REPORT OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL
AND TRAINING

TECHNICAL REPORT: GENDER PAY EQUITY IN THE VIRGINIA STATE WORKFORCE

TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 6

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2000

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Sara Redding Wilson
Director

Department of Personnel and Training

James Monroe Building
101 N. 14th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 225-2131
(V/TDD) (804) 371-7671

September 8, 1999

Dear Governor Gilmore and Members of the
General Assembly:

House Joint Resolution 341 of the 1998 Session of the General Assembly asked the Department of Personnel and Training to study gender pay equity in the State's workforce. The request was based on the findings of a 1998 JLARC study, reported as House Document Number 40.

The Resolution asked the Department of Personnel and Training to:

(1) perform periodic analyses of gender salary differences within job classes;
(2) examine specific agencies and specific agency job classes for possible reasons that may explain gender pay differences; and
(3) review and update its job classification system, addressing the placement of job classes in grades 7 through 11, and whether the implicit tradeoffs between different job requirements, such as education and working conditions, are appropriate.

Enclosed for your review and consideration is the 1999 report that has been prepared in response to this Resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

Sara R. Wilson

Sara Redding Wilson

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable G. Bryan Slater
Secretary of Administration

PREFACE

House Joint Resolution No. 491 of the 1997 General Assembly directed the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) to study gender pay equity in the State workforce. The JLARC study, reported in House Document No. 40, 1998, evaluated two aspects of pay equity: (1) equal pay for identical work; and (2) equal pay for work requiring comparable skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions. The study found that, generally, the two aspects of pay equity are met.

The JLARC report included three recommendations for further study to be conducted by the Department of Personnel and Training. These recommendations formed the basis for House Joint Resolution 341 of the 1998 General Assembly. It requested that the Department of Personnel and Training:

(1) perform periodic analyses of gender salary differences within job classes;
(2) examine specific agencies and specific agency job classes for possible reasons that may explain gender pay differences; and
(3) review and update its job classification system, addressing the placement of job classes in grades 7 through 11, and whether the implicit tradeoffs between different job requirements, such as education and working conditions, are appropriate.

The Department of Personnel and Training prepared this report in response to House Joint Resolution No. 341. A copy of the Resolution is included as Appendix A of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Department of Personnel and Training (DPT), using October 1998 data, replicated the statistical analysis that the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) conducted in 1997. The 1998 data set included information on 65,816 employees who were subject to the provisions of the Virginia Personnel Act. Of these, 33,748 (51.3%) were female and 32,068 (48.7%) were male.

The data was grouped into 6,086 agency-class combinations and salary averages were computed for males and females in each agency-class. DPT applied screens that JLARC developed to the agency-class summaries to identify possible cases of gender-based discrimination. Sixty-one agency-class combinations (1.0%) passed through the screens and, thus, were identified for further examination. Of the 61, thirty-three involved males being paid more than females and 28 involved females being paid more than males.

The percentage of cases where the screens did not explain salary differentials between genders was small (1.0%). Also, there was balance between the number of cases where males were paid more (33, or 0.54%) and where females were paid more (28, or 0.46%). These findings do not indicate that the State's compensation program violates the principle of pay equity for similar work.

The State system is highly structured and controlled by policies. Thus, there are few opportunities for gender-based discrimination. Starting pay, competitive offers, reallocation increases, and performance increases were identified as the only pay decisions where agencies' managers have the discretion to make decisions affecting the relationship of males' and females' salaries.

The 61 agency-class observations that passed the JLARC screens included 188 employees in 41 agencies. DPT contacted these agencies for qualitative information to explain why the males were paid more than the females, or vice versa. Thirty-nine agencies responded to the survey. The reasons for pay disparity fell into 8 categories: starting pay, prior experience, performance increases, competitive offers, northern Virginia differentials, length of service, administrative error, and transactions sequence. No indication was found that employees' genders formed the basis for pay disparity in any agency.

The final JLARC recommendation was for DPT to review and update its job classification system. A major effort, known as the Class Specification/Specification Update (CR/SU) program attempted to do this in the latter 1980's and early 1990's. The program was since dropped due to DPT staff reductions. Maintaining specifications for agency-unique classes has been decentralized to the agencies that use them.

Current efforts may result in an updated classification and compensation program and may improve pay equity. Included are the work of the Commission on Reform of the Classified Compensation Plan and compensation pilot programs in place in selected agencies. Also, DPT has proposed a simplified classification and compensation approach for

information technology positions; this approach could be expanded to other occupational areas. Finally, DPT has drafted an in-range salary adjustment policy, which would allow adjustments of employees' salaries for reasons including improved equity among employees.

JLARC asked that DPT assess the placement of job classes in grades 7 through 11, and whether the implicit tradeoffs between different job requirements, such as education and working conditions, are appropriate. The assignment of salary grades is based a complex combination of factors. The first factor used in assigning salary grades to job classes is internal alignment. Each job class is compared with other classes in the same general occupational area. Seven factors are used to evaluate the job classes: Complexity of Work; Supervision Given; Supervision Received; Scope; Impact of Actions; Personal Contacts; and Knowledge, Skills and Abilities.

DPT does not utilize comparisons of the classification factors of dissimilar jobs in assigning salary grades, and it does not support the use of this methodology for evaluating the appropriateness of ranges assigned to male-dominated job classes vis-à-vis female-dominated classes. It is simply too subjective to compare dissimilar jobs, where the grade assignment of one class may be based largely on one classification factor while the grade of another may be based on an entirely different factor.

There are other indicators, rather than job evaluation factors, that can be used to evaluate whether the grade assignments have an adverse effect on either gender. Market data from southeastern states and from Virginia private employers was used as the primary indicator of the appropriateness of the salary ranges of male-dominated and female-dominated classes in grades 7 through 11.

Overall, the survey of southeastern states indicated that employees in male dominated classes, on average, were paid more than were employees in female-dominated classes relative to the other states. The simple average deviation was 0.53% higher for male-dominated classes, and the weighted average deviation was 0.96% higher. However, neither group's deviations were as high as the deviations of the non-dominated group.

Similarly, the state survey of private industry found that the male dominated classes were more competitive than the female-dominated classes. In this case, the male-dominated classes had smaller negative deviations. The simple average deviation was 4.99% lower for male-dominated classes, and the weighted average deviation was 1.65% lower.

Turnover rates did not explain the differences among the salary range deviations of the three groups of classes. The 19 female-dominated classes had the lowest salary ranges relative to the other states, but the highest average turnover rates, with a 13.55% average weighted by the number of employees in each job class and a 13.36% simple average.

As the classification and compensation program is updated, DPT should ensure that any differences in salary ranges between male-dominated classes and female-dominated classes are supported by job evaluation criteria (within occupational areas) and by market and staffing data.

GENDER DIFFERENCES WITHIN JOB CLASSES

DPT replicated the statistical analysis that the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) conducted. State employee data effective October 1998 data was used for this analysis. The data set included information on 65,816 employees who were subject to the provisions of the Virginia Personnel Act. Of these, 33,748 (51.3%) were female and 32,068 (48.7%) were male. The information was grouped into 6,086 agency-class combinations and salary averages were computed for males and females in each agency-class. A sampling of these groupings are listed in Appendix B of this report.

DPT applied screens that JLARC developed to the agency-class summaries to identify possible cases of gender-based discrimination within job classes. The first screen removed 1,964 agency-classes with no male employees, leaving 4,122 agency-classes. The next screen removed 2,327 agency-classes with no female employees, leaving 1,795 agency-class combinations with male and female employees.

Screens were then run to test explanations for differences in the average salaries of males and females in the agency-class groups. The first of these screens removed 1,476 additional groups where the difference between males and females was less than the spread of salaries within the male and female groups. The salary spread within each gender was measured by the standard deviation. Three hundred nineteen agency-class observations passed through this screen.

The next screen removed 43 observations where the male and female average salaries were the same, indicating that there was no salary disparity based on gender. There were 276 agency-classes remaining following this screen. Then, observations were removed where higher male salary averages could be explained by the longer state service of the males, using the JLARC estimate of 2.3% average salary increases per year. This screen reduced the number of remaining observations from 276 to 186. The same approach was applied to situations where female average salaries exceeded male averages, which reduced the number of unexplained salary differences to 67.

A final screen was designed to remove observations where the salary disparity could be explained by differences in the percentage of male and female employees in the northern Virginia area. This location is significant because the State pays employees in northern Virginia higher salaries in order to compete with private firms in the area. However, no additional agency-class observations were screened out by this step.

The screens resulted in 67 observations with salary differences requiring further explanation. However, during the time between October 1998, when the listing was generated, and January 1999, when the agencies were contacted for additional information to explain the salary differences, there were changes in the work force. Thus, six additional agency-class observations were removed. One no longer had any employees, male or female; three had only one employee, and two had only female employees.

The remaining 61 agency-class combinations (1.0%) passed through the screens and, thus, were identified for further examination. Of the 61, thirty-three involved males being paid more than females and 28 involved females being paid more than males.

The percentage of cases where the screens did not explain salary differentials between genders was small (1.0%). Also, there was balance between the number of cases where males were paid more (33, or 0.54%) and where females were paid more (28, or 0.46%). These findings did not indicate that the State's compensation program violates the principle of pay equity for similar work.

THE EFFECT OF STATE POLICIES

The State system is highly structured and controlled by policies. Thus, there are few opportunities for gender-based discrimination in. Starting pay, competitive offers, reallocation increases, and performance increases were identified as the only pay decisions where agencies' managers have the discretion to make decisions affecting the relationship of males' and females' salaries.

DPT reviewed statistics relating to areas of compensation discretion to determine whether they indicated a gender bias at the state level. Statistics on competitive offers, reallocations, and performance ratings were available for calendar year 1998.

Competitive offers are increases that are provided to selected employees as an incentive for them to remain employed by the State rather than accepting offers from outside employers. In approving these requests, agencies consider: 1) the skills of the employee, 2) the impact of the employee's work on the effectiveness of the agency, 3) the anticipated difficulty in replacing him or her, 4) the amount offered by the other employer, 5) the availability of funds, and 6) the potential impact on other employees in the agency.

There were 153 competitive offers approved during 1998, with 61, or 39.9%, provided to females and 92, 60.1%, provided to males. These numbers are disproportionate to the percentages of females (51.3%) and males (48.7%) in the workforce. A summary of the 1998 competitive offers may be found in Appendix C of this report.

Competitive offers are typically made to employees with higher levels of skill, education, and impact on agency operations. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect a larger number of competitive offers to be made to employees in the higher salary grades. This happened during 1998, as 108 of the 153 competitive offers (70.6%) were made to employees in grades 10 and above. Sixty-three percent of these increases were to males, which is reasonably consistent with the fact that 59% of the employees in grades ten and above are male.

Females comprise 54.4% of the employees in salary grades one through nine, and males 45.6%. However, of the 45 competitive offers made to employees below grade 10, only 21 (46.7%) were to females and 24 (53.3%) were to males. Competitive offers for employees should be monitored in the future to ensure that this is not a continuing trend.

A reallocation is a change in the class to which a position is assigned, typically resulting from a gradual change in the employee's duties. Agencies usually grant employees four-step increases when their positions are reallocated to classes in higher salary grades. Agencies may choose to grant smaller increases, however, when funding is limited.

During 1998, there were 4,571 position reallocations to higher grades statewide. Of these 2,870 (62.8%) were positions with female incumbents and 1,701 (37.2%) had male incumbents. A sample listing of the reallocations is included as Appendix D of this report.

The proportion of all females who were reallocated (6.4%) exceeds the percentage of males who were reallocated (4.0%). This may be explained by the statistics above indicating that males, on average, occupy higher level positions than do females. Therefore, there may be fewer opportunities for males to advance in this manner.

As noted, some employees are granted increases of less than four steps when their positions are reallocated to a class in a higher salary grade. During 1998, 130 females received these smaller increases. This represented 4.5% of the females reallocated. Among males, increases of less than four steps were granted to only 2.8% of those who were reallocated. DPT should continue to monitor these actions to ensure that this disparity is not a continuing trend.

Starting pay statistics by gender were not available at the time of the study. Also, there is added complexity in analyzing staring pay statistics because they are affected by the employee's experience and salary history, in addition to negotiations with the hiring agency. Therefore, starting pay analysis in this report is limited to those situations where agencies were contacted for information concerning pay disparities between males and females. These contacts are discussed in the next chapter.

Performance increases are the final area of compensation where agencies' managers have discretion in increasing employees' salaries. In 1993, 1994, and 1998, variable salary increases, based on performance evaluations, were granted to employees. Performance evaluations are descriptive, rather than numerical. The values are "Does Not Meet Minimum Expectations," "Fair But Needs Improvement," " Meets Expectations," "Exceeds Expectations," " and " Exceptional." DPT assigned numbers (1 through 5) to these values in order to evaluate the relative ratings of males and females.

In 1998, the overall average rating for females was 3.95, compared with 3.88 for males, meaning that females were rated, on average, higher than males. Employees rated "Exceptional" or "Exceeds Expectations" were granted two-step increases. A higher percentage of females were rated "Exceptional," 20.8% compared with 14.0% of males. However, a higher percentage of males were rated "Exceeds Expectations." The result was that the same percentage of males and females (74.9%) were granted two-step increases.

The same percentage of males and females (25.1%) were granted one-step increases for ratings of "Meets Expectations." Also, the percentage of male employees (0.98%) and

female employees (0.91%) who did not receive increases because they were rated "Fair But Needs Improvement" or "Does Not Meet Minimum Expectations" were comparable.

In the other two years when performance increases were funded, 1993 and 1994, the relative distribution of ratings was similar to the 1998 distribution. In both years, females' average ratings were higher than males.

In 1993, the average female rating was 3.78 and the male average was 3.62. More females were eligible to be considered for three-step increases, as 17.0% were rated "Exceptional," while 10.0% of males received the same rating. In 1993, employees who were rated "Exceeds Expectations" or "Meets Expectations" were granted two-step increases. Eighty-eight percent of males and 81.4% of females received these ratings.

Employees rated "Fair But Needs Improvement" received one-step increases in 1993. A higher percentage of males (1.7%) than females (1.4%) received one-step increases. The percentage of employees who did not receive increases, because they were rated "Does Not Meet Minimum Expectations," was the same for males and females (0.2%).

In 1994, the average female rating was 3.80, compared with a male average of 3.70. Employees who were rated "Exceptional" were eligible for consideration for three-step salary increases in 1994. Among females, 17.2% were rated "Exceptional," compared with 10.3% of males. Employees rated "Exceeds Expectations" received two-step increases. Forty-seven percent of females and 50.9% of males were rated in this category in 1994. Among females, 34.5% were rated "Meets Expectations," compared with 37.1% of males. These employees were granted one-step increases in 1994.

In 1994, employees who were rated "Fair But Needs Improvement" or "Does Not Meet Minimum Expectations" did not receive performance increases. A higher percentage of males (1.6%) than females (1.2%) were rated in these categories.

In summary, salary increases based on performance appear to have had no effect on the relationship of male and female average salaries in 1998. In the other two years when performance increases were funded, 1993 and 1994, they appear to have increased female average salaries relative to male averages.

EXAMINATION OF SPECIFIC AGENCY JOB CLASSES

The 61 agency-class observations that passed the JLARC screens included 188 employees in 41 agencies. These observations are listed in Appendix E of this report. The largest concentration of employees was in the Department of Criminal Justice Services and the class Forensic Scientist; 61 of the employees (32.4%) were in this category.

In 22 of the 41 agencies (53.7%), the screens were passed by only one job class, with one female and one male employee in that class. In another 13 agencies, more than one class passed through the screens but among those that did pass, 25 classes had only one male and one female employee. The remaining 33 employees were in job classes with more than two employees in the agency.

DPT contacted the 41 agencies for qualitative information to explain why the males were paid more than the females or vice versa. Thirty-nine agencies (95.1%) responded to the survey, providing information on 58 of the agency-class groups (95.1%) and 182 of the employees (96.8%).

The reasons for pay disparity fell into seven categories: Starting Pay, Prior Experience, Performance Increases, Competitive Offers, Northern Virginia Differentials, Length of Service, and Transactions Sequence. The reasons are discussed in more detail below and summarized as Appendix F of this report.

It should be noted that the individual reasons totaled more than 58, the number of agency-class groupings. This occurred because in many cases the pay disparity was caused by a combination of reasons. In some cases, there were "negative" reasons; that is, the disparity existed even though one of the reasons brought the male and female average salaries closer together.

The most frequently reported reason for pay disparity between males and females was the respective staring salaries of the employees. In 29 cases starting salary was reported as a factor in the relationship of male and female salaries. For 17 of the 29 situations, agencies provided information on the employees' salaries prior to being employed by the State. The prior salaries supported the employees' starting salaries and did not indicate any bias according to gender.

In the remaining 12 situations where staring pay was cited as a factor in pay disparity, comments indicated that staring pay was based on the State's starting pay policy. The policy allows agencies to hire applicants at salaries up to 10% above the salary they were paid by their prior employer. Agencies can exceed 10% where difficult recruitment is encountered.

Agencies typically negotiate starting salaries with the selected applicants. In making salary offers, they consider applicants' experience and prior salaries; the salaries of other, similarly situated employees; the number of qualified applicants; and the availability of funds. The applicants' decisions to accept salary offers impact their salaries throughout their careers, because all future salary increases build on the staring salaries.

If other employers, generally, were to pay employees of one gender more than those of the other gender performing the same work, this practice could affect the salaries of state employees. There is no current provision in state policies to correct such disparity. However, the small number of agency-class combinations that passed the screens, as well as the information that agencies provided on staring pay for those situations, did not indicate that this problem exists.

Length of state service was cited as a reason for pay disparity for 26 agency-classes. JLARC assumed an average annual pay increase of 2.3% in designing its screens. This percentage was based on the average pay increases over an eleven-year period. However, during that period there were some years when no salary increases were granted. The result was that the screen might not have fully accounted for pay increases for employees with short service or very long service.

For example, employees hired in 1992 were eligible for performance increases of up to 6.9% in 1993 and 1994. These increases would have combined to lift their salaries 14.3% above the salaries of otherwise similar employees hired in 1995. Also, the late 1970's and early 1980's were a period of higher inflation than is experienced today. Therefore employees hired in that period received salary increases in excess of 2.3% for several years. The average increase for the years 1975 through 1982 was 10.1% per year.

There were 13 agency-classes that were explained, at least in part, by employees' performance ratings. Three years were significant in the performance differences- 1993, 1994, and 1998. These were the only years when employees were granted performance increases that were based on their ratings. Interestingly, there were seven situations where pay disparity was found even though performance increases brought the salaries closer together.

Another 13 agency-class pay relationships were affected by the sequence of transactions. An example of how this occurred would be where one employee was promoted from grade six to grade eight. Typically, this employee would receive a four-step salary increase. If a second employee were promoted from grade six to grade seven, and then, subsequently, promoted to grade eight, this employee would receive a four-step increase each time, or a total of eight steps. With other conditions being equal, the latter employee's salary would be four steps higher than the former employee's salary.

Employees' relative experience was mentioned as a contributing factor to pay disparity for nine of the agency-classes. As noted above, agencies may consider applicants' experience in determining staring salaries. Under normal circumstances, prior salary is the primary determinant of staring pay. However, experience may be a factor. For example, applicants may be offered less than a 10% increase, or even a decrease in salary, from their prior salaries if agencies do not think that their experience supports the usual increase.

Three other reasons contributed to pay disparity. There were three situations where an employee of one gender, but not the other, had been granted a competitive offer. In two situations one of the employees was working in northern Virginia. In one situation an exception to policy was approved because an applicant was offered a salary that was inappropriate according to policy.

No indication was found that employees' genders formed the basis for pay disparity in any agency or agency-class combination.

REVIEW AND UPDATE OF THE JOB CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

JLARC did not identify any clear systematic flaws with DPT's overall classification system. However, JLARC's third recommendation asked DPT to review and update its job classification system. Specifically, DPT was asked to address the placement of job classes in grades 7 through 11, and whether the implicit tradeoffs between different job requirements, such as education and working conditions, are appropriate. JLARC also noted that class specifications for many job classes had not been reviewed or re-evaluated for several years.

There are a number of activities in progress that may provide opportunities to update the State's job classification system. Foremost among these is the Commission on Reform of the Classified Compensation Plan. The Commission was established by Item 546 of Chapter One of the Special Session I, 1998 Virginia Acts of Assembly. Its members represent the Gilmore Administration, the General Assembly, and human resource officers of other large organizations. It is assisted in its work by an advisory group of human resource officers from selected state agencies and an employee advisory committee.

The Commission is charged with reforming the classified pay plan. It is to provide a compensation program with flexibility to meet State workforce needs, performance-based salary increases, a revised means of gauging the competitiveness of state salaries and benefits, and a clear definition of the roles of DPT and state agencies in the administration of the new plan. The plan also may include multiple pay plans based on broad occupational classes and other modern compensation features deemed appropriate for large, multi-site employers.

Another avenue for revising the classification and compensation plan has been the development of pilot programs in selected agencies. These pilots include skill-based and competency-based compensation, as well as performance-based incentive payments. These approaches reduce the importance of tenure and prior salary experience and increase the importance of employees' abilities and contributions to the effectiveness of their agencies.

Another current activity is that DPT has drafted a policy to allow agency managers more flexibility to increase employees' salaries within their current salary ranges. Under this approach, employees' salaries may be adjusted for such reasons as increased responsibilities, completion of training or education, market changes resulting in staffing problems, or to improve equity of the salaries of similarly-situated employees. This latter reason, particularly, has potential for correcting gender-based pay disparities.

In the latter 1980's and early 1990's, DPT assigned staff to work with human resource staff of the various state agencies to re-group state jobs into more current classes and to draft revised class specifications to describe their work. The project was known as the Class Revision/Specification Update, or CR/SU, program. This effort was successful in generating new class specifications for many job classes in a variety of occupational areas.

However, DPT has undergone successive staff reductions since 1990. As a result, the CR/SU program was halted and responsibility for maintaining specifications for agency-unique job classes was decentralized to the agencies using them. There has been little progress in updating class specifications in recent years.

Concurrent with the work of the Commission on Reform of the Classified Compensation Plan, DPT has been working to develop a new classification and compensation approach for the State's information technology employees. The suggested approach would streamline and simplify the job classification process, and allow managers more discretion in classifying their employees based on a combination of their duties and their abilities. If successful, this approach has potential for application to the classified workforce generally.

Applying the information technology model to many job classes could be a relatively easy method of updating job specifications. However, if either the information technology approach or the in-range salary adjustment policy were implemented, agency managers would need to be trained, and their actions monitored, to ensure that existing pay disparities do not increase as a result of their compensation decisions.

ASSESSING JOB CLASSES IN GRADES 7 THROUGH 11

JLARC recommended that DPT assess the placement of job classes in grades 7 through 11, and whether the implicit tradeoffs between different job requirements, such as education and working conditions, are appropriate.

The assignment of salary grades is based a complex combination of factors. The first factor used in assigning salary grades to job classes is internal alignment. Each job class is compared with other classes in the same general occupational area. Seven factors are used to evaluate the job classes. The seven Classification Factors are:

1. Complexity of Work
2. Supervision Given
3. Supervision Received
4. Scope
5. Impact of Actions
6. Personal Contacts
7. Knowledge, Skills and Abilities

DPT considers all of the classification factors in assigning pay ranges. In its recommendation, JLARC focused on job requirements (knowledge, skills, and abilities) and working conditions. Working conditions are not one of the DPT factors, but they may influence salary range assignments through the effect that they have on market data or staffing problems that poor working conditions cause.

DPT does not utilize comparisons of the classification factors of dissimilar jobs in assigning salary grades, and it does not support the use of this methodology for evaluating the appropriateness of ranges assigned to male-dominated job classes vis-à-vis female-dominated classes. It is simply too subjective to compare dissimilar jobs, where the grade assignment of one class may be based largely on one classification factor while the grade of another may be based on an entirely different factor.

The State system never recognizes gender as an appropriate factor in evaluating job classes and assigning them to salary grades. There are no "male classes" or "female classes." Males or females may apply for any position for which they are qualified. There are other indicators, rather than job evaluation factors, that can be used to evaluate whether the grade assignments have an adverse effect on either gender.

MARKET DATA – SOUTHEASTERN STATES

Market data is a major factor in assigning salary grades to job classes. The goal of the Commonwealth, as stated in the Virginia Personnel Act, is to provide salaries and benefits that are competitive with those of private industry in the State. However, many state jobs are unique to government. Therefore, when new job classes are established, DPT gathers salary data from other governmental entities, typically other states in the Southeast, in addition to private salary data that is available.

Because the southeastern states are used consistently when salary ranges are assigned to job classes, these states provide a good frame of reference for determining whether there is gender bias in the salary grades of classes in grades seven through eleven.

There is an annual survey of these states' pay ranges for 111 job classes. In 1998, 43 of the classes were in grades 7 through 11. This survey is particularly helpful because the job classes were selected so as to provide a good cross-section of the job classes used in most states. The classes also were selected irrespective of their composition by gender, which makes them random for use in this study. A summary of this survey data is included as Appendix G of this report.

Among the survey classes in grades 7 through 11, in Virginia, 19 of the classes met the JLARC definition of being female-dominated. That is, females populated 70% or more of the positions in these classes. Twelve of the classes were male-dominated, while neither males nor females dominated the remaining 12.

The survey found that Virginia, generally, pays above the average of all states. This is true because Virginia's private employers pay more than those of other states pay, or because some of the other states have been unable to remain competitive with employers in their areas due to funding problems.

Salary range midpoints were used to gauge competitiveness. The largest average deviation (+11.35%) was for the 12 job classes that were not dominated by males or females. The median deviation was 10.08% and the average weighted by the number of employees in

each class was 19.78%. Virginia did not trail the average for any of the job classes in this category.

The highest deviation in the non-dominated group was for the Training and Development Coordinator class, 21.43%. The most populous class in the group was the Corrections Officer Senior, with 4,839 employees and a 17.36% deviation. The Probation Counselor class also was heavily populated, with 1,013 employees and a deviation of 13.96%.

The average deviation for the 19 female-dominated classes was 6.99%. The median was 7.14% and the average weighted by the number of employees in each class was 8.51%. Virginia trailed the average for four of the female-dominated classes: Accountant Senior (-0.29%), Social Worker (-2.36%), Graphic Artist (-8.19%), and Business Manager (-5.39%).

The most populous classes in the female-dominated category were Public Health Nurse, with 537 employees and a 12.45% deviation, and Practical Nurse B, with 387 employees and a 15.27% deviation. The highest deviation (20.85%) was for the Public Relations Specialist class.

The average deviation for the 12 male-dominated classes was 7.52%. The median was 7.64% and the average weighted by the number of employees in each class was 9.47%. Virginia trailed the average for two of the male-dominated classes: Game Warden (-1.89%) and State Park Manager Senior (-0.48%).

The most populous classes in the male-dominated category were Corrections Sergeant, with 660 employees and a 12.06% deviation, and State Police Trooper II, with 582 employees and a 10.77% deviation. The highest deviation was for Electronics Technician (22.35%).

Overall, the survey of southeastern states indicated that employees in male dominated classes, on average, were paid more than were employees in female-dominated classes relative to the other states. The simple average deviation was .53% higher for male-dominated classes, and the weighted average deviation was .96% higher. However, neither group's deviations were as high as the deviations of the non-dominated group.

MARKET DATA – PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Another source of market data is the annual salary survey of the Commonwealth. It compares State salaries and benefits with those of private firms in Virginia. The 1998 survey included 23 job classes in grades 7 through 11. Ten were female-dominated, 9 male dominated, and neither males nor females dominated four classes. The survey information is found in Appendix H of this report.

As with starting pay of individual employees, which was discussed in the previous chapter, the State has limited ability to correct for any gender-based salary bias in the private sector. The State is obligated to pay salaries that are consistent with salaries paid by private industry. Alternatively, if the State pays less, it will not be able to attract and retain a qualified workforce or, if it pays more, taxpayers and employers could complain that public

funds are being wasted. However, the competitiveness of male-dominated job classes and female-dominated classes should be comparable.

Unlike the survey of southeastern states, the state survey found that the State, generally, lags private employers in Virginia. Also different was the finding that non-dominated classes were not the most competitive, with a simple average deviation of –10.22% and a weighted average deviation of –11.33%. The weighted average deviation was the greatest negative deviation among the three groups.

As with the southeastern states' survey, however, the state survey found that the male-dominated classes had smaller negative deviations than did the female-dominated classes. The simple average deviation of the male-dominated classes was –8.15%, and the weighted average deviation was –7.43%. The comparable deviations for female-dominated classes were –13.14% and –9.08%, respectively.

The greatest negative deviation among female-dominated classes was for the Graphic Artist class (-28.36%). The class Senior Accountant lagged private industry by 23.60%. None of the State midpoints for female-dominated job classes exceeded the average midpoint for private industry. The most populous classes in this group were the Administrative Support Technician Senior, with 1,018 employees and a –4.87% deviation, and Senior Bookkeeper, with 620 employees and a –2.02% deviation.

Among the male-dominated classes, the greatest negative deviation was for the Electrician Senior class (-22.33%), followed by the Storeroom Supervisor (-19.63%) and Equipment Repair Supervisor (-19.26%) classes. The State exceeded the private average for two classes: Planner and Carpenter.

STAFFING PROBLEMS

Salary grade assignments are not static, but they are historically anchored. They typically change when staffing problems occur. Turnover rates provide the best indicator of staffing problems because there are costs associated with recruitment and employee development, even though there may be an adequate supply of applicants to replace employees who leave. Turnover rates, overall, should be similar for male-dominated classes and female-dominated classes if more competitive salaries for the male-dominated are justified.

Turnover rates during the 18 months ending December 31, 1998 were captured for the 43 job classes in grades 7 through 11 that were included in the salary survey of southeastern states. The rates are displayed in Appendix I of this report.

The turnover rates did not explain the differences among the salary range deviations of the three groups of classes. The 19 female-dominated classes had the lowest salary ranges relative to the other states, with an 8.51% weighted average deviation and 6.99% simple average deviation. However, this group had the highest average turnover rates, with a 13.55% average weighted by the number of employees in each job class and a 13.36% simple average.

The salary deviations were highest for the non-dominated group of classes. The weighted average salary deviation was 19.78%, and the simple average was 11.35%. The turnover rates for this group were higher than the rates of the male-dominated classes, but lower than the rates of the female-dominated classes. The weighted average turnover rate was 12.12% and the simple average was 10.48% for the non-dominated group.

Turnover rates were the lowest for the group of male-dominated classes. The weighted average turnover rate for this group was 6.49% and the simple average was 7.68%. Salaries of the male-dominated classes were ahead of the southeastern states' average by 9.47%, weighted average, and 7.52%, simple average.

As the classification and compensation program is updated, DPT should ensure that any differences in salary ranges between male-dominated classes and female-dominated classes are supported by job evaluation criteria (within occupational areas) and by market and staffing data.

APPENDIX A

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 341

Requesting the Department of Personnel and Training to review certain gender pay equity issues in the State workforce.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, March 12, 1998
Agreed to by the Senate, March 10, 1998

WHEREAS, the principle of equal work for equal pay remains an important consideration affecting the productivity of any workforce; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth is one of the largest employers in Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) recently completed a study of gender pay equity in the State workforce and found that on average female State employees earned approximately 16 percent less than male employees; and

WHEREAS, the study also found that this gap is less than the national average and that men and women with comparable longevity in the same job classes earned salaries that were about equal; and

WHEREAS, JLARC made recommendations for further review of certain patterns of salary differences among State employees by the Department of Personnel and Training; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Department of Personnel and Training be requested to review certain gender pay equity issues in the State workforce. The Department shall perform periodic analyses of gender salary differences within job classes as recommended in the JLARC study; and, be it

RESOLVED FURTHER, That, based on the results of these periodic analyses, the Department be requested to examine specific agencies and specific agency job classes for possible reasons that may explain gender pay differences. These reviews should incorporate qualitative information regarding individual incumbents including, but not limited to, performance evaluations, education and training, work experience prior to State service, impacts of attrition on job class composition, and market effects, if any, on job salaries; and, be it

RESOLVED FINALLY, That the Department be requested to review and update its job classification system. The review should address the placement of job classes in grades 7 through 11, and whether the implicit tradeoffs between different job requirements, such as education and working conditions, are appropriate.

All agencies of the Commonwealth shall provide assistance for this study, upon request.
The Department shall conduct its work in a timely manner and periodically submit its findings and recommendations to the Governor and future Sessions of the General Assembly as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents.

APPENDIX B

AVERAGE SALARY BY PARENT AGENCY, CLASS, AND GENDER
OCTOBER 31, 1998
(EXAMPLE PAGE)

PARENT AGENCY	CLASS CODE	CLASS TITLE	MALE AVG SALARY	MALE STANDARD DEVIATION	NUMBER OF MALES	MALE YEARS SERVICE	MALE PERCENT NOVA	FEMALE AVG SALARY	FEMALE STANDARD DEVIATION	NUMBER OF FEMALES	FEMALE YEARS SERVICE	FEMALE PERCENT NOVA
122	11025	Office Services Specialist						17817	0.00	1	1.0	0.0
122	11045	Program Support Technician	26604	0.00	1	11.0	0.0	24337	0.00	1	3.0	0.0
122	11038	Executive Secretary Senior						29738	0.00	1	21.0	0.0
122	11046	Program Support Tech Sr						24885	0.00	2	2.0	0.0
122	27321	Personnel Assistant						24885	0.00	1	11.0	0.0
122	12071	Administrative Staff Assistant						26018	0.00	1	6.0	0.0
122	23413	Fiscal Technician Senior						27204	0.00	1	12.0	0.0
122	23414	Accountant						32510	0.00	1	21.0	0.0
122	23093	DPB Analyst A	40876	6088.00	4	1.8	0.0	39112	7317.50	2	3.0	0.0
122	27301	Human Resource Officer						43428	0.00	1	25.0	0.0
122	46162	Human Res D. P. User Liaison						49637	0.00	1	28.0	0.0
122	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst						46429	0.00	1	13.0	0.0
122	15051	Computer Systems Engineer	39726	0.00	1	9.0	0.0	47474	0.00	1	24.0	0.0
122	23094	DPB Analyst B	45005	7550.09	3	11.0	0.0	42313	5261.18	6	1.8	0.0
122	35254	Public Relations Manager						59319	0.00	1	11.0	0.0
122	15045	Systems Analyst	58012	0.00	1	4.0	0.0					
122	23095	DPB Analyst C	58913	5483.45	12	10.6	0.0	56687	4703.33	5	12.6	0.0
122	23157	DPB Section Manager	69728	7473.08	5	19.2	0.0	66307	0.00	1	13.0	0.0
122	23051	Deputy For Budget/DPB	96829	0.00	1	27.0	0.0					
123	62031	Housekeeping Worker	18628	0.00	1	0.0	0.0	18628	0.00	1	1.0	0.0
123	61381	Trades/Utilities Worker	19335	2537.08	8	13.1	0.0	21292	0.00	1	17.0	0.0
123	63161	Vehicle Service Attendant	21772	0.00	1	0.0	0.0					
123	11024	Office Services Assistant						17489	2688.89	3	0.7	0.0
123	11067	Postal Assistant	15588	0.00	1	0.0	0.0					
123	64091	Warehouse Worker	22102	467.16	3	1.0	0.0					
123	11025	Office Services Specialist						21055	2542.51	6	3.8	0.0
123	11036	Secretary Senior						24447	2280.55	3	17.3	0.0

APPENDIX C

COMPETITIVE OFFERS - JANUARY 1 - DECEMBER 31, 1998

AGENCY	CLASS	CLASS TITLE	GRADE	FORMER SALARY	NEW SALARY	SALARY INCREASE	PERCENT INCREASE	GENDER
247	11036	Secretary Senior	05	20364	22763	2399	11.78	F
501	11025	Office Services Specialist	05	19477	21292	1815	9.32	F
601	43111	Nutritionist Assistant	05	19477	21772	2295	11.78	F
152	11045	Program Support Technician	06	19048	22763	3715	19.50	F
194	62042	Housekeeping Supervisor Sr	06	19477	21772	2295	11.78	F
247	11037	Executive Secretary	06	22262	27816	5554	24.95	F
247	11045	Program Support Technician	06	23800	26604	2804	11.78	F
203	44052	Practical Nurse B	07	21772	27204	5432	24.95	F
280	27321	Personnel Assistant	07	25445	29083	3638	14.30	F
707	43161	Occupational Therapist Asst	07	27204	29738	2534	9.31	F
707	43161	Occupational Therapist Asst	07	26018	31794	5776	22.20	F
221	15072	Computer Oper Tech Sr	08	23276	28443	5167	22.20	F
247	35251	Pub Rel Asst Spec	08	25445	33242	7797	30.64	F
213	23414	Accountant	09	25445	31093	5648	22.20	F
247	61183	Printing Customer Serv Spec	09	29083	36340	7257	24.95	F
262	47023	Vocational Rehab Counselor	09	28443	31093	2650	9.32	F
702	47023	Vocational Rehab Counselor	09	24885	28443	3558	14.30	F
208	22072	Grants Administrator	10	30408	34756	4348	14.30	F
182	21371	Hear Off/Unempl Comp	11	35539	44406	8867	24.95	F
194	53012	Analytical Chemist	11	33242	35539	2297	6.91	F
203	43031	Speech Pathologist	11	31093	39726	8633	27.77	F
236	26103	Buyer Senior	11	39726	45406	5680	14.30	F
151	15043	Programmer/Analyst	12	33242	42471	9229	27.76	F
203	43162	Occupational Therapist	12	43428	46429	3001	6.91	F
221	35253	Public Relations Coordinator	12	31794	37158	5364	16.87	F
221	23416	Accounting Manager A	12	34756	44406	9650	27.76	F
295	23422	Business Manager B	12	37995	44406	6411	16.87	F
501	35253	Public Relations Coordinator	12	37995	48544	10549	27.76	F
501	27324	Personnel Practs Analyst Sr	12	47474	51898	4424	9.32	F
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	32510	37158	4648	14.30	F
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	37995	41535	3540	9.32	F
707	43162	Occupational Therapist	12	47474	48544	1070	2.25	F
707	43021	Physical Therapist Institution	12	39726	45406	5680	14.30	F
765	22272	Human Services Prog Coord	12	39726	42471	2745	6.91	F
140	53046	Forensic Scientist Senior	13	42471	44406	1935	4.56	F
194	21253	Insurance Program Supv	13	42471	49637	7166	16.87	F
203	43171	Occupational Therapy Supv	13	47474	50755	3281	6.91	F
204	23442	Auditor Senior-Internal	13	34756	37995	3239	9.32	F
236	23442	Auditor Senior-Internal	13	38851	41535	2684	6.91	F

APPENDIX C

COMPETITIVE OFFERS - JANUARY 1 - DECEMBER 31, 1998

AGENCY	CLASS	CLASS TITLE	GRADE	FORMER SALARY	NEW SALARY	SALARY INCREASE	PERCENT INCREASE	GENDER
501	51022	Transportation Engineer Sr	13	50755	64847	14092	27.76	F
151	23141	St Acctg Syst Anal	14	44406	54262	9856	22.20	F
161	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	39726	46429	6703	16.87	F
201	31022	Education Assoc Specialist	14	42471	49637	7166	16.87	F
216	23417	Accounting Manager B	14	37995	45406	7411	19.51	F
217	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	41535	44406	2871	6.91	F
501	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	43428	59319	15891	36.59	F
703	45052	Psychologist Senior	14	41535	46429	4894	11.78	F
720	15051	Computer Systems Engineer	14	39726	45406	5680	14.30	F
777	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	39726	48544	8818	22.20	F
777	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	41535	50755	9220	22.20	F
151	15045	Systems Analyst	15	58012	64847	6835	11.78	F
161	15045	Systems Analyst	15	48544	58012	9468	19.50	F
161	15045	Systems Analyst	15	48544	54262	5718	11.78	F
601	15045	Systems Analyst	15	50755	64847	14092	27.76	F
720	15045	Systems Analyst	15	42471	55485	13014	30.64	F
704	45062	Psychology Director	16	64847	70889	6042	9.32	F
161	23292	Tax Executive Assistant	17	69328	74119	4791	6.91	F
501	23512	Transportation Team Member	32	24885	28443	3558	14.30	F
501	23512	Transportation Team Member	32	27816	31794	3978	14.30	F
501	23512	Transportation Team Member	32	35539	43698	8159	22.96	F
501	23511	Trans Assoc Team Member	32	22262	26604	4342	19.50	F
201	15067	Data Base Analyst	15	56734	58012	1278	2.25	M
203	62151	Grounds Worker	02	14909	16298	1389	9.32	M
146	63033	Highway Equip Operator C	06	22262	26604	4342	19.50	M
236	61383	Trades/Utilities Lead Worker	07	25445	29083	3638	14.30	M
236	44294	Sterile Supply Supervisor	07	22262	29083	6821	30.64	M
733	64084	Storekeeper Supervisor	07	20823	26018	5195	24.95	M
737	61522	Water Sys Treat Plant Oper Sr	07	21772	30408	8636	39.67	M
151	15072	Computer Oper Tech Sr	08	24337	29083	4746	19.50	M
194	61352	HVAC Install & Repair Tech	08	27204	31794	4590	16.87	M
216	61352	HVAC Install & Repair Tech	08	23800	28443	4643	19.51	M
236	34012	Enrollment Services Specialist	08	22262	28443	6181	27.76	M
501	63182	Equip Repair Tech Sr	08	28443	33991	5548	19.51	M
501	54024	Engineering Technician IV	08	24337	29083	4746	19.50	M
501	63064	Transportation Maint Supv	08	22763	28443	5680	24.95	M
501	63182	Equip Repair Tech Sr	08	24337	26604	2267	9.32	M
501	63182	Equip Repair Tech Sr	08	25445	26604	1159	4.55	M
501	63182	Equip Repair Tech Sr	08	24337	29083	4746	19.50	M

APPENDIX C

COMPETITIVE OFFERS - JANUARY 1 - DECEMBER 31, 1998

AGENCY	CLASS	CLASS TITLE	GRADE	FORMER SALARY	NEW SALARY	SALARY INCREASE	PERCENT INCREASE	GENDER
501	54024	Engineering Technician IV	08	23276	25445	2169	9.32	M
501	54024	Engineering Technician IV	08	22763	28443	5680	24.95	M
501	54112	Trans Construction Inspector	08	27204	32510	5306	19.50	M
217	61504	Plumber/Steamfitter Supv	09	24337	26604	2267	9.32	M
280	63183	Equipment Repair Supervisor	09	37995	39726	1731	4.56	M
501	54122	Hwy Permits & Subdiv Spec Sr	09	40621	45406	4785	11.78	M
765	15081	Computer Network Tech	09	24885	37995	13110	52.68	M
181	15042	Programmer	10	29083	33242	4159	14.30	M
247	15012	Installation & Repair Tech Sr	10	37995	40621	2626	6.91	M
280	21385	Agency Management Analyst	10	41535	45406	3871	9.32	M
288	15012	Installation & Repair Tech Sr	10	29083	31794	2711	9.32	M
501	54026	Engineering Technician VI	10	29738	32510	2772	9.32	M
501	54026	Engineering Technician VI	10	27204	33242	6038	22.20	M
501	54026	Engineering Technician VI	10	27204	31794	4590	16.87	M
501	54026	Engineering Technician VI	10	32510	37158	4648	14.30	M
501	54026	Engineering Technician VI	10	33242	35539	2297	6.91	M
501	54026	Engineering Technician VI	10	26604	32510	5906	22.20	M
704	15082	Comp Network Tech Sr	10	35539	40621	5082	14.30	M
765	15082	Comp Network Tech Sr	10	31093	41535	10442	33.58	M
216	15043	Programmer/Analyst	12	32510	41535	9025	27.76	M
236	61284	Bldgs And Grnds Supt B	12	41535	43428	1893	4.56	M
247	15043	Programmer/Analyst	12	35539	39726	4187	11.78	M
262	23432	Budget Analyst Senior	12	37158	41535	4377	11.78	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	32510	41535	9025	27.76	M
501	54208	Trans Roadside Devel Mgr	12	37995	40621	2626	6.91	M
501	63067	Trans Res Maint Oper Mgr	12	54262	59319	5057	9.32	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	33991	37995	4004	11.78	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	38851	49637	10786	27.76	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	39726	43428	3702	9.32	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	32510	36340	3830	11.78	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	32510	37995	5485	16.87	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	32510	37158	4648	14.30	M
501	51021	Transportation Engineer	12	48544	55485	6941	14.30	M
733	27311	Human Resource Officer-Field	12	32510	39726	7216	22.20	M
194	26145	St Procurement Rev Analyst	13	45406	49637	4231	9.32	M
501	51022	Transportation Engineer Sr	13	43428	48544	5116	11.78	M
501	21387	Agency Mgt Lead Analyst	13	42471	51898	9427	22.20	M
140	53047	Forensic Scientist Supervisor	14	46429	55485	9056	19.51	M
151	23133	Accts Dept Asst Fiscal Mgr	14	43428	47474	4046	9.32	M

APPENDIX C

COMPETITIVE OFFERS - JANUARY 1 - DECEMBER 31, 1998

AGENCY	CLASS	CLASS TITLE	GRADE	FORMER SALARY	NEW SALARY	SALARY INCREASE	PERCENT INCREASE	GENDER
151	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	38851	46429	7578	19.51	M
151	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	39726	55485	15759	39.67	M
182	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	37995	38851	856	2.25	M
208	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	39726	43428	3702	9.32	M
216	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	40621	48544	7923	19.50	M
221	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	37995	43428	5433	14.30	M
247	35081	Telecomm Support Serv Mgr	14	54262	55485	1223	2.25	M
409	52016	Environmental Engr Consultant	14	55485	58012	2527	4.55	M
440	52016	Environmental Engr Consultant	14	41535	45406	3871	9.32	M
501	15051	Computer Systems Engineer	14	41535	53067	11532	27.76	M
701	52206	Architectural Consultant	14	44406	49637	5231	11.78	M
704	22102	Men Hlth/Ment Ret Fac Adm A	14	54262	56734	2472	4.56	M
720	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	45406	53067	7661	16.87	M
724	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	47474	53067	5593	11.78	M
765	15051	Computer Systems Engineer	14	46429	59319	12890	27.76	M
765	15044	Senior Programmer/Analyst	14	47474	60655	13181	27.76	M
151	15067	Data Base Analyst	15	54262	64847	10585	19.51	M
151	15045	Systems Analyst	15	49637	62021	12384	24.95	M
161	15045	Systems Analyst	15	47474	58012	10538	22.20	M
201	15067	Data Base Analyst	15	56734	58012	1278	2.25	M
501	15045	Systems Analyst	15	45406	56734	11328	24.95	M
704	45061	Psychology Supervisor	15	41535	56734	15199	36.59	M
704	27313	Human Res Mgr Sr-Fld	15	48544	58012	9468	19.50	M
720	15052	Computer Systems Sr Eng	15	48544	59319	10775	22.20	M
765	15045	Systems Analyst	15	49637	60655	11018	22.20	M
765	15045	Systems Analyst	15	60655	64847	4192	6.91	M
152	23116	Cash Administrator	16	59319	64847	5528	9.32	M
221	15068	Data Base Administrator	16	55485	62021	6536	11.78	M
720	22246	Men Hyg Research Director	16	66307	70889	4582	6.91	M
765	15068	Data Base Administrator	16	62021	70889	8868	14.30	M
765	15046	Prog/Systems Devel Supv	16	54262	67801	13539	24.95	M
201	31024	Education Lead Specialist	17	69328	74119	4791	6.91	M
208	15054	Computer Systems Chief Engr	17	56734	75788	19054	33.58	M
129	27468	DPT Program Director	18	55485	63418	7933	14.30	M
704	42246	Mental Health Physician C	23	126499	132262	5763	4.56	M
705	42246	Mental Health Physician C	23	118323	129348	11025	9.32	M

APPENDIX D

REALLOCATIONS - JANUARY 1 - DECEMBER 31, 1998
(EXAMPLE PAGE)

AGENCY	AGENCY ABBRV	FORMER CLASS	FORMER GRADE	FORMER SALARY	NEW CLASS	NEW GRADE	NEW SALARY	GENDER
299	MECC	11045	6	20364	34012	08	22262	M
299	MECC	11035	4	17041	11037	06	18628	F
299	MECC	11035	4	17041	11036	05	18628	F
301	VDACS	15043	12	49637	15044	14	54262	F
301	VDACS	35252	10	34756	26031	11	37995	F
301	VDACS	11025	5	24885	11045	06	27204	F
301	VDACS	81316	9	24885	81202	10	27204	M
301	VDACS	15043	12	49637	15044	14	54262	F
301	VDACS	27321	7	21772	27341	08	23800	F
301	VDACS	11045	6	29083	11046	07	31794	F
301	VDACS	15043	12	39726	15044	14	43428	F
301	VDACS	81203	11	37995	81204	12	41535	M
301	VDACS	26032	13	43428	26033	15	47474	F
325	DBA	11037	6	29083	11046	07	31794	F
325	DBA	26061	16	66307	26063	18	72486	F
325	DBA	26061	16	54262	26063	18	59319	M
325	DBA	11045	6	29083	11046	07	31794	F
325	DBA	12071	8	33991	11052	09	37158	F
325	DBA	26062	17	77495	26063	18	84716	M
402	MRC	82366	8	32510	82367	09	35539	M
403	DGIF	11045	6	19582	26101	08	21407	F
403	DGIF	82212	12	34943	82213	13	38199	M
403	DGIF	23412	6	21292	23413	08	23276	F
405	VRC	21241	13	51898	21242	14	56734	M
405	VRC	21195	14	42471	21198	17	49637	M
405	VRC	21195	14	42471	21198	17	49637	M
407	VPA	23414	9	33421	23415	11	36535	F
408	CBLAD	11037	6	22262	11038	07	24337	F
408	CBLAD	83444	14	54262	52017	15	55485	M
409	DMME	11067	4	17424	11025	05	19048	F

APPENDIX E

AGENCY-CLASSES THAT PASSED THROUGH ALL SCREENS
OCTOBER 31, 1998

PARENT AGENCY	CLASS CODE	CLASS TITLE	MALE AVERAGE SALARY	MALE STAND. DEVIATION	NUMBER OF MALES	MALE AVG YRS SERVICE	MALE % IN NOVA	FEMALE AVERAGE SALARY	FEMALE STAND. DEVIATION	NUMBER OF FEMALES	FEMALE AVG YRS SERVICE	FEMALE % IN NOVA
123	23412	Fiscal Technician	26604	0	1	9.0	0.0	18628	0	1	5.0	0.0
123	61402	Painter	27834	1012	3	10.3	0.0	22262	0	1	9.0	0.0
123	24032	Employment Services Counselor	24885	0	1	4.0	0.0	24337	0	1	4.0	0.0
123	33065	Academic Teacher	30613	0	1	2.0	0.0	28611	0	3	1.7	0.0
127	23414	Accountant	28443	0	1	0.0	0.0	37995	0	1	2.0	0.0
129	27452	St Hlth Ben Plans Spec Sr	39726	0	1	8.0	0.0	45406	0	1	13.0	0.0
140	53045	Forensic Scientist	46721	5559	21	9.1	14.3	38495	5713	26	6.2	26.9
140	28188	Crim Justice Program Mgr	53067	0	1	5.0	0.0	40621	0	1	2.0	0.0
150	23445	Audit Supervisor - Internal	41535	0	1	8.0	0.0	51898	0	1	8.0	0.0
154	15073	Computer Operations Supervisor	42471	0	1	19.0	0.0	44406	0	1	19.0	0.0
156	26102	Buyer Specialist	29083	0	1	15.0	0.0	33991	0	1	17.0	0.0
156	15082	Comp Network Support Tech Sr	29738	0	1	10.0	0.0	38851	0	1	20.0	0.0
161	11067	Postal Assistant	15588	0	1	9.0	0.0	21292	0	1	21.0	0.0
161	11052	Office Manager	27204	0	1	16.0	0.0	35539	0	1	26.0	0.0
165	23416	Accounting Manager A	47474	0	1	21.0	0.0	40621	0	1	21.0	0.0
182	24414	Emp Sec Reg Mkting Mgr	55485	0	1	28.0	0.0	45406	0	1	23.0	0.0
182	24415	Emp Security Reg Dir	62021	0	2	27.0	0.0	70889	0	1	27.0	100.0
194	53073	Microbiologist Supervisor	41535	0	1	25.0	0.0	47474	0	1	28.0	0.0
194	15046	Prog/Systems Development Supv	55485	0	1	6.0	0.0	64847	0	1	6.0	0.0
199	23415	Accountant Senior	39726	0	1	14.0	0.0	31093	0	1	10.0	0.0
201	45051	Psychologist	30408	0	1	0.0	0.0	37995	0	1	0.0	0.0
202	23414	Accountant	33242	0	1	7.0	0.0	24337	0	1	2.0	0.0
208	34033	Research Specialist Advanced	29083	0	1	0.0	0.0	35539	0	1	0.0	100.0
208	52205	Architect Senior	51898	0	1	12.0	0.0	34756	0	1	0.0	0.0
211	26103	Buyer Senior	36340	0	1	11.0	0.0	29083	0	1	11.0	0.0
212	11027	Office Services Supv Sr	29738	0	1	5.0	0.0	20823	0	1	3.0	0.0
212	33012	Technical Instruction Coord	32510	0	1	0.0	0.0	33991	0	1	0.0	0.0
213	15045	Systems Analyst	42471	0	1	2.0	0.0	60655	0	1	9.0	0.0
215	36296	Museum Assistant Director	29083	0	1	0.0	0.0	37158	0	1	2.0	0.0
216	34042	Audio Visual Supervisor	43428	0	1	24.0	0.0	38851	0	1	24.0	0.0
216	23418	Accounting Manager C	59319	0	1	19.0	0.0	62021	0	1	19.0	0.0
221	61411	Bldg Construction Inspector	33991	0	1	10.0	0.0	25445	0	1	1.0	0.0
221	15046	Prog/Systems Development Supv	67801	0	1	18.0	0.0	49637	0	1	10.0	0.0
223	22044	Human Serv Prog Dir, Sr	62850	0	1	25.0	0.0	56734	0	1	10.0	0.0
236	35312	Alumni Pgm Coord Sr	32510	0	1	2.0	0.0	37995	0	1	2.0	0.0
242	62032	Housekeeping Lead Worker	14259	0	1	1.0	0.0	13638	0	1	1.0	0.0
245	15052	Computer Systems Senior Eng	44406	0	1	9.0	0.0	50755	0	1	9.0	0.0
247	61184	Printing Services Supervisor A	26604	0	2	3.5	100.0	24885	0	2	2.5	100.0
247	32051	Archivist A	25445	0	1	4.0	100.0	32510	0	1	12.0	100.0

APPENDIX E

AGENCY-CLASSES THAT PASSED THROUGH ALL SCREENS
OCTOBER 31, 1998

PARENT AGENCY	CLASS CODE	CLASS TITLE	MALE AVERAGE SALARY	MALE STAND. DEVIATION	NUMBER OF MALES	MALE AVG YRS SERVICE	MALE % IN NOVA	FEMALE AVERAGE SALARY	FEMALE STAND. DEVIATION	NUMBER OF FEMALES	FEMALE AVG YRS SERVICE	FEMALE % IN NOVA
261	21386	Agency Mgmt Analyst Sr	29083	0	1	1.0	0.0	44406	0	1	10.0	100.0
261	21387	Agency MGt Lead Analyst	47474	0	1	14.0	0.0	42471	0	1	13.0	100.0
262	22222	Hs Manager Sr-Fd	59319	0	1	5.0	0.0	46429	0	1	0.0	0.0
325	26032	Mktg & Sales Rep Sr	46429	0	1	11.0	0.0	34756	0	1	1.0	0.0
403	15043	Programmer/Analyst	42471	0	1	2.0	0.0	35539	0	1	1.0	0.0
407	76053	Police Captain	32510	0	1	6.0	0.0	43428	0	1	18.0	0.0
409	21387	Agency MGt Lead Analyst	54262	0	1	26.0	0.0	42471	0	1	16.0	0.0
440	15051	Computer Systems Engineer	43428	0	1	6.0	0.0	37995	0	1	5.0	0.0
501	62151	Grounds Worker	17817	0	1	12.0	0.0	24885	0	1	15.0	100.0
501	12044	Photocopy Supervisor	19048	0	1	7.0	0.0	27816	0	1	23.0	0.0
501	35041	Photo Lab Tech	25445	0	1	17.0	0.0	20823	0	1	10.0	0.0
501	27332	Employee Relations Analyst Sr	42471	0	1	5.0	0.0	39726	0	1	3.0	0.0
501	26104	Buyer Manager	49637	0	1	31.0	0.0	42471	0	1	31.0	0.0
501	35254	Public Relations Manager	38851	0	1	11.0	0.0	58012	0	1	11.0	100.0
601	23442	Auditor Senior-Internal	50755	0	1	13.0	0.0	34756	0	2	4.0	0.0
602	23443	Audit Manager-Internal	67801	0	1	12.0	0.0	51898	0	1	12.0	0.0
701	37042	Planner Senior	46429	0	1	21.0	0.0	39726	0	1	16.0	0.0
701	72182	Corrections Warden	51898	0	1	22.0	0.0	49637	0	1	21.0	0.0
702	21386	Agency Mgmt Analyst Sr	43428	0	1	27.0	0.0	34756	0	1	20.0	0.0
720	15071	Computer Operations Technician	18628	0	1	9.0	0.0	27204	0	1	20.0	0.0
720	43488	Food Operations Director A	35539	0	1	11.0	0.0	45406	0	1	19.0	0.0
720	44195	Physician's Asst Category I	49637	0	1	17.0	0.0	50755	0	1	17.0	0.0
720	22133	Community Services Director	62021	0	1	22.0	0.0	55485	0	1	19.0	0.0
762	22125	Staff Attorney	49637	0	2	0.0	0.0	31794	0	1	0.0	0.0
765	27326	Personnel Practices Manager	62021	0	2	26.0	0.0	56734	0	1	24.0	0.0
841	21241	Policy Analyst	51898	0	1	11.0	0.0	42471	0	1	3.0	0.0
942	35072	Graphic Designer	26018	0	1	1.0	0.0	30408	0	1	4.0	0.0
999	23452	Auditor Senior-External	34756	0	1	7.0	0.0	48544	0	1	20.0	0.0

APPENDIX F

REASONS CITED BY AGENCIES FOR PAY DISPARITY - JANUARY 1999

REASON	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES
STARTING SALARY	29
(PRIOR SALARY REPORTED)	(17)
STATE SERVICE	26
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	13
SEQUENCE OF TRANSACTIONS	13
EMPLOYEES' PRIOR EXPERIENCE	9
COMPETITIVE OFFERS	3
NORTHERN VIRGINIA DIFFERENTIALS	2
POLICY EXCEPTION - AGENCY ERROR	1
TOTAL	96

APPENDIX G

1998 SOUTHEASTERN STATES SALARY SURVEY DATA

VIRGINIA'S 98 TITLE	CLASS CODE	GRADE	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	PERCENT MALES	PERCENT FEMALES	98 RANGE MIDPOINT	98 SURVEY AVERAGE	% VA EXCEEDS SALARY AVERAGE	WTED AVG	SIMPLE AVG
FEMALE-DOMINATED										
Dental Hygienist	41092	9	9	0.0	100.0	$ 31,166	$ 26,862	16.02		
Public Health Nurse	42011	11	537	0.4	99.6	$ 37,245	$ 33,120	12.45		
Personnel Assistant	27321	7	87	2.3	97.7	$ 26,079	$ 23,431	11.30		
Practical Nurse B	44052	7	387	4.7	95.4	$ 26,079	$ 22,625	15.27		
Medical Technologist	43081	9	61	8.2	91.8	$ 31,166	$ 29,669	5.05		
Personnel Practices Analyst	27323	11	57	8.8	91.2	$ 37,245	$ 31,133	19.63		
Nutritionist	43112	9	107	9.4	90.7	$ 31,166	$ 30,802	1.18		
Speech Pathologist	43031	11	20	10.0	90.0	$ 37,245	$ 35,538	4.80		
Registered Nurse	42141	11	246	10.6	89.4	$ 37,245	$ 33,118	12.46		
Health Educator	35051	8	24	12.5	87.5	$ 28,509	$ 27,722	2.84		
Social Worker	45103	8	76	13.2	86.8	$ 28,509	$ 29,197	-2.36		
Accountant	23414	9	337	16.3	83.7	$ 31,166	$ 30,714	1.47		
Graphic Artist	35071	7	23	17.4	82.6	$ 26,079	$ 28,405	-8.19		
Disability Determination Analyst	47203	9	89	21.4	78.7	$ 31,166	$ 28,617	8.91		
Buyer Specialist	26102	9	69	26.1	73.9	$ 31,166	$ 29,088	7.14		
Clinical Social Worker	45112	10	168	26.2	73.8	$ 34,070	$ 31,076	9.63		
Business Manager	23421	10	100	29.0	71.0	$ 34,070	$ 36,010	-5.39		
Public Relations Specl	35252	10	105	29.5	70.5	$ 34,070	$ 28,192	20.85		
Accountant Senior	23415	11	215	29.8	70.2	$ 37,245	$ 37,354	-0.29		
			2717						8.51	6.99
NON-DOMINATED										
Employment Sec Interviewer	24023	8	297	31.3	68.7	$ 28,509	$ 25,773	10.62		
Clinical Social Worker Superv	45113	11	57	31.6	68.4	$ 37,245	$ 34,262	8.70		
Employment Service Counselor	24032	9	6	33.3	66.7	$ 31,166	$ 28,463	9.50		
Eeo Analyst	27351	11	9	33.3	66.7	$ 37,245	$ 34,001	9.54		
Auditor, Internal	23441	11	13	38.5	61.5	$ 37,245	$ 34,056	9.36		
Vocational Rehab Counselor	47023	9	236	39.4	60.6	$ 31,166	$ 29,614	5.24		
Analytical Chemist	53012	11	39	41.0	59.0	$ 37,245	$ 33,476	11.26		
Environmental Program Analyst	83442	11	37	46.0	54.1	$ 37,245	$ 33,215	12.13		
Probation Counselor	72402	10	1013	47.3	52.7	$ 34,070	$ 29,895	13.96		
Programmer	15042	10	134	51.5	48.5	$ 34,070	$ 31,805	7.12		
Training & Development Coord	33021	11	85	51.8	48.2	$ 37,245	$ 30,671	21.43		
Corrections Officer Sr	72018	8	4839	68.6	31.4	$ 28,509	$ 24,292	17.36		
			6765						19.78	11.35

APPENDIX G

1998 SOUTHEASTERN STATES SALARY SURVEY DATA

VIRGINIA'S 98 TITLE	CLASS CODE	GRADE	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	PERCENT MALES	PERCENT FEMALES	98 RANGE MIDPOINT	98 SURVEY AVERAGE	% VA EXCEEDS SALARY AVERAGE	WTED AVG	SIMPLE AVG
MALE-DOMINATED										
Environmental Hlth Specl	41222	9	23	73.9	26.1	$ 31,166	$ 29,954	4.05		
Environmental Inspector	83431	9	16	75.0	25.0	$ 31,166	$ 29,751	4.76		
Corrections Sgt	72014	9	660	84.6	15.5	$ 31,166	$ 27,811	12.06		
State Park Mgr, Sr	82192	11	18	88.9	11.1	$ 37,245	$ 37,426	-0.48		
Forester	82151	10	74	89.2	10.8	$ 34,070	$ 31,911	6.76		
Game Warden	82202	9	128	94.5	5.5	$ 31,166	$ 31,765	-1.89		
State Police Trooper II	71113	11	582	95.2	4.8	$ 34,070	$ 30,757	10.77		
Wildlife Biologist	82031	11	23	95.7	4.4	$ 37,245	$ 33,601	10.84		
Electronics Technician	55011	9	26	96.2	3.9	$ 31,166	$ 25,472	22.35		
Electrician	61372	7	108	98.2	1.9	$ 26,079	$ 25,459	2.44		
HVAC Install & Repair Tech	61352	8	148	98.7	1.4	$ 28,509	$ 25,901	10.07		
Carpenter	61302	7	130	100.0	0.0	$ 26,079	$ 24,033	8.51		
			1936						9.47	7.52

APPENDIX H

1998 STATE SALARY SURVEY DATA

CLASS TITLE	CLASS CODE	SALARY GRADE	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	PERCENT MALES	PERCENT FEMALES	VIRGINIA RANGE MIDPOINT	SURVEY WTED AVG MIDPOINT	% VA EXCEEDS AVERAGE	WTED AVG	SIMPLE AVG
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY SENIOR	11038	7	392	0.8	99.2	26,079	31538.8	-17.31		
PERSONNEL ASSISTANT	27321	7	87	2.3	97.7	26,079	26663.7	-2.19		
SENIOR BOOKKEEPER	23413	8	620	9.0	91.0	28,509	29095.9	-2.02		
ADMIN. SUPPORT TECH. SENIOR	11046	7	1018	12.8	87.2	26,079	27415.2	-4.87		
ACCOUNTANT	23414	9	337	16.3	83.7	31,166	36956.7	-15.67		
GRAPHIC ARTIST	35071	7	23	17.4	82.6	26,079	36402.2	-28.36		
BUDGET ANALYST	23431	10	24	25.0	75.0	34,070	40811.6	-16.52		
BUYER	26102	9	69	26.1	73.9	31,166	36660.3	-14.99		
PUBLIC RELATIONS SPECIALIST	35252	10	105	29.5	70.5	34,070	36195.5	-5.87		
SENIOR ACCOUNTANT	23415	11	215	29.8	70.2	37,245	48751.2	-23.60		
			2890						-9.08	-13.14
INTERNAL AUDITOR	23441	11	13	38.5	61.5	37,245	37801.1	-1.47		
ANALYTICAL CHEMIST	53012	11	39	41.0	59.0	37,245	47064.2	-20.86		
PROGRAMMER	15042	10	134	51.5	48.5	34,070	39373.0	-13.47		
TRAINER	33021	11	85	51.8	48.2	37,245	39245.0	-5.10		
			271						-11.33	-10.22
PLANNER	37041	11	7	71.4	28.6	37,245	36473.6	2.11		
STOREROOM SUPERVISOR	64084	7	61	88.5	11.5	26,079	32449.3	-19.63		
ELECTRICIAN	61372	7	108	98.2	1.9	26,079	29300.8	-11.00		
HVAC INSTALLATION & REPAIR TE	61352	8	148	98.7	1.4	28,509	28639.5	-0.46		
EQUIPMENT REPAIR TECHNICIAN	63181	7	128	99.2	0.8	26,079	29238.0	-10.80		
CARPENTER	61302	7	138	100.0	0.0	26,079	22538.2	15.71		
CARPENTER SENIOR	61303	8	64	100.0	0.0	28,509	30898.8	-7.73		
ELECTRICIAN SENIOR	61373	8	90	100.0	0.0	28,509	36706.0	-22.33		
EQUIPMENT REPAIR SUPERVISOR	63183	9	116	100.0	0.0	31,166	38599.8	-19.26		
			860						-7.43	-8.15

APPENDIX I

COMPARISON OF SALARY DEVIATIONS WITH TURNOVER RATES
FY 1998 AND 1999

VIRGINIA'S 98 TITLE	CLASS CODE	GRADE	98, % VA EXCEEDS SALARY AVERAGE	WTED AVG	SIMPLE AVG	FY 1999 TURNOVER RATE	FY 1998 TURNOVER RATE	AVERAGE TURNOVER RATE	WTED AVG	SIMPLE AVG
FEMALE-DOMINATED										
Dental Hygienist	41092	9	16.02			0.00	0.00	0.00		
Public Health Nurse	42011	11	12.45			8.12	10.13	9.13		
Personnel Assistant	27321	7	11.30			7.14	13.04	10.09		
Practical Nurse B	44052	7	15.27			23.22	15.82	19.52		
Medical Technologist	43081	9	5.05			0.00	9.43	4.72		
Personnel Practices Analyst	27323	11	19.63			14.82	5.17	10.00		
Nutritionist	43112	9	1.18			13.20	24.53	18.87		
Speech Pathologist	43031	11	4.80			40.00	20.83	30.42		
Registered Nurse	42141	11	12.46			32.78	25.73	29.26		
Health Educator	35051	8	2.84			25.00	18.18	21.59		
Social Worker	45103	8	-2.36			18.42	12.66	15.54		
Accountant	23414	9	1.47			6.90	7.62	7.26		
Graphic Artist	35071	7	-8.19			10.00	15.00	12.50		
Disability Determination Analyst	47203	9	8.91			12.76	8.16	10.46		
Buyer Specialist	26102	9	7.14			8.00	6.33	7.17		
Clinical Social Worker	45112	10	9.63			16.86	19.39	18.13		
Business Manager	23421	10	-5.39			2.18	7.59	4.89		
Public Relations Specl	35252	10	20.85			23.16	10.11	16.64		
Accountant Senior	23415	11	-0.29			6.58	8.92	7.75		
				8.51	6.99				13.55	13.36
NON-DOMINATED										
Employment Sec Interviewer	24023	8	10.62			7.74	6.41	7.08		
Clinical Social Worker Superv	45113	11	8.70			10.52	10.71	10.62		
Employment Service Counselor	24032	9	9.50			50.00	0.00	25.00		
Eeo Analyst	27351	11	9.54			0.00	0.00	0.00		
Auditor, Internal	23441	11	9.36			16.66	2.31	9.49		
Vocational Rehab Counselor	47023	9	5.24			10.88	6.67	8.78		
Analytical Chemist	53012	11	11.26			23.80	6.98	15.39		
Environmental Program Analyst	83442	11	12.13			0.00	3.03	1.52		
Probation Counselor	72402	10	13.96			9.82	9.23	9.53		
Programmer	15042	10	7.12			19.84	11.63	15.74		
Training & Development Coord	33021	11	21.43			11.62	7.32	9.47		
Corrections Officer Sr	72018	8	17.36			13.58	12.77	13.18		
				19.78	11.35				12.12	10.48

APPENDIX I

COMPARISON OF SALARY DEVIATIONS WITH TURNOVER RATES
FY 1998 AND 1999

VIRGINIA'S 98 TITLE	CLASS CODE	GRADE	98. % VA EXCEEDS SALARY AVERAGE	WTED AVG	SIMPLE AVG	FY 1999 TURNOVER RATE	FY 1998 TURNOVER RATE	AVERAGE TURNOVER RATE	WTED AVG	SIMPLE AVG
MALE-DOMINATED										
Environmental Hlth Specl	41222	9	4.05			0.00	17.65	8.83		
Environmental Inspector	83431	9	4.76			22.20	11.11	16.66		
Corrections Sgt	72014	9	12.06			6.78	7.32	7.05		
State Park Mgr, Sr	82192	11	-0.48			0.00	0.00	0.00		
Forester	82151	10	6.76			2.70	5.48	4.09		
Game Warden	82202	9	-1.89			4.96	7.48	6.22		
State Police Trooper II	71113	11	10.77			3.78	4.26	4.02		
Wildlife Biologist	82031	11	10.84			8.34	7.69	8.02		
Electronics Technician	55011	9	22.35			19.04	0.00	9.52		
Electrician	61372	7	2.44			12.64	6.19	9.42		
HVAC Install & Repair Tech	61352	8	10.07			9.30	8.66	8.98		
Carpenter	61302	7	8.51			9.10	9.65	9.38		
				9.47	7.52				6.49	7.68