of auditing the personnel system. Lois Jund commented that audits of state agencies should be a role of the Division of Personnel. Senator Ray asked whether there is an internal audit function in the Department of Administration, and Ken Kareen responded that the internal audit function was deleted from the department's budget and reestablished under the Office of the Governor. The Department of Administration does have some audit responsibilities. Senator Ray suggested that a departmental ombudsman position might be created to handle such studies. Lois Jund mentioned that the Civil Service Commission's Personnel Branch performs personnel audits in agencies, examines specific positions, training and EEO functions, and writes reports containing recommendations for improvement. Ken Kareen elaborated that the Personnel Branch is then audited by the General Services Administration, which has a similar function.

Senator Ray moved that the subcommittee recommend that audits be performed in agencies by the Division of Personnel and that the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee determine the scope of the audits and be the recipient of reports. There were no objections.

Lois Jund asked who would be responsible for auditing the Division of Personnel, and Ken Kareen suggested that the study be performed jointly by the Division of Legislative Audit and the Department of Administration. Senator Ray pointed out that current legislative audit methods are time consuming, and reviews are not performed annually. Presently, the Legislative Audit Division reviews the system and reports findings to the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee, which submits the report to the department involved. The department then considers the report and submits a reply to the Legislative Audit Division. Mr. Kareen stated that legislative audits performed on the Division of Personnel are extremely time consuming. Mr. Murphy asserted that the Division of Personnel would be capable of handling performance audits on agencies if other functions were decentralized and the Division was responsible for administering the personnel system. Senator Ray moved that the subcommittee recommend that there be annual audits of the personnel system performed either by the Division of Personnel, the Legislative Audit Division or a combination of both. Lois Jund amended the motion by deleting reference to "annual". There were no objections.

On the issue of creating more effective disciplinary measures for violation of Personnel Rules, Senator Ray observed that supervisors are apparently lacking selfdiscipline. Ms. Jund stated that the U.S. Civil Service Commission has rules on offenses and publishes a table of penalties covering each offense. Mr. Kareen commented that under the present system, violations of Alaska's Personnel Rules are considered misdemeanors. He remembered only one prosecution in the history of the state.

Senator Ray cited an example of problems arising when the desire to prosecute is lacking. Ms. Jund commented that employees found violating the Personnel Rules should have an opportunity for hearing or appeal. Pat Murphy explained that collective bargaining unit representatives are responsible for representing employees in all disciplinary actions. All employees are responsible for abiding by the Personnel Rules, and if it is proved that they are willfully violating them, management has the right to take disciplinary action. Senator Ray asked whether the subcommittee agreed that the present disciplinary system is ineffective. Pat Murphy did not concur. Ms. Jund asserted that disciplinary measures are not applied consistently, because they are left to the supervisor's discretion and because there are no established guidelines. Ken Kareen stated that there are many parties involved when violations occur who are concerned with assisting the employee. He advocates uniform application of disciplinary measures and penalties less severe than misdemeanors. Senator Ray suggested that the subcommittee recommend an amendment to the Personnel Act to provide disciplinary action commensurate with the seriousness of violations. There were no objections.

Senator Ray brought up the issue of recommending comprehensive revision of both the Personnel Act and the Personnel Rules. The subcommittee had already voted affirmatively on recodifying the State Personnel Act. Senator Ray suggested that the decision on who should conduct the recodification process be left to the legislature's discretion. Members concurred, and suggested that the Personnel Rules be redrafted following revision of the statutes.

Senator Ray adjourned the meeting at 11:45.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Senator Bill Ray, Chairman
Lynda McCurry
Lois Jund
John Pugh
Sandra Withers

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Doryce Eggleston
Ken Kareen
Bob Mourant
Pat Murphy

CERTIFICATION, CLASSIFICATION & RECRUITMENT
Capitol Building, Juneau
October 11, 1979

MINUTES

Senator Ray, Chairman, called the subcommittee meeting to order and invited Ron Lehr, Director of the Division of Budget and Management, to address questions on the role of his division in the classification and reclassification processes. Karen Corey was also present, representing the Governor's Office.

In the classification of new positions, the Division of Budget and Management is responsible for preparing position authorization forms, known as SA 21's. The agency requests that the division authorize the creation of a new position. This form is returned to the agency, which submits it with a position description (P402) to the Division of Personnel for their action on the proposed classification. The role of Budget and Management is to verify that funds are available for the position and to insure that the position is in accordance with the operations plan of the agency.

Senator Ray commented that the subcommittee has heard testimony regarding frequent delays in the classification process that was attributed to Budget and Management. Mr. Lehr responded that in most instances, SA21's are prepared by the division in May or June, well before the beginning of the fiscal year. Senator Ray mentioned the subcommittee's concern over Budget and Management's veto powers. Mr. Lehr explained that the Division of Budget and Management staff acts as the staff of the Governor's Budget Review Committee during the preparation of the Governor's budget, just as the Legislative Finance Division serves as staff of the Legislative Finance Committees during their review. In neither case do the staff members have decision-making powers. He added that there were some delays this year, since the legislative cut-back on the proposed budget required agencies to revise their operational plans. To insure that this was done, the division held up processing other documents for each agency, including authorizing expenditures for new positions, until the operations plan of the agency had been cleared.

Lynda McCurry commented that in the Department of Labor, the establishment of new positions doesn't present a problem. However, there have been problems in reclassifying positions, from seasonal to part-time for example. Ms. McCurry cited delays in the delete/reestablish process of up to several weeks. She was informed by Budget and Management analysts that reclassification actions were low on the division's list of priorities. She does not feel that agencies should be respon-

sible for calling the division to expedite the process. Mr. Lehr stated that reclassification actions should not take more than a few days. The division only has to verify that funding is available and that the reclassification is in accordance with the operation plan intended in the budget.

Ms. McCurry stated that from the program manager's point of view, it is difficult to obtain answers to questions over which Budget and Management and the Division of Personnel have authority. Mr. Lehr responded that the division revised its procedures manual, in August or September, and it may help in identifying the source for answers.

Senator Ray pointed out that there are some who feel that the Division of Budget and Management consists of a group of elitists who give everyone a bad time. Apparently, some staff members act as though they have more authority than is actually the case. Mr. Lehr replied that he would have to hear specific complaints to respond to the accusation.

Senator Ray asked whether each analyst in the division is assigned to one department. Mr. Lehr explained that each analyst works on a budget category, and there is one category for each department, with the exception of Natural Resources. He added that the division's task is quite simple, and it is easy to complete authorization forms, which are not very complex.

Senator Ray noted that personnel officers and agencies do not care to call the division whenever they have difficulties, because this often leads to being labeled as a trouble-maker. Mr. Lehr stated that the division has a control function responsible for exercising the Governor's authority. Some friction is inherent, given that role. Lynda McCurry observed that one of the problems appears to be a lack of communication between the division and the user agencies.

There are only certain instances when the division has to get involved in the classification process, such as in the delete/reestablish actions and when reclassifications require additional money. Doryce Eggleston stated that there are no clear operating procedures outlined for personnel officers, thus there is confusion as to the role of the division. Senator Ray suggested that the first step in the process, submitting the forms to the Division of Personnel, could be eliminated. Thus, P402's and SA21's could be sent directly to the Division of Budget and Management for authorization. Mr. Lehr stated that the Division of Personnel serves as a screening function, and his division would be overrun with requests if that step were eliminated.

Senator Ray recommended that the division write a handbook outlining procedures for all entities coming in contact with the division.

Mr. Lehr stated that the division has been writing a procedures manual for internal use, but it is a time consuming task and not a high priority. Senator Ray suggested that a short-form manual be prepared in the meantime in collaboration with the Division of Personnel and some of the agencies experiencing difficulties. There were no more questions for Mr. Lehr. Senator Ray expressed the commission's thanks for his participation in the meeting and offered congratulations on his recent promotion to the position of Director. Mr. Lehr and Ms. Corey left.

Lois Jund suggested that agencies could expedite the process by preparing position descriptions prior to receipt of SA21's. Ms. McCurry noted that APEA representatives have referred to problems in the process of upgrading classifications. Ken Kareen explained that their problems are results of grievances over position reclassifications. When the Division of Budget and Management receives requests for upgrading, they have to verify that funds are available and in accordance with legislative intent. Often, funds have not been appropriated for the elevated classifications, and the Division must delay authorization until funds have been approved.

Senator Ray addressed subcommittee members, stating his hopes that the commission can remain objective on issues that members are personally involved with. He informed the subcommittee that he had made a report to the Legislative Council on the commission's activities and their lack of action on the merit system/collective bargaining issues. The council indicated that the collective bargaining issue is a priority for commission consideration. Senator Ray assured the council that all information researched and all public testimony heard on the topic will be placed in the final report to the legislature. He invited members to prepare their own reports on any of the issues discussed during meetings. Senator Ray asserted that the commission is a legislative entity that is responsible for disseminating whatever information it acquires to the legislature.

On the issue of multiple applications, Ms. Jund commented that in the civil service system, an application may be submitted for all levels in a job series. Sandra Withers stated that the Division of Personnel operates with a limited number of employees and is designed to utilize their time and effort in the most productive manner. Senator Ray asked whether it would be possible to save time by accepting one application for a series, and then if an individual passed a test for the highest level, he or she could be scored for the lower levels accordingly. Ken Kareen explained that the Division of Personnel is working on computer backup that would allow for this in some instances. However, different values are assigned to experience and skills at different levels. Final scores are based on a combination of experience and knowledge of applicants, and individuals with both should be the best candidates for the job.

Senator Ray commented that individuals from academic backgrounds fare better on tests than those who have had more actual on-the-job experience. Mr. Kareen pointed out that the Division of Personnel is trying to develop a detailed questionnaire to evaluate experience in a more efficient manner. Evaluating experience described on applications and resumes can be difficult. Some applicants write autobiographies, and some scribble only a few lines. The recruitment responsibilities of the Division of Personnel are becoming more complicated because of state and federal regulations. The division cannot, at this time, interview an applicant for a position unless there is statistical documentation that the interview is nondiscriminatory.

Senator Ray moved that the subcommittee recommend that the Division of Personnel be encouraged to get away from the necessity of multiple applications, provided that the process doesn't become more labor intensive than it is presently. There were no objections.

The issue of test validation was addressed, and Ken Kareen asserted that the commission should not address the issue because of the complexity of state and federal regulations. Presently, a competent professional is required to study jobs and then construct validated tests. There are many alternatives, such as multiple choice, essay and combination tests. The Division must show statistically that people performing well on tests will perform best on the job. Lois Jund asked if there is an agency that validates tests nation wide. Mr. Kareen explained that there are a number of consulting firms that do, but there is no one agency involved. The leader in this area is the U.S. Civil Service Commission. Ms. Jund asked whether it would be possible to obtain validated tests to be used in Alaska. Mr. Kareen replied that the test couldn't be used unless it was validated for use in Alaska. The test on which the Civil Service Commission (Office of Personnel Management) spent the most money is currently being challenged in the courts because there is some question of its validity. The state is required by federal regulation to validate tests, but only some have been at this time. Ms. Jund asked if additional funding is necessary to complete the task. Mr. Kareen stated that he has mixed feelings on requesting additional funds because he doesn't believe that the state will ever be able to validate all tests. The subcommittee took no action on the issue.

On the issue of the veteran's preference system, Senator Ray suggested that it be abolished. Mr. Kareen stated that the Division of Personnel receives applications from career military people who are drawing retirement benefits from the federal government, and they expect to receive preference in state employment as well. Senator Ray suggested that the subcommittee recommend that veterans be given preference when applying for positions within a three-year period following discharge from the service. He believes that the present ten-point preference system for disabled veterans should not be changed. There was general agreement on the issue.

Referring to the topic of regional registers, it was pointed out that limiting registers to applicants from one region would restrict competition. Applicants presently have the option of choosing the area in which they are willing to accept employment on application forms. Ken Kareen pointed out that certification of some registers are handled in Anchorage. However, individuals indicate on applications that they are willing to work anywhere in the state but frequently turn down interviews for openings in rural areas. The state is required to hire from among the best available applicants, and limiting applicants to just one area would conflict with equal employment opportunity policies. Mr. Kareen stated that the U.S. Civil Service Commission (Office of Personnel Management) has regional registers requiring one application for each region. This type of system would increase the influx of paperwork in the Division of Personnel drastically. Lois Jund suggested that the state might be able to give hiring preference to residents in some rural areas. Senator Ray moved that the issue be noted in the commission's report and identified as a problem. There were no objections.

Members addressed the issue of interviewing the top five interested applicants on a register. Senator Ray suggested that requiring a cursory interview could alleviate some grievances from individuals who believe that they should have such opportunities. Lois Jund stated that appointing authorities work under time constraints, and a requirement would present difficulties. The procedure for requiring interviews for those on block scored registers was discussed. On some registers using block scoring, there are as many as 70 applicants in the top group. Terry Cramer commented that an individual had presented his views to her on an interview at the University of Alaska. He had been told that the position might be filled by promotion, and he felt that the interview was a waste of time. Senator Ray moved that the subcommittee recommend that the top five interested applicants be notified of position openings and given an opportunity to request a meaningful interview. The recommendation does not address registers using block scoring. There were no objections.

Senator Ray mentioned that the commission's recommendations on filling authorized permanent positions with only permanent employees had been taken care of in the new nonpermanent hiring law. He made a presentation on the new law to the Council of State Government's meeting, and it has been printed in their publication as a model for other legislatures. The staff is preparing a memo on the changes being implemented by the state.

On the issue of training, Senator Ray stated that the staff is preparing a report designed to inform the legislature of the commission's views.

There was general agreement that the issues of promotion and equal employment opportunities are matters for Division of Equal Employment

Opportunity consideration. Ken Kareen elaborated that the subcommittee is sympathetic to EEO philosophies and believes that the Division of Equal Employment Opportunity provides adequate representation of the issues.

Senator Ray commented that on the topic of documenting tasks performed above class specifications, there are sufficient means for promotional advancement and compensation. Documentation procedures are available, which are the responsibilities of supervisors and managers. The issue is also a bargainable item. Senator Ray moved that the subcommittee recommend that this continue to be a bargainable item. Mr. Kareen added that it is management's responsibility to insure that the position description of their employees are current. There were no objections.

Senator Ray adjourned the meeting at 11:50.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Senator Bill Ray, Chairman
Lois Jund
Lynda McCurry
Sandra Withers

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Doryce Eggleston
Ken Kareen

CERTIFICATION, CLASSIFICATION & RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
Capitol Building--Juneau
October 5, 1979

MINUTES

Senator Ray, Chairman, called the meeting to order and referred to the September 26 issues summary as an agenda for discussion. Items IIA1 (creation of a Department of Employee Relations) and IIA2 (adopting the Personnel Rules in compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act) were reviewed by members. Under language drafted into SB256, Personnel Rules would no longer be exempted from Administrative Procedure Act requirements. Under the present law, the Personnel Board has discretion as to whether a public hearing is held on proposed changes.

On the issue of a block scoring system (IIA3), Ken Kareen explained that the subcommittee's previous recommendation was viewed by the Division of Personnel as an encouragement to continue moving in that direction. He stated that currently, almost all clerical examinations are block scored. There are numerous federal requirements for compliance with examination regulations, and it is possible that further subcommittee refinements would not be in compliance. The federal government permits the use of block scoring in its own system where there is sufficient statistical information available.

Sue Greene stated that the "rule of five" is restrictive for some classes and not so for others. There are certain types of positions that require employee qualities that do not show up through testing. Ken Kareen commented that to meet this need, there are provisions in the Personnel Rules where an appointing authority has discretion to hire below the top five. When an exception is made, the burden is placed on the appointing authority to supply a reasonable explanation for such action.

Senator Ray stated that people's expectations of getting hired when within the top five are being thwarted, written examinations are ambiguous, experience is erroneously evaluated and "buzz words" are the most significant factors in evaluations. Darlene Livermore responded that final ratings are usually based 60% on experience and 40% on test scores. There are inherent difficulties in classifying people, and there is always a question of subjectivity. On another topic, it was noted that after an individual is tested and hired, the emphasis on training is dependent upon the position. If a classification is for training purposes, the examination is created to predict which individual has the greatest learning potential.

John Pugh pointed out that the Division of Personnel has improved certain classifications by consolidating them into larger classes. When his department needs a program coordinator, it requests the specific qualifications necessary. The Division of Personnel provides an eligible list of those persons on the general program coordinator list who meet the specific qualifications requested. However, this can be very time consuming for the Division of Personnel, and generalizations cannot always be made in classifications.

Senator Ray elaborated on existing classification problems, such as requests for accountants, when a position only requires an accounting clerk. Sue Greene responded that the Division of Personnel relies on information from supervisors, who are required to review each of their employees' position descriptions during the annual performance evaluations. There is a need to improve the system. Ken Kareen pointed out that a recommendation to create a stronger audit function in the Division of Personnel would make the division even less popular than it is now. Members discussed some possibilities for reviewing the classification system. Washington contracts with a consulting firm on an ongoing basis. Alaska has previously contracted with a firm to examine and make recommendations on the system. Although the firm was well respected, their recommendations were unpopular and not acted upon. Ken Kareen agreed with Sue Greene that a study performed by an outside firm would be more objective, but credibility would be better from the Division of Personnel. If a study were to be done, it would be important for the current division staff to work with the firm conducting the study because they would be responsible for maintaining the revised system.

Lynda McCurry stated that several agencies have highly developed classification review plans. However, there is a lack of resources for all departments to do so. Departments and personnel sections should be more responsible for position classifications. John Pugh suggested that register ranking could be better handled by departmental personnel, especially unique classes which some departments are responsible for now. Some classification problems can be attributed to the departmental employees who write evaluations and minimum qualifications. How much authority for independent action should personnel officers have? Personnel officers in some departments are classifying positions. In various agencies, employees are responsible for writing their own job descriptions and evaluations, which are reviewed by supervisors and then sent to personnel sections. Lynda McCurry stated that if an incumbent is familiar with the work, he or she will usually be able to write a very honest job description. In the Word Processing Center, for example, it was found that almost universally, the staff rated its work with fewer points than actually earned. John Pugh mentioned his belief that "padding" is more prevalent for positions in Juneau offices than those located in other parts of the state. Positions with a higher level of decision-making authority are better paid in the state than are those with less authority but more daily responsibilities.

Senator Ray asked the subcommittee whether personnel officers should be centralized or decentralized. Darlene Livermore replied that it would appear to be easier to have them congregated in one central location. However, good logic dictates a decentralized system to the maximum degree possible, where the personnel officers have a great amount of authority and some type of uniformity in regulation application. John Pugh commented that there are some functions that need to remain in the Division of Personnel. He recommends a centralized system to establish and maintain policies and procedures, with a strong audit function. Lynda McCurry added that the Confidential Employees Association recommends that personnel officers with classification authority be located in each department and that there be a strong audit function in the Division of Personnel.

Sue Greene said that there are two points of concern in maintaining a cohesive system of equitable application. In the long term, fragmentation can occur in a decentralized system. She recommends that personnel officers be hired and managed by departments and be delegated different levels of authority, depending upon their capabilities. Presently, each department has a personnel section, and the Division of Personnel employs individuals to service all the departments. Employees in the division distribute some activities to departments and ask for assistance in various tasks. Ms. Greene advocates moving in the direction of greater delegation of tasks to the departments at the discretion of the Division of Personnel.

Senator Ray observed that the decentralization of personnel officers appeared to be favored by members and that the biggest argument against such an action would be the veto power of the Division of Personnel. Classification procedures could be performed by personnel officers in agencies, but the Division of Personnel would have the final word. Ken Kareen explained that there are many variables that must be taken into consideration when delegating tasks to departments such as different management skills, personalities, general abilities and knowledge of procedures of personnel officers and their staffs. The Division of Personnel responds in proportion to the input and performance qualifications of departments.

Senator Ray commented on complaints the commission has received regarding reclassifications that originate in departments, are approved by personnel officers and then denied by the Division of Personnel. Ken Kareen responded that this problem relates to control at the commissioner's level. How much authority should they have in the process? Even if personnel officers were employed by the Division, they would still be subjected to pressure from commissioners and would have to consider priorities. Darlene Livermore recommended the delegation of functions from a centralized division, responsible for overseeing rules

and regulations on how to distribute tasks. That is how the Department of Labor is working now. Ms. Livermore stated that delegation of responsibilities could work on a performance basis to the benefit of all. Those personnel offices incapable of performing could be dealt with by providing training to the staff or by whatever action became necessary.

John Pugh cited the prompt classification of new positions as being a major problem. New positions are assigned to a class in the budget enacted by the legislature and should be handled by departments so that programs can start on time. Ms. Livermore stated that the problem in classification of new positions is created by the Division of Budget and Management. In a study initiated by Senator Croft two years ago, it was found that delays are most often due to delays in receiving position descriptions or in Budget and Management's authorization process. Once a department has written a job description (P402), after the budget has been authorized by the legislature and signed by the Governor, the entire mass of paperwork must be submitted to Budget and Management so that the source of funding can be identified and documents can be coded into the budget process.

Senator Ray asked why Budget and Management is involved in the process. It was explained that they must verify the existence of funds appropriated to agencies for their classifications and that the use of funds is consistent with the legislature's intent. The staff was directed to request that a representative of the Office of Budget and Management attend the next subcommittee meeting.

On the question of reviewing all existing classifications, Senator Ray stated that he would prefer to have someone other than the Division of Personnel perform the study. It was noted that there is presently insufficient staff in the division to perform a comprehensive review. Darlene Livermore commented that she had been in contact with other states that had hired personnel consulting firms to investigate the feasibility of utilizing their services. The responses she received on some of the most respected firms were not favorable. The state or municipalities involved experienced extreme difficulties with the recommendations of the firms that were implemented.

Senator Ray suggested to the subcommittee that it recommend that the legislature fund a comprehensive review of existing classifications to identify troubled areas. Ms. McCurry stated that dealing with outside consultants had been disastrous in the past and that funds could be better spent by giving the Division of Personnel additional resources. Other options such as utilizing the Civil Service Commission (Office of Personnel Management), the Legislative Audit Division or the Division of Personnel were mentioned. Senator Ray modified his recommendation: A study should be performed by either the Division of Personnel, Legislative Audit, the Civil Service Commission, an outside consulting firm or a combination of the above. A vote was taken. Two were in favor and two opposed. The motion failed.

John Pugh moved that the subcommittee recommend that the Division of Personnel head towards broader classifications. There were no objections, and the motion passed.

On the topic of closing eligibility registers, Ken Kareen stated that the issue has gone to arbitration, and a decision has not been made. The grievance is based on the fact that once registers are closed, unionized employees are precluded from promotional openings because they cannot get on registers. John Pugh stated that open recruitment on all positions is ridiculous. The grievance arose when permanent employees were denied access to promotional lists. Mr. Pugh added that it makes sense to limit recruitment because of the insufficient amount of employees in the Division of Personnel.

Ken Kareen pointed out that the Division of Personnel is trying to schedule recruitment and staff workloads so that every job classification will be open for a minimum of 30 days per year. Senator Ray observed that applicants might be allowed to test for closed positions at any time. From the public standpoint, testing should be available at all times. Lynda McCurry pointed out that there are instances where only four positions exist in one classification, yet the Division of Personnel receives 185 applications annually. Ken Kareen stated that the state is spending funds on recruitment that is unnecessary. Last year, the Division of Personnel processed 60,000 applications from approximately 28,000 individuals. Mr. Kareen stated that the present Division of Personnel policy is to close recruitment for a maximum of 11 months when there are sufficient numbers of eligibles on registers to meet the state's needs for one year. Mr. Pugh asserted that registers should not be closed to permanent employees. Senator Ray asked why a present employee should be treated better than a citizen.

Senator Ray moved that the subcommittee recommend the continuation of open registers in a modified form. There were no objections, and the motion passed.

Members agreed to hold a meeting next week to receive testimony from Ron Lehr of Budget and Management and possibly from a representative of the Governor's Office.

Senator Ray adjourned the meeting at 12:10.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Senator Bill Ray, Chairman
Lynda McCurry
John Pugh
Ken Kareen (for Sandra Withers)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Doryce Eggleston
Sue Greene
Darlene Livermore
Bob Maurant

CLASSIFICATION, CERTIFICATION & RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
Governor's Conference Room, Juneau
April 17, 1979

MINUTES

Senator Ray, Chairman, called the meeting to order and invited testimony from individuals present. He stated that the Commission requires information from people regarding all sides of the issues it is considering. The commission feels strongly that people should be able to speak freely without fear of repercussions from their supervisors or others. Members will weigh all information and opinions expressed in making their decisions.

TESTIMONY

Lynda McCurry presented testimony on the question of centralization/decentralization. In her estimation, it would be possible to decentralize personnel functions to some departments without additional cost to the state. Many unique job classes are presently examined and classified by personnel officers who are experienced in working with departmental job classifications.

Ms. McCurry believes that personnel officers should be employed by departments rather than by the Division of Personnel to assure access to departmental commissioners. Regarding the placement of personnel officers in departments, Ms. McCurry recommended as her personal opinion either placement in the commissioners' offices or at least as supervisors in offices of directors of administrative services one level below. It is essential for personnel officers to have a direct line of communication with the commissioners' offices in order to keep the chief executives up-to-date.

Senator Ray asked if there are instances when there is not ready access to the commissioners. Ms. McCurry responded that this is the case in some instances, and she does not believe that commissioners are fully aware of the problem.

Senator Ray questioned whether changing the statutes to require that personnel officers be administrative assistants for labor relations in order to have direct access to commissioners would eliminate this problem. Ken Kareen asked if a law stating that personnel officers shall have access to the commissioners would improve the situation. He added that there are a wide variety of commissioners and that the Personnel Rules are subject to different interpretations by them. Ms. McCurry stated that it is not uncommon for division directors to take action without the knowledge of personnel officers.

Senator Ray inquired if a change in the law would lessen the number of problems and complaints received by the Ombudsman's Office. Frank Flavin responded that if it were the specific intent of the law, commissioners would be more likely to give the personnel officer's position the responsibility needed. Pat Hunt said that the responsibilities of the positions are diminished in some instances. If positions were put into the law, they would become partially exempt because of policy role. Ms. McCurry stated that this could upset the personnel officers' departmental status if positions were placed in law as part of the commissioner's office. The change in the law might not have the desired effect.

Senator Ray commented that he could not comprehend a personnel officer not having access to the department's commissioner. Ms. McCurry recommended that centralization/decentralization should be based on the cooperation of the Division of Personnel and agencies, depending on the abilities of the individual department. Personnel officers who abuse the authority given them should be held accountable for their actions, and the delegation of authority should be removed to correct the situation if necessary. This would require a strict audit system to be developed by the Division of Personnel and Labor Relations.

Ken Kareen elaborated that in the State Personnel Act, delegation of this authority is discretionary rather than mandatory. Testimony from Wisconsin indicated that when their Department of Employment Relations withdrew delegation of authority, they also withdrew funding for departmental personnel office staff. Should the same thing be possible in Alaska?

Senator Ray pointed out that the non-permanent employee bill is moving through the legislature and that the section on punitive damages is an innovative approach to discouraging abuses of rules and regulations. He has recently been appointed to the Council of State Governments. If the Commission so wishes, he will present this approach to the Council so that other states may consider it.

Doryce Eggleston, Personnel Officer for the Department of Public Safety, presented testimony regarding her department's Personnel Office, which is in the Division of Administrative Service. The office does have access to the commissioner, deputy commissioner and division director.

The question of centralization vs. decentralization can be broken down into two separate issues: personnel officers and personnel functions. These two aspects may have direct

impact on the general public, applicants and on the departments.

On the centralization or decentralization of personnel officers, Ms. Eggleston stated that there would be great impact on departments if personnel officers were made employees of the Division of Personnel. As indicated in the Commission's report, the goals of this move include better communication between the Division of Personnel and departments, uniformity of application of the Personnel Rules and control by the Division of Personnel. These can be achieved within the present structure. The Personnel Rules need to be clarified and redrafted in accordance with changes in the statutes to limit the many different interpretations within departments. There is no reason why regular meetings cannot be held between the Division of Personnel and the departmental personnel officers to discuss various aspects of labor relations and personnel administration such as arbitration proceedings, union contracts, negotiation results and ambiguous Personnel Rules. These meetings would insure better communication and more uniform interpretation of the Personnel Rules by the departments.

Possible problems for personnel officers moved into the Division of Personnel would include loss of credibility and trust of employees within departments and difficulties in remaining part of departmental management teams. Personnel officers would be considered outsiders, and this might lead to departmental staff circumventing them on some matters. For example, she would not have been included in the Director's staff meeting where strategy and planning were discussed with the new Commissioner if she had been an employee of the Division of Personnel. No one can successfully serve two masters. It would be possible to be caught in the middle of problems between the two. Problems could also arise in funding for the position, performance evaluations, training, approval of leave, etc. Impact upon applicants would be minimal, but user agencies would be affected by the change.

On the centralization or decentralization of personnel functions, Ms. Eggleston agrees with Ms. McCurry that functions cannot be decentralized across the board. She believes that this type of program should be optional for each department, depending on the feasibility of operating the system with present staff. There would be a significant impact on applicants and the general public as well as on the departments if functions were decentralized.

Recruitment and advertising could be performed by departments with information, assistance and review provided by the Division of Personnel. These could be made more selective, especially for regional positions. This would also be an advan-

tage for rural areas.

Ms. Eggleston advocates the review of unique job applications by user departments. The Division of Personnel reviewed over 55,000 applications in 1978. If this responsibility was shared with departments, more time could be spent on those applications, and better judgements could be made. The departmental staff have more technical knowledge on the positions unique to their departments. The register process, placement on eligible lists and hiring would also be expedited. The Division of Personnel could provide guidance and oversight when necessary.

Classifications could be performed by departments with guidance and oversight from the Division on general job classes. The departments could work directly with the Office of Management and Budget on funding. The processes could be speeded up through departmental participation.

There should be no adverse impact on the number of staff in the Division of Personnel. Staff functions could be changed to guidance and oversight roles by the Division, and studies could be done on employee turnover, career ladders, classification, counseling, minority recruitment, etc. One of the reasons for the lengthy delays in the Division of Personnel is the time needed for examination and recruitment. The result of decentralization would be less frustration on the part of applicants, the general public and the departments. All must work together to resolve time problems.

Senator Ray suggested a hypothetical situation. What if a department decided to reclassify its Personnel Officer positions to some other classification and to ask the Division of Personnel to handle all its personnel functions for it. That would provide the department with two positions for other work and yet insure that the necessary personnel functions were performed without using departmental funds. This possibility is one reason why he favors providing for personnel officers in departments by statute.

Pat Murphy pointed out that each department should have a personnel officer. The Commission has already put together a bill on the Department of Employee Relations. Problems can develop when trying to be too specific in legislation. Each department in the bill will have a personnel officer. Not all departments are ready for decentralization. He leans towards an audit function within the Department of Employee Relations.

Pat Hunt added that he wouldn't mind seeing jobs in the statutes and that it would be important to specify the level of responsibility as well as the titles. Frank Flavin asked

if the intent was for the departmental personnel officers to have the responsibility of recruiting, advertising and examining for unique positions. Would the departments be in a position to do this better than the Division of Personnel? Ms. Eggleston replied that an employee in her office could handle the paperwork faster in regard to unique job classes. Mr. Flavin rephrased his question to general terms: Is a personnel officer in a department more capable of making decisions? Ms. Eggleston responded affirmatively.

Pat Murphy stated that the Commission has received a number of complaints in the area of rating education and training where people believe they have been judged erroneously. The Division of Personnel has no time to check these areas. If unique job classes were handled through the departments, more time would be spent on these evaluations. Technical job classes cannot be handled by generalists. Mr. Murphy asked how applicants would be routed to the correct departments in a decentralized system. Ms. Eggleston replied that the Division could act as a receiving agency for applicants and direct forms to the proper agencies. Ken Kareen pointed out that this is being done now in the Department of Education.

Senator Ray pointed out that the Commission has received testimony regarding the difficulties of "fighting city hall" and the adverse results this may bring about. One concern is the "black marks" individuals receive for speaking out about problems encountered within the state system. Frank Flavin elaborated that he does receive cases of this type, but that they are difficult to verify. Senator Ray referred to previous testimony before the Commission where one individual's score had been changed noticeably by the Division of Personnel after she complained to them.

Ken Kareen countered that in the central office of the Division of Personnel, everything is documented. Those individuals responsible for rating applicants have practically no influence over selection of applicants. There is little chance that the hiring authority will know about problems in the Division. Therefore, problems in ratings will not influence final hiring decisions. Senator Ray asked if this meant that there is no communication between the Division and departments. Mr. Kareen stated that this type of communication would not be tolerated in his office.

Mr. Flavin questioned what role personnel officers play in the evaluation of merit violations. Ms. Eggleston responded that personnel actions, such as selection from eligible lists, are reviewed before they are returned to the Division of Personnel for placement of the person selected on the state payroll.

All material is checked before it is sent out by personnel officers. Advice may be sought from the Division of Personnel and commissioners, deputy commissioners or directors where questionable circumstances appear.

Senator Ray asked what happens if a commissioner or deputy commissioner asks a personnel officer to break the rules. Ms. Eggleston replied that there are legal implications, and steps may be taken. She gave an example of one individual who was fired because he refused to do what the director requested. Through a grievance procedure, he was reinstated. Personnel officers can and do refuse to certify anything illegally. The commissioner and deputy commissioner are each certifying officers and can sign positions authorizations (PA's) thereby taking responsibility for any impropriety if they insist on pursuing the matter over the objections of the personnel officer. Frank Flavin asked if Ms. Eggleston's personnel files have ever been audited. She replied that there is a post-audit procedure. Lynda McCurry commented that the Department of Labor has been subject to numerous federal audits. Ken Kareen stated that there are certain review procedures handled by the Division of Personnel, but there are no audits in that sense.

Wells Gabier, a state employee for over seven years and current employee of the Alaska Occupational Information Coordination Committee (AOICC) testified regarding his experiences with the committee, the Department of Health and Social Services, the Department of Labor and the state Manpower Service. He addressed the topic of his PCN and gave a brief description of his background.

In 1970, Mr. Gabier was hired out of Colorado for a position in Alaska, and his relocation expenses were paid by the state. Upon arrival, he was classified as an Employment Counselor III. One year later, he was reclassified as State Counseling Supervisor for the Department of Labor, and spent five years in that capacity. During this time, he communicated with the Division of Personnel frequently on the subject of upgrading the Counselor-level positions by one range. He worked with Lee Antrim (the Departments of Labor's representative in reviewing tests for employment interviewers) on the reclassification.

Mr. Gabier then took a voluntary demotion of one range step to go to work for the Department of Health and Social Services. One year later, he retired from state employment and moved to Mississippi for a short period of time. Upon his return to Alaska, he experienced the trials and tribulations of applying for state employment and of having his experience rated. He was subsequently placed on 18 registers, and was asked to interview with the AOICC for his present position. The following

is description of events that took place after his initial interview:

March 10, 1978--The position description was first written by committee member Phyllis Woodman, Personnel Officer for the Department of Education which controls the funding of the state AOICC.

March 14, 1978--The position description was transmitted to Mike McMullen in the Classification Section of the Division of Personnel as that of a Social Research Coordinator at range 20. Both Ms. Woodman and committee members supported this classification level.

April 6, 1978--A decision was returned to the department that the classification should be at the Research Analyst III level. It appears that the Social Research Coordinator class was being eliminated, and this was considered an equitable substitute. Wishing to get started on the program, the committee decided to accept the classification given by the Division of Personnel and requested the Analyst III register. Unable to find a qualified applicant for the position on this register, the committee requested parallel registers which required approximately the same range and job functions. Mr. Gabier was within the top five on two of these and was hired for the position.

Mr. Gabier pointed out he had qualified for these registers without receiving employee credit or veteran's preference points. Prior to his appointment, he had applied for the Research Analyst II and III registers. His examination results came back as below passing. The committee had hired him for a position that the Division of Personnel had deemed him to be ineligible for. Entering the position, Mr. Gabier realized that the responsibilities were not consistent with the Research Analyst III level. The committee had indicated during a meeting that they would push for a reclassification of the position at a later date.

November 20, 1978--The committee submitted a reclassification request to the Division of Personnel.

December 28, 1978--The delete/establish form was sent to Budget and Management by the Division of Personnel.

February 9, 1979--Mr. Gabier checked with the Division of Personnel on the status of his reclassification, after having waited for a response for a number of months. The Division advised him that the request would be signed within a week by the Office of Budget and Management.

The position description and authorization came back listed as a Project Coordinator. Again, the advice of Phyllis Woodman

had been ignored, although she had supplied first-hand information on the job functions. It had been stated on the request that if the position came back as anything other than a Program Coordinator, a desk audit would be requested. Ms. Woodman was advised that more detailed paperwork would have to be supplied to justify a desk audit performed by the Division of Personnel.

April 12, 1979--A request was submitted for a desk audit.

Due to the fact that the position remains classified improperly after a period of over one year, Mr. Gabier felt that the matter should be brought to the attention of the commission.

Ken Kareen spoke from the vantage point of the classifier. The personnel officer came to him seeking advice and assistance on the best way to get the job filled. In this instance, the classification of Research Analyst III was not appropriate, and alternate lists were suggested by Mr. Kareen, such as Project Coordinator.

Mr. Flavin asked for the definition of a desk audit. Mr. Gabier explained that a classification specialist actually goes to the place of employment and gets a verbal description of the job. In his experience, Mr. Gabier feels that the Division of Personnel has difficulty in interpreting anything that is not in writing. Ken Kareen responded that the demand for desk audits cannot be satisfied by the Division of Personnel, given the limited amount of staff available. There is a reluctance on the Division's part to conduct an audit unless the need is perceived. Quite often, the Division receives inadequate position descriptions.

Pat Murphy stated that the commission has heard a lot of testimony along similar lines, where employees and technical authorities have different opinions. It is very difficult to ascertain who is right and who is wrong.

Mr. Kareen pointed out that there is also a third party involved in this type of dispute: the collective bargaining union. Mr. Gabier commented that he has never felt that this is a problem for grievance procedures. It should have been handled when it was initially brought to the Division's attention. If the system were decentralized, this responsibility would be given to the personnel officers who are more qualified to make judgements.

Fred Cook, Personnel Officer with the Department of Fish and Game, testified on the question of centralization/decentralization. He believes that personnel officers should be a part of the management teams of departments. Fisheries Biologists

are convinced that the Department of Administration is a regulatory agency rather than a service-oriented agency. This is consistent with the feeling of the troops in the field.

Mr. Cook feels that personnel functions should be delegated to the departments if they are willing to accept the responsibility. Personnel officers would not be able to supervise their staff members if they were centralized in the Division of Personnel. If there were instances where opinions differed, it would be difficult to argue with supervisors in the Division of Personnel.

Mr. Cook does not see any way that centralization would make the personnel system more efficient. If a person is not employed by a department, they are left out of policy-making decisions and information is then relayed down to them. The Division of Personnel should have more positions assigned to them, and he urged the Blue Ribbon Commission to make that recommendation.

One suggestion Mr. Cook presented was to have personnel officers exchange positions with staff in the Division of Personnel intermittently. This is something that has been discussed in the past and seen by many as workable. This might relieve the schism between Personnel and the departments by increasing the awareness of each others' problems.

Frank Flavin asked which functions personnel officers in departments could perform better than the Division of Personnel, assuming adequate resources exist. Mr. Cook suggested that the Department of Fish and Game could rate applicants for positions in technical areas generally above range 16. In the case of biometricians, for example, a committee consisting of other specialists in that field would be better qualified to make evaluations than generalists in the Division of Personnel.

Mr. Flavin pointed out that past testimony has revealed problems on the rating of biologists: Is an adequate job being done? Mr. Cook responded that in higher-level classes, the departmental personnel officers could do a better job, assuming the department has the staff to do so.

Mildred Zenger, Personnel Officer with the Department of Natural Resources, concurred with testimony presented. She expressed the following, representing her personal opinions:

Ms. Zenger stated that the Division of Personnel could better handle rating and examinations if they were given additional funding. Her department lacks staff to handle decentralization, but is in a better position to handle certain unique

job classes. Ms. Zenger does not believe that qualified judgments are made by the Division of Personnel examiners in those cases. The Department of Natural Resources specialists used to help the Division of Personnel rate applications in the more technical fields.

Over the years, personnel officers' access to the commissioner has varied. At present, access is more limited than in the past. Access and support are essential for providing back-up to personnel officers when program managers disagree with their decisions. Ms. Zenger also made it clear that though the Department of Natural Resources is under fire for many reasons, some accidental and some intentional, she is not defending those who hire illegally. She has never certified a document illegally in her 30 years of state service.

Ms. Zenger believes that some functions handled by the Division of Personnel could be delegated to the individual departments. A better means of communication between personnel officers and the Division is one solution. Removing personnel officers from departments would cause problems. It would then be difficult to convince employees in the department that personnel officers are actually working for them and trying to help the department. This might also lead to the belief that personnel officers were regulatory oriented.

Frank Flavin asked if the problems within the department were geographical in nature, due to the large number of staff in field offices. Ms. Zenger answered they are due to the influx of new employees who don't understand the system and lack education in the standards of the system rather than poor intent. Ms. McCurry concurred that cycles do run good and bad depending on who's who in the zoo. Ms. Zenger reiterated that there are many new people who do not understand what they are supposed to do. Senator Ray pointed out that this might call for some type of statutory identification.

Mr. Flavin asked Ms. Zenger if she has access to personnel files in departmental field offices as a personnel officer. Ms. Zenger answered that her travel is limited. She did not have a large staff until the past year. The central office does perform a monthly audit on departmental personnel actions.

Senator Ray commented that this is ample reason to have a trouble shooter to take care of these matters. As an example, he mentioned two Public Safety officers who are responsible for presenting informational programs in schools to juveniles.

Frank Flavin stated that in his experience, problems were more prevalent in agencies where personnel officers do not have

high status. There are significantly fewer personnel problems in those departments with strong personnel officers. Pat Murphy agreed that certain departments have more problems than others. The departments of Health and Social Services, Transportation and the Division of Corrections have strong commissioners or directors who typically insist on independence, which can lead to union grievances. APEA has been able to resolve problems before they develop into major crises by negotiating with personnel officers with stronger positions in their departments. Another aspect of the problem is that in departments with high turnover rates, the management staff is less well informed about the requirements of union contracts and the Personnel Rules.

Senator Ray pointed out that the reorganization of the secretarial staff of the Department of Administration into a typing pool is a topic which the commission has overlooked. Pat Murphy commented that there is general agreement that the program has created a mess.

Ken Kareen responded that a previous commissioner of Administration thought that if the equipment were upgraded and typists were combined in one location, there would be more work performed at less cost to the state. Many of the people in the pool have fallen behind on the typing requirements set by the program. Mr. Kareen also asked about Don Fisher's report to the commission on the subject. Pat Murphy replied that APEA is doing investigative work on the matter and that information will be available at a later date.

Senator Ray requested a resume of the information available to date and said that he was interested in pursuing the matter personally. Experimenting with state employees is not an acceptable procedure. Pat Murphy commented that the coordinator of the typing pool program has been on contract with the state for two or three years. He believes that this should be a permanent position.

Frank Flavin requested that the staff prepare a breakdown of where personnel officers are located in each department and to whom they report. Lynda McCurry offered to supply this information to him. Senator Ray directed the staff to write to each department advising them that attempts to keep individuals from testifying at commission meetings or to punish them for speaking will not be tolerated.

Lois Wingo, Personnel Officer for the Department of Military Affairs, concurred with testimony heard. She stated that employee/personnel officer relationships are stronger when the personnel officer is in the department. Ms. Wingo acts as Training Coordinator, EEO Officer and Payroll Supervisor in addition

to her functions as the department's personnel officer. She does have access to the commissioner's office and receives support from high-level management. She is not expected to circumvent the Division of Personnel in fulfilling her duties. The department was audited once, about a year ago, by the Legislative Audit Division. Leave records were checked against the files, and employee records were spot-checked.

Senator Ray asked whether Ms. Wingo had ever been in a catch-22 situation where her superior asked her to do something contrary to her beliefs. Ms. Wingo replied that this happens very rarely.

Frank Flavin asked if there was any conflict of interest in being an EEO Officer and a Personnel Officer. Ms. Wingo answered that some perceive a conflict between the two functions, and some don't. It depends on who is the Director of EEO. Lynda McCurry pointed out that there is a problem with adding EEO functions to the duties of personnel officers in departments. However, this function must be placed in a position where the person will do the job. When EEO functions were taken out of the Personnel Office of the Department of Labor and given to someone else, no progress was made on the reports required to be filed. Eventually, the EEO responsibilities returned to the personnel officer. Ms. Wingo stated that she doesn't have hiring authority, so there is not a direct conflict. She does encourage the hiring of women and minorities. Frank Flavin asked if she has "double clout" with the additional EEO responsibilities. Ms. Wingo said that this did give her additional authority.

Senator Ray asked for input from commission members on the continuation of additional meetings. He stated that they will have to be after the legislative session is over.

Ken Kareen offered his thoughts on the decentralization issue. An employee starts his employment by pledging his loyalty and credibility to a department. The supervisor giving direction may severely test the loyalty of the employee to do the job and advance his career vs. state rules and compliance with the laws. Elements of regulation and compliance should be built into Personnel. This would serve to limit the flexibility, but would avert capricious and arbitrary proceedings. At what cost should the state encourage dedication to the department? What is the cost to the state for decentralization? In some cases, 18 departments could be working on 18 different systems. There has to be some uniform application of rules to give employees constants. Employees do not know where these lines are. Mr. Kareen offered an observation: There are tremendous variations based on the personality of the personnel officers and person-

ality of their supervisors. Senator Ray elaborated that it is a question of either having a cut and dried or a flexible system. Ken Kareen stated that an employee starts with an investment in state employment. If a new boss gives a questionable direction, that will severely test the loyalty of the employee to his or her career vs. the state rules. Some stand up to the tests, and some don't. The problem does exist.

Mr. Kareen expressed his feelings that examination and review boards do not work well, judging by his past experiences. One of the most frequent problems encountered is in rating applications. For example, his staff is instructed not to make assumptions in rating applicants. What is judged is the information provided in writing. A review board may be tempted to consider information not on the record, thereby favoring applicants they know over those they do not. This could cause problems if the decision were ever audited. There will always be errors and mistakes.

Responding to Mr. Gabier's testimony, Mr. Kareen stated that Mr. Gabier has two options open to him: to go through the union or through supervisory channels. Bob Maurant commented that as a former union negotiator, he has had problems with the Division of Personnel. There are no checks made on the ethics of the Division of Personnel staff. There is no assurance that a check will be made if there is no violation of union contract. An individual has no assurance of ethics in force.

Mr. Gabier addressed the philosophical difference between himself and Mr. Kareen. He observed that the attitude seems to be "If you don't like it, fight it". What happened to settling these matters fairly? If he followed the proper channels, he would be told in two months that his complaint is not a grievable matter. He believes that this is an example of violation of merit principles. In his opinion, the Division of Personnel thinks only in terms of dollars rather than in terms of people.

Senator Ray asked commission members if they would agree to his making a personal investigation into the word processing center problems. There was no dissent.

Senator Ray suggested another meeting in Anchorage following the end of the session. Pat Murphy commented that issues might best be dealt with in subcommittee meetings on particular problems, followed by a full commission meeting to review subcommittee suggestions. Meetings to receive public testimony are also necessary. No decision was made on a future schedule.

IN ATTENDANCE

Senator Bill Ray, Chairman
Frank Flavin
Patrick Hunt
Lynda McCurry
Bob Mourant (for John Pugh)
Ken Spray

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Darlene Howard
Ken Kareen
Pat Murphy