

Threshold Decision Points: To include or not include in the study....? (YES or NO):

- A. Bonuses paid to exempt personal staff of statewide elected officials
-- *discussion indicates YES*

- B. How 6/10 of 1% money is used for all other exempt positions
-- *discussion indicates YES*

- C. How 6/10 of 1% money is used for all classified positions under Pay Plan 20
-- *discussion indicates YES*

- D. All base pay adjustments (would include across-the-board pay increases as well as the 6/10 of 1% money)
-- *discussion indicates MAYBE, MAYBE NOT*
 - if so, include personal staff of statewide elected officials?
 - if so, include all other exempt positions?
 - if so, include all classified positions?

- E. State Fund pay and compensation, including bonuses
-- *discussion indicates MAYBE, MAYBE NOT*

-- *Staff note: State Fund is funded by workers' compensation insurance premiums, so it is not part of HB 2 or HB 13 (the pay plan bill). Thus, a study of State Fund compensation practices would be approached as a separate study, even if included in this resolution. LC 2319, requested by Sen. Perry, is on HOLD, but would involve a study of workers' compensation insurance in general, including compensation practices*

Policy concerns and goals, associated study questions

- transparency
 - what can we do to avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety?

- accountability and oversight
 - how can we ensure standard procedures are established and followed?
 - how can we ensure there is ongoing monitoring and periodic review?

- equity
 - are pay practices equitable within and between agencies?
 - is there a sound rationale for exempt positions and variability within and between agencies?

- definition and clarity
 - are the various types of pay increases (e.g., merit vs. market pay, bonuses vs. incentives) clearly defined?
 - are agencies applying the various types of pay increases appropriately?

* Prepared for the House State Administration Committee by Sheri Heffelfinger, Legislative Services