CCR Mecf, 407.3

PAGES: 1 through 181

In the matter of:

GOVERNMENT

KENTUCKY SAC FORUM ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF MINORITIES AND

est ar

WOMEN IN KENTUCKY STATE

PLACE: Frankfurt, Kentucky

DATE: Tuesday, March 14, 1989

,

,,

g‡

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

2

1

In the Matter of:

KENTUCKY SAC FORUM ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF MINORITIES AND

WOMEN IN KENTUCKY STATE GOVERNMENT

6 ||

5

Tuesday, __ March 14, 1989

8

7

Capital Plaza Hotel 405 Wilkinson Boulevard Frankfurt, Kentucky

10

The above-entitled forum came on pursuant to notice, at 9:00 a.m.

)

12

13

11

PORTER PEEPLES, SR., CHAIRMAN

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

INDEX

ı ı	
2	Kentucky Advisory Committee
3	
4	William F. Muldrow, Acting Director Central Regional Division
5	Office of the Governor and Department of Personnel:
6 7	Thomas C. Greenwell Commission
8	State Personnel Board:
9	Arthur Hatterick Executive Director
10	Employee Organizations:
11	Karla Walker, President Blacks in Government
12	
13	George Parsons, President Kentucky Association of State Employees
14 15	Charlesmarie Maxberry, President Women's Network
16	Community Organizations:
17	William Coefield, State President NAACP
18	Dr. Betty Sue Griffin
19	National Council of Negro Women
20	Legal Services:
21	Daniel Goldberg, Directing Attorney Appalachian Research and Defense Fund of Kentucky, Inc.
22	State Agencies:
23	Henry J. Curtis, Attorney Chief Department of Parks

24

25



1	Office of General Counsel
2	Cabinet of Human Resources
3	Jack O'Nan, Personnel Branch Manager Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet
4	Louis Mathias, Attorney
5	Department of State Police
6	Phyllis Alexander, Executive Director Kentucky Commission on Women
7	Enforcement Agencies:
8	Angela Koshewa, Assistant Compliance Director Kentucky Human Rights Commission
9	
10	Paul Gholston, Area Director Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
11	
12	
13	
14	

PROCEEDINGS

MR. PEEPLES: Good morning everyone.

We are going to call to order this meeting of the Kentucky Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

For the benefit of those of you in the audience I want to introduce myself. My name is Porter Peeples, and I am the Chairperson of the Kentucky Advisory Committee.

Members of the Committee with us today are

Robert Scwemm, Paul Oberst, James Stewart, Douglas Den Uyl,

James Rosenblum, and Ms. Thelma Clemons will be joining us.

We are here today to conduct a committee forum for the purpose of gathering information on the employment of minorities and women in the Kentucky state government, with special attention to the implementation of the state affirmative action plan, and efforts to assure equal opportunity in recruiting, hiring, training, and promotion.

The jurisdiction of the Commission includes discrimination, or denial of equal protection of the law because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicapped, or national origin within the Administration of Justice.

Information which relates to the topic of the forum will be especially helpful to the advisory committee.

The proceedings of this forum, which are being recorded by a public stenographer, will be sent to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

Commission for its advise and consideration.

 C_{n}

Information provided may also be used by the advisory committee to plan future activities.

At the outset I want to remind everyone present of the ground rules. This is a public meeting open to the media and the general public. We have a very full schedule of people who will be making presentations within the limited time we have available. The time allocated for each presentation must be strictly adhered to. This will include a presentation by each participant followed by questions from the committee members.

To accommodate persons who have not been invited but wish to make statements, we have scheduled an open period on our agenda at 5:00 p.m. Anyone wishing to make a statement during that period should contact a staff member for scheduling.

Written statements may be submitted to committee members, or staff here. Or, by mail to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 911 Walnut Street, Suite 3100, Kansas City, Missouri, 64126.

The record of this meeting will close on March 31, 1989.

Though some of the statements made today may be controversial, we want to insure that all invited guests do not defame, or degrade any person or organization. In order

knowledgeable persons with a wide variety of experience and viewpoints have been invited to share information with us.

Any person or any organization that feels defamed or degraded by statements made in these proceedings should contact our staff during the meeting so that we can provide a chance for public response.

Alternately, such persons or organizations can file written statements for inclusion in the proceedings. I urge all persons making presentations to be judicial in your statements.

The advisory committee appreciates the willingness of all participants to share their views and experiences with the committee.

Mr. Muldrow will now share some opening remarks with you.

MR. MULDROW: I would like to extend my welcome to all of you. I am the acting Regional Director of the Commission's office in Kansas City. I express my own appreciation to the committee for those of you who have agreed to participate with us here today. We are looking forward to hearing your remarks, and receiving the information that you have for us.

This forum is typical of others conducted by advisory committees throughout our region on various topics

related to Civil Rights concerns of minorities and women.

As Mr. Peeples has explained the information which is received here today, and which is being transcribed by a public stenographer, will eventually be summarized in a written report to our commissioner's, and with their authorization it will be published and distributed to the public for anyone who would like to have a copy free of charge.

So again, welcome to all of you, and we look forward to a very profitable and satisfying time together today.

Thank you very much.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much, Bill.

We will now proceed with the agenda as printed.

Our first presenter today representing the Office of the

Governor, and Department of Personnel, Commissioner

Thomas C. Greenwell.

MR. GREENWELL: Mr. Peeples, Mr. Muldrow, distinguished members of the committee, bringing warm and sunny greetings from the Commonwealth's Governor, Governor Wallace Wilkinson, to welcome you. Those of you who have traveled from out-of-state to our bluegrass state, we hope that your stay is enjoyable and pleasurable.

He asked me today to represent him at this public forum due to the fact that I am the chief enforcer of

affirmative action plans in the Kentucky state government.

Kentucky is known as a uncommonwealth. As
Governor Wilkinson said in Louisville at last years minority
exposition, Kentucky's greatest wealth is her people.

I welcome this opportunity to share with you this morning the information on Kentucky's affirmative action plan.

We might say this morning that the plan is an investment plan for the uncommonwealth of Kentucky. The people themselves.

Just under one year ago, as a matter of fact on March 31st of last year, Governor Wilkinson signed Senate Bill 163 into statutory form. A piece of legislation that was sponsored by former Senator Georgia Powers and guided it through successfully the 1988 General Assembly.

Prior to that date affirmative action in the public work force was largely voluntary. As you know, the Federal Government does not the several states to enact affirmative action statutes.

Certain Federal programs administered in the states do provide for guarantees and guidelines that must be adhered to, to provide for equal employment opportunity.

But, by and large the initiative for assuring equal opportunity rests with the states themselves.

I am glad to be able to report to you this morning

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

that Kentucky is among those states committed to equal employment opportunity through affirmative action.

In the Commonwealth of Kentucky affirmative action is no longer just a good idea worthy of voluntary cooperation. It is the law requiring compliance.

Since 1972 every Kentucky governor issued an executive order outlining his or her affirmative action plan. Those individual and successive efforts forged a chain of policy continuity in the absence of law.

But, on March 31, as no governor before him,

Governor Wallace Wilkinson made history, and forever changed

the direction of affirmative action in Kentucky.

The difference between the Governor's policy and the law of the Commonwealth is not subtle, it is substantial. Prior to 1988 the Kentucky Personnel Board would not have heard appeals on affirmative action because affirmative was only a policy issue for the Department of Personnel.

After the action of the General Assembly in 1988, and the action of the Governor following that legislative session, the Department of Personnel and the Kentucky Personnel Board have assigned the responsibilities for enforcing that law.

Scheduling, as you have, this forum on this date limits to some degree the quantity of information available

to share with you today.

I do think, however, you will not be disappointed by the end of my remarks by either the quantity of what I have to share, or the quality of what I do share.

As of this date, what we have at best are early indicators, and some hard facts. Some statistics based on very limited experience. While the indicators are important I am much more interested in the evaluations we will make after one full year of the plan's implementation.

As I have indicated we are about two weeks shy of celebrating the first anniversary of affirmative action as law in Kentucky. That is, of course, cause for celebration, and I am grateful for you for giving us this highly publicized occasion to celebrate that first anniversary.

In fact, in a few moments I will be going to use this occasion to make some timely announcements about Kentucky's affirmative action plan. You can draw a bigger crowd, quite frankly, than we are capable of doing in the Department of Personnel.

The Government, as you all know, does not ordinarily work at break neck pace. So, we are approaching the first anniversary. We are, in fact, only three months into the time table of the plan itself. It is hardly enough time to get our feet wet, much less enough time to make a comprehensive report based on a complete year of

 administration and compliance with the plan.

Since December last, when the time table began to tick, every day has been a new day for affirmative action in the state work place. Day in, and day out we are establishing our benchmark year. The standards by which our success for the future leans.

This I can say without reservation. The state plan is effective. It is by design, and I believe, one of the best plans in the fifty states. The government of Canada has asked for a copy of it.

Undoubtedly, it is the most comprehensive plan in the commonwealth's history. What makes it effective? Aside from the commitment of the Governor and the General Assembly is this, its specific goals and time tables.

Kentucky civil rights advocate, Galen Martin, has said of the plan. "The plan is an improvement because there is a clear call for each agency to set goals and time tables for affirmative hiring".

I can, and I shall report to you this morning that the goals and time tables in Kentucky's plan have produced compliance and results in a timely manner.

As we develop the plan we relied heavily on the Federal Government, and especially the EEOC. We virtually adopted the eight EEO categories utilized by EEOC in its annual report.

All one thousand, four hundred-and-fifty job classifications in the Kentucky state government have been coded according to these eight EEO categories. The thirteen cabinets which shape Kentucky state government, in their recruiting, hiring, training, and promotions, practice that design and implement affirmative action plans that mirror and comply with state law and federal design.

What I am saying is this, as we speak the same language we can talk to each other and understand where we are and where we need to act next. This too, is an essential characteristic inherent to the Kentucky affirmative action plan. The share of responsibility.

Except for its own one hundred and twenty-five employees, the Department of Personnel does not singularly recruit state workers, nor does the Department of Personnel unilaterally, or arbitrarily hire, train, or promote state employees in the thirteen cabinets. It is not our responsibility. We do not have such broad authority.

These responsibilities we share with the cabinet secretaries and their staffs. I, for one, believe that this approach of shared responsibility is effective. Insuring that Kentucky's affirmative action plan is in service to equal employment opportunity for all Kentucky people.

To tell you the truth, parity with regard to non-white minorities has been achieved in the overall work

AND THE PARTY OF T

force. The plan has a goal of 7.4%. As of February 28,

1989, non-white workers accounted for 7.81% of the statewide
work force in Kentucky state government.

Parody for women at 52% of the statewide work force remains to be achieved. As of February 28, 1989, women constituted 47.3% of the work force in state government. Up from the end of the previous administration.

Overall, we have made a good start. That is my assessment as we come together today. Almost one year after we received the mandate and the authority to enforce the affirmative action law and three months into the administration of the plan itself.

I am happy to report to you this morning that as late as the close of business yesterday the thirteen cabinets are largely in compliance with the state plan. The thirteen cabinets have issued the required policy statements. The thirteen cabinets have made their utilization reports to the Department of Personnel. All thirteen cabinets have designated an EEO coordinators and counselors.

Where there is noncompliance is in the issuance of cabinet plans. Ten of the thirteen cabinets have not forwarded their plans to me as the state plan requires.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to use your forum to call those ten cabinets to compliance with the

statute. Your plan was due on February 1, 1989. This is March 22nd. I expect your plan on my desk by April 1st.

In the policy memo I issued along with Governor Wilkinson and the state plan I said, "All agencies within the state government are accountable for their participation in affirmative action". I meant that then, and I mean it today.

Already I have indicated the Governor's leadership in the implementation of the plan. I might add that he exercised his unprecedented leadership in the first one hundred days of his administration.

I assure those of you who are not blessed to call Kentucky your home that the Governor's leadership in affirmative action has made all the difference in the world, and its implementation in state agencies.

The Governor holds me chiefly responsible, and accountable for implementing the plan. As I just said, it is my job on the Governor's behalf to hold the agencies equally accountable.

The plan provides for means of accountability.

Every six months the state EEO coordinator in the Department of Personnel compiles the affirmative action record of each cabinet. The report is given to me and upon my review and approval is then forwarded to the Governor. I can assure you that no one alone is accountable. It is simply to say

that what goes around comes around. What started with the Governor returns to the Governor.

The Governor then shares the report with the cabinet secretaries, and they in turn share their report with the EEO coordinators of their respective cabinets.

This report contains these indisputable facts.

The current breakdown on all cabinet employees by race and sex. Whether or not the cabinet is in compliance with the plans goals and time tables. The number of women and minorities the cabinet needs to recruit or promote in order to be in compliance.

There are, it seems to me, to be two basic ways an agency to meet its basic affirmative action obligation.

Recruitment of new employees and promotion of incumbent employees.

As the Commissioner of personnel I am firmly convinced, based on seventeen personnel management experience, that both work. It does in fact take both, a balance of both. The plan mandates that we use both.

Prevailing circumstances in hiring in state government makes internal promotions a more viable outlet for achieving the goals of the affirmative action plan at this time.

Of course, state government like any employer must recruit from its work force from without. I am committed to

recruitment among Kentucky's private and public colleges, and universities and vocational schools. But, I would not hold out false opportunity for any one of those for the sake of appearances today.

The simple and astonishing fact is that there are, today, 28,000 qualified applicants on our job bank registers for positions with Kentucky state government. We have within the work force more than enough non-white minorities to reach our affirmative action goals in all eight EEO categories.

As of February 28, 1989, we actually had one hundred-and-fifty-eight more non-white minority incumbent workers in the state work force than would be necessary to achieve parity in the eight EEO categories.

The opportunity I would suggest to us all is promotion of incumbents through education and training. Of course there are specific categories and classifications with categories which can not wait for 541 people to receive training, certification, and qualification. But, I believe those to be the exceptions instead of the rule.

The cutting edge for affirmative action in state government today is to achieve parity within each eight EEO categories. We need to look within and promote within. We are doing just that.

According to the most current data for fiscal year

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

3 4 5

 1987, we appointed 2,394 new employees to the thirteen cabinets. 52% of these new employees were women. 12% were non-white minorities. At the very same time we promoted 4,186 incumbent employees. 52% of these promotions went to women. 7% went to non-white minorities. In other words, for every new employee added to the work force we promoted 1.7 employees. Almost two to one.

I do not know of another employer in Kentucky who has that kind of a record. As good as the record is I think with redirected effort we could be even better. We could provide more opportunity to women and to non-whites in the Kentucky state work force.

According to data compiled in our Department, as of February 28, 1989, we had added an additional 541 non-white workers in five of the eight EEO categories to meet parity in all eight categories. On the other hand we have in three of the eight EEO categories 699 non-white incumbents above parity.

In other words, as I suggested to you previously, we have more than achieved statewide parity in non-white employment. What this points out is a great deal of effort, and must be waged by state employees and state agencies to train, educate incumbent non-white minority workers for jobs in the middle and upper EEO categories. The need is at the top and not at the bottom.

I am very encouraged by the interest of First Lady
Martha Wilkinson in this regard. She is, members of this
advisory committee and distinguished visitors to Kentucky,
the commander in chief of Martha's army. An all out battle
to arm 100,000 Kentuckians with their GED certificates.

Among the state work force there may be as many as 3,500 workers who have not earned their GED. It takes very little analysis to conclude that these 3,500 employees congregate in the eight EEO categories located at the bottom.

If affirmative action is to extend equally to all workers in Kentucky, then we must be as diligent in training, educating, and promoting workers at the lower end of the scale, as we are in recruiting outsiders to the top positions. To do otherwise defeats our purpose.

In order to encourage and enable just about every single eligible state employee to get their GED, the Governor and I have issued an emergency administrative regulation. Reporting authorities, personnel administrators, and EEO coordinators should welcome this as an important tool in every affirmative action plan.

So, while we only have a three month indicator of the agencies compliance, and I find the record to be a good one so far, it is much to early for me to draw conclusions for you this morning.

}-A Be

At this point I see nothing but a willingness on the part of compliance on the part of the thirteen cabinet secretaries as they continue to implement the state affirmative action plan.

It was Herbert Spence, the English philosopher who said, "Progress therefore is not an accident, but a necessity". As I reviewed the affirmative action indicators from the state government in preparation for this forum, I found progress necessary to the erasure of discrimination from the public work force in Kentucky.

As I have indicated earlier, it is our efforts to insure equal opportunity for all state workers. We have the support of the General Assembly, the Governor, his cabinet and their agencies.

In addition to that basic level of assurance and progress I want to report other reassuring indicators of progress this morning.

In 1988, just prior to the issuance of the plan, the Governor asked me to walk the cabinet secretaries through the plan. At that time it was not statutory but by executive order. I did that in September. We exposed 350 supervisors, managers and policy makers from state and local governments of Kentucky to the plan in our state EEO conference in Louisville last September. The theme of that conference was captured in the poster, "Erase

Discrimination".

In December of 1988 I restructured the existing state EEO office within the Department of Personnel. Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to announce the significant actions, the affirmative actions we have taken in the state EEO office. Actions, which I believe, speak louder than words that I might say about affirmative action this morning.

When affirmative action was at the Governor's discretion, and not the law of the commonwealth the state EEO office vacillated in its visibility. Until January of this year the state EEO coordinator worked within a branch, within a division, within the Department of Personnel. That has changed.

We have elevated the position of the state EEO coordinator to the Commissioner's office, reporting directly to me. This move sends a clear signal to workers and cabinet secretaries, and the like, that affirmative action is a visible priority in Kentucky state government.

I fear that prior to this action, and despite thirteen years of faithful service by Joseph Humphrey, our previous state EEO coordinator, the location of the state EEO function indicate as something less than the kind of commitment the law now requires.

So, I have moved the role of the state EEO coordinator for all to see, and all to respect. I have made

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

Deputy Commissioner of Personnel Ralph Cunningham as the state EED coordinator. Mr. Cunningham has been Deputy Commissioner of personnel for nearly three years. He came to the Department from the staff of former United States Senator Walter D. Huddleston. I am persuaded that he is the right person for the job of assisting me in implementing the plan during this administration.

I have done more to restructure the state EEO office. The plan grants me the authority to appoint a citizens advisory committee. I have done so. The members of the committee include the thirteen cabinet EEO coordinators who share the primary responsibility for making the plan work. That is another acknowledgement of inherent sharing of responsibility of affirmative action in Kentucky's plan.

This advisory committee is an indispensable part of our overall design for achieving parity in the state government work force, and insuring equal employment and economic opportunity for every applicant and employee alike, with no regard to race, color, religion, national origin, handicapped, sex, or age.

That is one of the elements of restructuring that could have the greatest impact on the progress and success of affirmative action. I have merged the employee grievance process which can, and frequently does accommodate EEO

complaints with the employee assistance program.

While I will elaborate on this in a few moments, I do believe that this action is without precedent in the fifty states. With Mr. Cunningham, I have met with the cabinet secretaries as the plan calls for. To review progress to date. I will meet with every cabinet secretary as the year continues for the specific purpose of reviewing their progress.

We also have begun with the plan this year is an EEO conference. Early in February I convened key personnel leaders in my office to discuss concrete and specific ways to build on the success of the previous conference, and to broaden the context of this years conference within the fabric of the work force.

My commitment and my vision shared with the Governor, such that I want all facets of the work force, is to insure greater access to equal employment opportunity.

That, I believe, is affirmative action.

I have persuaded for reasons already mentioned that affirmative action is weaving its way into the structures of Kentucky state government, above and beyond our expectations. In other words, our task here is more to provide leadership on the front end than to coerce after the fact.

Here is a case in point. In 1986 the General

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

Assembly of Kentucky substantially lowered the number of 2 years necessary to be certified as a career state employee. 3 Instead of twenty years it is now only a required sixteen There are legal rights and privileges accorded to

career employees of state government.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Despite the fact that white males constitute the majority of the work force, the obvious primary beneficiaries of this action are women and non-white minority incumbent employees. I am especially encouraged by this action.

For those among us who prefer hard facts to the indicators I have enumerated, let me share this information. Based on the last data available from fiscal year 1987, we are making progress in affirmative action in two critical actions. New hires or appointments, and promotions.

As I reported earlier, in fiscal year 1987 there were 2,394 appointments to the classified service. 52% of these were women, 12% of these were non-white minorities. In that same year, fiscal year 1987, we promoted 4,186 state workers to higher paying jobs, and 52% of these promotions went to women, and 7% of these promotions went to non-white minorities.

In other words, since the beginning of the present administration the statistics, only one indicator I might add, point to the progress in state government in insuring

non-discrimination in hiring and in promoting within the work force.

It was Franklin Roosevelt who said, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little". I would like to add enough action and enough opportunity.

There is every indication that we are making the effort, and we are making progress in our efforts across the board to provide equal employment opportunity for those who have little or no access in the past.

We are, of course, without problems and barriers as we work to achieve our goals and time tables. Even the plan recognizes that there will be problems along the way.

Section IV entitled, "Problem Area

Identification", gives the prime responsibility for

identifying problems and barriers to the agency heads. At

any time one of the five characteristics is found, a high

priority for corrective action is required. The five alarms

are underutilization or concentration of specific work

categories of target groups, retarded vertical and/or

lateral movement among the target groups, eliminating the

target groups in selection, decreased participation in

workshops and training events by the target groups, and

evidence of nonadherence to agency policy by managers and

supervisors.

These are problem areas that would preclude achievement of our goals. We are on the alert to recognizing, to identify, and resolve such problems.

Barriers to progress include limited financial resources, and I would call individual perception.

By constitutional mandate we must live within our means. Like every person and organization in the world, if there were unlimited human and financial sources we could do everything all at once. At least in theory. But, we must focus on what is possible within our means, and as we are, and as I have indicated, so close to achieving the goals of the time tables in the plan.

One additional possible barrier I generally fear is the perception among women, non-whites and handicap, that despite the law, despite the plan, despite the total responsibility and commitment from the top, the pace of affirmative action is not swift enough to accommodate the immediate needs and agendas of individual workers.

I fear that the very groups of individuals who have the most to gain will become discouraged, and that will drop out from the work force. That would be a tragedy. A tragedy for each one of them, and a tragedy for the people of the Commonwealth who would be robbed of their energy, skill, ambition, and their wisdom.

I hope that whatever I have shared with you this morning in this forum will keep state workers from surrendering to despair and defeat.

I offer as well the life experiences of none other than the Governor and Mrs. Wilkinson. Neither the Governor nor Mrs. Wilkinson was born into privilege. They were handicapped by growing up in poor rural homes. They worked in factories, warehouses, and in the fields. But, they did not drop out, they did not give up. Today, they are living, quite frankly, in a fine home with fine jobs.

This is the testimony, real life experiences to the belief. As the Governor says himself, that anybody can make it if they do not despair.

I see these barriers to our success in affirmative action, and while they have the potential I share a strong belief in the power of human nature to overcome every obstacle, every barrier.

If we have anticipated problems and barriers then it stands to reason that we have provided a system for filing and resolving complaints of discrimination and unequal treatment. One of the very best aspects of the grievance procedure is, it is a formalized process that brings the aggrieved employee and the immediate supervisor face to face. In many instances the appointing authority as well.

ntongs.

Grievances first, last, and always are best settled at the lowest level. They are essentially the responsibility of the aggrieved employee and the respective agency. If, however, there is no resolution to the grievance, then the aggrieved employee has every right and opportunity within the parameters of the procedure to make an appeal to a third party, namely the Kentucky Personnel Board.

The Board has the authority to render a decision to solve the grievance with the effective law. This entire procedure costs the aggrieved employee no money. Every aggrieved employee has equal access to the grievance procedure. The grievance procedure assures the employee the opportunity to clarify, record, and resolve the conflict.

To make the employee whole if you will.

Instead of the current practice among many agencies of the government I would prefer, and so would the Governor, that the original philosophy behind the grievance procedure be recaptured by the various agencies heads and personnel administering.

Currently too many aggrieved employees end up before the Personnel Board by default rather than earned appeal. Let me be clear about this. The very best place to resolve any and all grievances and complaints from state workers is at the lowest possible level. Between the

aggrieved employee and his or her immediate supervisor.

Only the most extreme cases should ever be compelled to seek assistance beyond the cabinet or agency level.

Speaking of grievances and complaints, department personnel has also made some significant changes in the defining and processing of both. Over the last decade the distinction between EEO complaints and general grievances has blurred. The department personnel and the Personnel Board share a responsibility for this blurring along with the expedient agencies.

The current backlog of grievances before the Personnel Board is the result of the lack of distinction.

The plan is very specific about what constitutes an EEO complaint. I urge all personnel administrators and EEO coordinators to become familiar with the plans definition.

I further recommend that the administrators and coordinators become practiced at counseling state employees on the proper procedure to use such a plan if necessary.

As I announced earlier in these remarks department personnel, in a major shift, has not only sharpened the definition of an EEO complaint in the accompanying EEO procedure, we have also merged grievance counseling with the state employee assistance program.

It stands to reason that an aggrieved employee is

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

an unproductive employee until his or her grievance is resolved. More often than not the same behavior is exhibited by a troubled employee as an aggrieved employee.

For that reason we have merged these two functions. Before, employee assistance programs were seen as a tool of management, and grievances were perceived as a tool of the employees.

What we have done, among things, in our restructuring is to bring state governments tools for resolution together for the good of all.

As never before in state government, we have today, at the disposal of every state employee the most comprehensive system for resolving complaints, of discrimination or unequal treatment in the work place.

I began these remarks by saying that while I welcome the opportunity to share the information I have so far, it is a little premature for me to be making an absolute complete evaluations of the effectiveness of Kentucky's affirmative action plan. Soon enough, we will be doing just that according to the plan and its time tables.

There are, in this audience today, others who without the cumbersome task of enforcing the entire plan, will nonetheless be eager to share their opinions, suggestions and recommendations based on their own personal experiences with the plan.

 Like you, I want to hear what they have to say.

intend to invite them to come tell me what they tell you

today when the plan's time table requires that we comply

with that schedule.

Experience is the valuable teacher of life. With the plan mine is unfortunately limited. I have shared with you as best as I could this morning. I realize that I have shared information today for which, to the most part, was favorable. Rather than plow through the field of perceptions, I have relied on facts. Admittedly premature, but nonetheless hard facts.

At this point, as the chief enforcer of the plan,

I am encouraged, if not satisfied with our progress to

date. In images any Kentuckian would understand it seems to

me that we are rounding the first pool of a mile and a

quarter track. Most of the race and the action are still

before us.

I have given you, ladies and gentlemen, as honest and accurate a snapshot of affirmative action in Kentucky today as the available facts allow.

Others who will follow me today may indulge their perceptions. They will be no less valuable to you, I am sure, in your quest for the true picture of affirmative action in the public work place in Kentucky.

As we affirm the equality and opportunity in

Kentucky state government, I am reminded of the American naturalist and author, my favorite, Henry David Thoreau. He spent two years, two months, and two days at Waldon Pond. In Waldon you may remember the quote. "It is never too late to give up our prejudices".

Whatever injustice may lie in the past we shall have the opportunity at hand to move justice forward.

Affirmative action is a step in the right direction.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity this morning to be with, and share with you where I believe we are in Kentucky state government.

Thank you very much.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much Commissioner.

Now, we will open up with questions from the panel. Are there any questions?

MR. MULDROW: You indicated that overall state employment of minorities and women has more or less reached parity with the labor force, but there is a tremendous variation among cabinets. One major cabinet has only 1% minority employment I understand. Whereas another one has almost 12%.

How do you account for this variation, and do you see as part of your responsibility of implementing the plan to address this diversity of employment levels? Is that included in the goals of the affirmative action plan, or how

will that problem be addressed?

_ 14

MR. GREENWELL: Yes, sir, it is the responsibility of the plan. The responsibility of the plan is such that it requires in all eight EEO categories.

As I indicated in my remarks we are troubled by the fact that the highest concentration of that 541 employees that we really need to be in compliance with the eight EEO categories, are located at the bottom of the first categories. They are service, maintenance type categories.

Through internal promotion, through retraining we have made some strides in doing that. I think our record of two promotions for every single outside hire will address, in the future I think, our efforts towards GED award. GED encouragements will allow those employees at the bottom the opportunity to seek advancement for themselves.

There are obvious job classifications at the top that we will have to recruit for. It is going to be difficult to take a janitor and make him into a lawyer. Or take a cook and make her into a general counsel in an agency. So, those kinds of recruitment efforts will always have to be present at the top.

What we are primarily emphasizing and hoping, that we can take the higher concentration of minorities in the bottom categories of the eight EEO categories and move them up as best we can.



MR. MULDROW: Still, the diversity of obtaining parity would not be resolved by promotion within. It would seem to me to be requiring intensive recruiting efforts, and hiring efforts on the part of some cabinets.

Are the goals that are set, are they across the board goals for all cabinets, or does each cabinet set its own hiring goals?

MR. GREENWELL: The goals are for state government as one employee. 7.4% for minorities, and 52% for women. It applies to all eight EEO categories in all of the thirteen cabinets.

We have participated in career days at universities. We last year participated for the first time in blacks in higher education. We intend to do that again this year.

We learned as recent as last week of a new Masters degree program at Murray State University, that the cabinet for natural resources have been recruiting from. We intend to participate in their career day this year for the first time. We did not, quite frankly, realize that is where they were going for recruitment purposes.

The Kentucky Commission on Human Rights every year publishes a directory, if you will, of black graduates of Kentucky state colleges and universities. We have always contacted those individuals advising them of opportunity for

employment in Kentucky state government. We will continue to do that in the future.

We will make those recruitment efforts in those career day visits as visible and successful as we possibly can, while at the same time not overlooking what I consider to be a very important element of our program and our plan. That is to try to take care of those who are already on the work force and provide them with upward mobility opportunities to at least another EEO category that may be just right above them.

MR. PEEPLES: You made a comment that you had provided us with some facts, and that we could pretty much look forward to some perceptions later. To me, it came off as the facts versus the perceptions position.

Could you give me, even if it may be hypothetical, what you perceive as the specific facts that show that you have achieved versus what we might look forward with coming on as some perceptions?

MR. GREENWELL: If I could, Mr. Chairman, maybe I can give you two. One would be on the fact that employees, unfortunately, feel that promotional opportunities are not as available as they would like for them to be.

They think that often times that a new administration often only goes out and hires new employees, new appointees, and that is simply not substantiated by

facts.

The fact is that for every single new employee we hire we have promoted 1.7 state employees. That is a fact versus a perception on the part of the employees.

Another example, I think, would be is that the plan, as I see it, affirmative action as a whole, is often perceived as being too slow. The grievance procedures seen as being something that you really do not want to get involved in because of problems that may occur after your complaint has been resolved, either to your satisfaction or not to your satisfaction on the part of the fear.

Hopefully, we have resolved that by streamlining that and keeping the grievance procedure at the lowest possible level where that the employee, and their immediate supervisor are resolving the very complaint that probably was created those two individuals.

MR. PEEPLES: Your affirmative action plan, as you stated, will be a year old the end of this month, and you went through a series of presentations to various department heads, and persons who are going to carry the hiring responsibility.

MR. GREENWELL: That is correct.

MR. PEEPLES: What was the basic general receptivity? I mean, how well the affirmative action plan itself received by those persons who were going to have this

responsibility?

It has been my experience with the urban league that people basically come kicking and screaming when they are told that is what they are to be in compliance with.

MR. GREENWELL: I would prefer to call it this way, that it was received and perceived, received with good feeling. Perceived with some fear because of the historic and non-traditional obstacles that I think they realized they faced.

The Cabinet for Natural Resources for example, historically has been a non-traditional curriculum for females to go through mining technology. For the Cabinet Secretary across the state government, it has been non-traditional for white males to go through secretarial science.

Traditionally across the state government is has been non-traditional for women to take electricity, plumbing, and carpentry work. Industrial work in college, or even in vocational school.

It is that fear, I think, that they all were concerned about. How do we find 7.4 percent minorities to do this type of work? How are we ever going to get, instead of having 95% female secretarial support, how are we going to reduce that to 52%? How are we going to get 52% of our women to be carpenters, electricians, plumbers, truck

drivers, to be females? It is that, I believe, that scares them more than anything else.

As I told them at the point in time that we discussed that, that we have, in fact, inherited the historic problem. That it is the educational system, the non-traditional education system that we must overcome. That we must make work for us for the first time in order to be in compliance in that specific way. It is going to take an amount of time to do that.

It is going to require a great deal of effort on the part of recruiting, and on re-training those kinds of individuals, and those kinds of employees who are willing to cross career paths after a period of time.

MR. ROSENBLUM: Mr. Greenwell, for about ten
years several members of this panel worked very closely with
the Kentucky State Police. Do you have any statistics
today, if not today you could send them to us, indicating
what the female employment and black employment is in the
State Police?

MR. GREENWELL: I do not have that today. As a matter of fact I cannot even get it at my office.

The State Police is not a part of our personnel system in state government. They have a separate independent personnel system, but I can, however, get that from them to provide to the committee.

MR. ROSENBLUM: I wish you would. You were not in compliance the last time we checked, after ten years of tracking this. We would like to know.

MR. GREENWELL: We will just have to acquire that from them for you all.

MR. DEN UYL: You mentioned two or three times the importance of education for promotion and so forth. Perhaps I missed it, but could you be more specific exactly what programs you have for getting people not only their GED's but perhaps other more advanced educational training to prepare them for promotions?

MR. GREENWELL: Yes, sir. We have a number of things, but first let me address the GED, if you will, and then we will address the higher education program.

The GED, we will provide for a 10% one time lump sum payment of their annual salary for any employee who received their GED. It used to be 5% percent of their annual salary, and it has stayed there for a number of years.

We felt that the program needed a fresh kick, a new start, and we decided to double that amount of money.

It now provides for a 10% lump sum, one time annual payment for every employee who receives their GED.

On the other end of the spectrum we provide for an educational increase. After an employee has completed 260

classroom hours of higher education, we have a program that will provide to an extent educational leave with pay. It is not granted often, but it is available for selective classification where we are having difficulty in recruiting, and/or retaining a particular job classification.

We have educational leave without pay where the employee, on the approval of their appointing authority, may be given as much as two years to pursue higher education.

We also have available a tuition assistance program where the employee who is not able, on the front end, to be able to purchase supplies and pay their tuition, we will do that.

We feel like that we have a fairly broad spectrum for any employee who wants to better themselves. Either through the high school education equivalency, or through higher education.

MR. SCHWEMM: Could you briefly explain why the state police in not a part of your system, and are there any other groups that might be considered by people like me who are outsiders of the state government as naturally within your group, and would be surprised to learn, as I am, that the state police are not in your system?

MR. GREENWELL: Historically the state police, and when I say historically I cannot tell you this morning for how many years, have been independent. An independent

agency of the personnel system.

The Department of Personnel was established in 1960 by then Governor Combs. It has always primarily been referred to as Chapter 18 in the statutes. The state police has always been found in Chapter 16.

It would be my suggestion to you, and that is all it is, is that they go back that far, at least from the previous twenty-nine years, that they have not been a part of state government personnel. They are not merit employees, but an independent agency.

The state police employees, the non-uniform employees, many of those are found, if not all of them are found in Chapter 18. The only exception would be the policy making employees.

But the uniformed personnel, which I believe this gentleman is specifically talking about, are not to my knowledge ever been located in the merit system, nor under personnel statutes.

MR. SCHWEMM: Just briefly, without going through this whole Charter. Are there others, like the state police, that are not under Chapter 18?

MR. GREENWELL: There will be a few but they will not be of the size of the state police. That looks like an organizational chart showing the thirteen cabinets. All of those are going to be within the personnel system. There

1 will be some small agencies on there that will not have any 2 classified employees, merit system employees if you will, 3 but they will be an office with maybe a half dozen employees 4 or something like that. Is the situation with the state 5 MR. OBERST: 6 police typical nationally, or just a Kentucky peculiarity? 7 Do you know? MR. GREENWELL: No. sir. I do not. I do not know 8 if that is a national problem or not. 9 MR. MULDROW: You have a very large job, 10 Commissioner, implementing the plan for twenty-five thousand 11 employees. Is that what it is in the State of Kentucky? 12 13 MR. GREENWELL: Some thirty-two thousand. What kind of staff do you have to 14 MR. MULDROW: 15 help with job? What kind of resources are assigned to this task? 16 17 MR. GREENWELL: This specific task? MR. MULDROW: Yes. 18 As I said, it used to be in a 19 MR. GREENWELL: branch within a division within the department. We have 20 21 just moved it to the Commissioner's office. 22 We have a staff assigned specifically to this program of three employees that work solely in the area of 23 24 affirmative action and equal employment opportunity.

لا ي الريخ

25

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

Three employees?

MR. MULDROW:

MR. GREENWELL: Yes, sir. We only have a hundred-and-twenty-five in the whole agency.

MR. MULDROW: Do you consider that to be adequate for the job?

MR. GREENWELL: It took a pretty good hit. I do not know how many of you are familiar with health insurance in state government, but it took a pretty good hit because last September we found out that we were not going to have a carrier who was going to underwrite, or offer us an indemnity package.

State government in November, for the first time, was forced to go to a self-insured program. We had a consultant come in and tell us what we needed to do for a short period of time.

One of the first criticisms that they had of the Department was the fact that we only had 2.4 people assigned to the health insurance program. The Department I think historically has not been blessed with a great many employees.

I am not one for hiring people just for the purpose of hiring staff, or having them available. I like the people to work, and I like them to be busy. I think people are happier when they have something to do. Quite frankly, I do not necessarily believe that we need to hire anybody else. We have coordinators in each cabinet. We

の心療を

have expertise available to us and are called from any cabinet that we want.

I do not see that the Department of Personnel has suffered, or will suffer in the future as a result of not increasing the size of that staff like we did in the insurance program.

MR. PEEPLES: Commissioner, thank you very much for your time.

MR. GREENWELL: Thank you and this committee very much. I appreciate the opportunity.

MR. PEEPLES: We will next hear from the Executive Director of the State Personnel Board,

Mr. Authur Hatterick.

MR. HATTERICK: Good morning, Mr. Peeples,
Director Muldrow, members of the committee. It is a
pleasure to be with you today.

I would put you on notice probably that if someone is wanting to get a few words in I am not going to take a half a hour.

It is nice to be with you this morning. The
Kentucky Personnel Board, for what some of you might be more
familiar with, is as a civil service commission. In most
states they are referred to as civil service commissions.

In Kentucky the State Personnel Board and the Personnel
Department, since the inception of the merit system in 1960,

they were basically one.

In 1982 the Personnel Board was carved out and it was designated as an independent body to serve primarily as a quasi judicial body to hear appeals, and complaints relating to employees covered by the state merit system, Chapter 18.

Chapter 16, which the earlier question was referring to the state police, I believe at the time that the state police, who at that time I believe they were attached to the Department of Highways, they were the old highway patrol, and at the time that they were singled out and separated from the Department of Highways, I believe then Chapter 16 was promulgated and enacted.

They have been separate and have their own separate board, similar to our board, that serves the Chapter 18 employees, the merit employees.

But, that has been some time ago that the highway patrol was carved out, certainly in excess of thirty years I would imagine.

The Personnel Department, at that time, was part of the old Finance Department. I would prefer that this committee be an appropriations and revenue committee because I would like to be here asking for more money.

The Personnel Board's situation today is that we are considerably backlogged. In fact, as of today we have

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

 approximately 350 appeals, if you will, of all types that are backlogged. We are scheduling cases today that were filed with the Board last April. We are almost, at this point in time, running a year behind.

That is unacceptable., I think that is unacceptable to the unacceptable to the employees, and it is unacceptable to the agencies, and it is not fair to all of those that are involved. However, that is the situation as a result of the amount of appropriation that the Board has been allotted to accommodate the appeals that have been filed.

But, at the same time the Board has been rather productive in the number of actions that it has been able to address, and I would just like to give you a few short figures in reference to the 1987-88 fiscal year that ended last June. There were 300 appeals that were held. We had a carry over at the beginning of that fiscal year of 250. During that year there were an additional 611 appeals filed. We were able to get out appeals totaling 498. Meaning that we were able to enter final orders on almost 500 cases, which still left us a carry over 363 cases.

The appeals this year are running at about the same level, a little bit more. As of today we have received, this fiscal year, since last July 1, we received a total of 520 filed appeals.

Now, I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity

in which to break them out with some more meaningful figures in reference to the types. I do have some general, but maybe not as far as you might have preferred, that I would prefer. I just did not have an opportunity to go through and analyze them individually.

But, some statistics that I believe might be useful to you. That is, approximately 10% of those that have been filed relate to charges of alleging discrimination. Of that 10% approximately half of those would relate to the protected class categories; race, sex, age.

The other half primarily allege political discrimination. I do not believe you would like to discuss that today, but if you would I am sure we could.

So, really the Board addresses all types of appeals, whether it is for a routine dismissal, demotion, suspicions, allegations of discrimination or whatever it might be. The Board addresses them on a first come first serve basis. First in, first out. That sometimes generates some problems for the employees, for their witnesses.

As to the effectiveness of the system for the filing and resolving complaints of discrimination, as to your requested suggestions, your recommendations relating to any disparities and discrimination in state government, I think the procedure that the Commissioner was eluding to

this morning of the EEO complaint procedure, hoping that that will kick in and will work.

It should resolve a lot of problems for the Board. It should also resolve more timely complaints and grievance relating to questions that the Commissioner's program should address and would never have to get to our adversary situation. Because when it comes to the Board it certainly is one of an adversary relationship, and anything that can be resolved at that lower level, less adversarial, everyone would be better off we would think.

I would be glad to try to respond to any questions that you may have in reference to the Board's normal activities, or historical experience.

That is all that I have of my presentation at this time.

MR. PEEPLES: Questions?

MR. MULDROW: I think we would be especially interested in the roughly 5% of the appeals that you handle which relate to discrimination. I wonder if you could give us some indication as to what those involve, what types of complaints are coming forward involving discrimination?

MR. HATTERICK: Several types. One would be those individuals who feel that they have received disciplinary action different than males, and/or whites.

We have received many non-white appeals eluding to

the fact that they have received disciplinary action more harsh than their counterparts in the same facilities, the same agencies. They have gotten a thirty day suspension, and other individuals have received on week suspension. they were dismissed, and somebody else was suspended. is a common kind. We have a few where females are eluding to the fact that the last supervisors that have been appointed for years have always been males. We are receiving a few more of those than we used to in the past. Probably those are the ones that hit me the most number wise. MR. MULDROW: Would you handle appeals dealing with hiring discrimination in the hiring process? MR. HATTERICK: Our jurisdiction goes to not only employees, but also applicants and eligibles for positions. Whether they are current employees or not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MULDROW: Do you receive complaints directly, or only at the appellate stage? In other words, can an employee complain to you directly in the initial stages of an action?

MR. HATTERICK: An employee, or an applicant who feels that they have been discriminated against, penalized or whatever, can file directly with the Board.

> MR. MULDROW: So, you do not deal only with

> > Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

appeals then? You would be the investigative authority, procedures?

MR. HATTERICK: They file directly with the Board, and that then develops into the appeal hearing.

MR. SCHWEMM: To carry that through. After your decision, if it is favorable to the employee, do you have the power to direct the agency to change its position about the employee?

MR. HATTERICK: Yes, we do that. I believe I am safe in saying this. We are the only agency in state government that has the authority to direct agency compliance. Other agencies such as the Human Rights Commission, they have to go to the court to get one of their orders enforced. But, the Personnel Board has the ability to directly order an agency to comply.

Once that has been done, once the final order has been issued either party has thirty days to appeal that circuit court.

One of the new provisions of the last session, or the session before last of the General Assembly provides that if an employee wins on appeal before circuit court, if it goes that far, they can get attorney fees. Normally, with the Board, and now with the Board, cases before the Board, the prevailing employee cannot receive attorney fees. They can now if it is appealed to circuit court, and they

win at the circuit level. That was a recent addition.

q

MR. ROSENBLUM: Would you briefly describe, or sketch the outline of your Board, the composition of the Board?

MR. HATTERICK: Yes. We have five members that are appointed by the Governor. Two are elected by the merit employees themselves. The five that are appointed by the Governor we have three males, three white males, two white females. Of the two merit employees, one white male, one black male. The black male is a recent selection as a result of a vacancy, and was selected by the other members of the Board to fill out that remaining term.

But, those are the seven members of the personnel Board.

MR. ROSENBLUM: Do they have a personnel background?

MR. HATTERICK: Most of them are management type people. Two of the Governor appointees are attorneys. One is a President of a bank, and also happens to be President of the Kentucky Bankers Association. One is a executive, and she is vice-president of a radio station, and an ex-mayor of one of our communities. One is a professional insurance, home builder.

The two merit employees both have considerable personnel background experience, probably ten to twenty

يون التيانية. إلى التشاهدة years experience each.

MR. MULDROW: As an outside I find the complaint processes available a little confusing. It is my understanding that each cabinet, or agency has an internal complaint procedure. Individuals can also complain to the state Human Rights Commission, and from what you are saying they can also complain to you. How do they know which avenue to follow, or is it optional?

MR. HATTERICK: I think it depends on who they talked to last. State employees do have a unique situation in as much as there are two agencies that they can file an appeal, regardless of the grievance or complaints. There is a difference there on what they can file with the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights or the Personnel Board. There are different benefits. There are different time frames as to when those must be done.

The Chapter 18 specifically provides a set procedure for those employees who are covered by Chapter 18, the merit system law.

The Kentucky Commission law covers basically all employers/employees in the Commonwealth. Yes, employees can file with the Commission, and they can file with the Board also if it is something that the Board has jurisdiction for.

Most areas of filing under our law is thirty days from the date of the alleged action. With the Commission,

180 days maybe. In some cases the Commission can do its actions, get certain benefits for the complainant. The Board cannot. It might provide services that the Board cannot.

The Commission has to go to court maybe if they cannot reconcile with everybody's agreement. Whereas with the Board, the Board can give a direct order for payment or whatever. There has been some success as far as the Board is concerned, because in the last twenty or some years the Board has been involved in back awards to the tune of about twenty million dollars. So, it has had a considerable amount of exposure that way.

But, the grievance that you talk about, as I understood the question, is really different from the complaint that they can file with the Kentucky Commission, and/or the appeal, if you will, that they can file with the Personnel Board.

The Department of Personnel earlier eluded to the EEO complaint procedure. That is something that we have not had a lot of experience with yet, as the Commissioner indicated. That is kind of early on. That is in addition to these other statutory provisions that we are referring to.

MR. OBERST: As I understand it, ninety-five of your business does not overlap?

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

MR. HATTERICK: That is correct.

MR. STEWART: The statutory regulations relative to the appeal process as well as compensation for the attorneys at the circuit court level, if he wins his attorney gets paid, is that true?

MR. HATTERICK: Yes, sir, that is all statutory. There is no attorneys fees to a normal appeal process, normal Board hearing. But, as a result of a Board order that is appealed to circuit court and the employee prevails at the circuit court level or above, then there can be an award of the attorney fees to the employee.

Not through the services rendered before the Board, but for the circuit court and above.

MR. MULDROW: From your perspective is the affirmative action plan in the state working? I mean, it has been in place almost a year now. What are your observations? Is progress being made in overcoming the problems?

MR. HATTERICK: I would say this. It is working, it can always work better. It is like the questions that you were asking of the Commissioner earlier, some of the agencies apparently are doing better than others in some of the higher categories. Those areas, certainly, will be able to place more emphasis on their needs I believe.

The statistics that the Commissioner shared with

you this morning I think indicate an increase of previous years, and previous years from that. In 1972, I helped prepare the first affirmative plan for state government, and I know what was involved at that time in getting the first one drafted. I have seen it change a little bit each time, and see a little different emphasis placed on it. Also to the point that the Commissioner indicated earlier, the time tables and goals that have been added now with the recent legislation.

Those are all pluses, and I would like to think that it will lead to better gains in future years.

MR. STEWART: The Commissioner of state police, who does he answer to and is there statutory regulations regarding his procedures?

MR. HATTERICK: The Commissioner of the state police, I think at this time, is also the Secretary of the Justice Cabinet. But, Chapter 16 is a specific law that addresses all of the circumstances of the state police. The hiring, their board, their review process, their appeals, their compliment direction of how many of certain types of ranks there is to be in the state police work force.

But, all of that is covered specifically in Chapter 16, including any authority to promulgate regulations.

MR. STEWART: But, the affirmative action plan

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

that was adopted by the state does not cover the state police, is that right?

MR. HATTERICK: I do not know. I am sorry.

MR. OBERST: Has there not been a long standing tradition of non-civilian participation in police department matters?

MR. HATTERICK: All of the employees in the state police department who are non-uniformed type, they are covered by the state affirmative action plan. They are covered by Chapter 18. It is only the uniformed personnel that are exempt.

MR. PEEPLES: Any further questions?

Mr. Hatterick, thank you very much for your time.

We will now move to the segment of our program where we are going to have employee organizations, and the first employee organization to address us today will represent Blacks in State Government. Its President, Ms. Karla Walker.

MS. WALKER: On behalf of the Kentucky Blacks in Government, now referred to as BIG, I want to thank the Kentucky advisory committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for the opportunity to participate in this community forum on the employment of minorities and women in Kentucky state government.

BIG, a national organization conceived in 1975 by

black federal employees, was incorporated as a non-profit organization under the District of Columbia jurisdiction in 1976.

It functions as an employee support group, and advocacy group for equal opportunity, and a resource for black government employees.

The Kentucky chapter of BIG, in accordance with its national philosophy, functions as an advocate of equal employment opportunity for blacks in government thereby encouraging agencies to promote blacks when vacancies occur, and assist in recruiting blacks for all job categories, especially managerial and administrative positions.

We also attempt to provide a mechanism for the synthesis, dissemination, and coordination of information for blacks in government, as well as identify issues of concern to black employees, and explore methods to address these concerns.

Attached to the materials that you have before you is a fact sheet with additional information on our organization.

I will now address the issues as outlined in your March 1, 1989 letter. The basis of our statements are the staff reports of the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights, and interviews with state government employees.

It is our belief that Kentucky's affirmative

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

_ .

action plan, prior to its being signed into law by Governor Wallace Wilkinson on March 31, 1988, referring to Senate Bill 163, cannot be assessed as to its effectiveness yet, because it has not been fully implemented and enforced.

Even though some agencies have attempted to meet the federal mandates as required, no agency has fully or adequately participated in the State's plan. So, it has never been fully implemented and enforced.

Most state agencies tend to be reactionary.

Therefore, if the plan is not enforced they would only do the bare minimum.

Our observation is that no progress has been made in non-discrimination for minorities. We have come to this conclusion based upon information provided by the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights, and specific comments by employees concerning the equal opportunity.

That is, lack of opportunity for training.

Unequal treatment on the job. Lack of opportunity for promotion on career development. Lack of an open promotion system, and a disproportionant disciplinary action among blacks.

There needs to be a thorough understanding that the number of minorities and women hired is not the only determinate in assuring equal opportunity.

We looked also at what types of jobs that are

being recruited, hired, trained and promoted in. Generally, no definitive steps have been taken to recruit or promote minorities or women to upper levels.

Black employees are found in disproportionate numbers in the lower salaried positions, and few are able to obtain upgrades to the higher level positions for which they qualify.

Black employees are disciplined in a substantially higher rate than other employees with similar work records, and offenses. This inequity has been reported to the EEOC, the State Commission on Human Rights, and to the Kentucky Personnel Board.

No improvement in this area has occurred. No legal action has been pursued by black employees due to the inability to recover legal fees if the matter is successfully litigated by the employee. If an employee goes to the Personnel Board and is not accompanied by an attorney, unless that employee is also sophisticated enough so that he can handle the legalities of the problem, they may not win their case as the Personnel Board does not help you prove your case.

There are some specific problems and barriers in achieving the plan's goals. A lack of commitment at the executive level that stems not only from the government, but on down through the agency heads and managers in the

different departments.

A lack of funding and adequate staffing of state EEO programs. A lack of strength of regulation and full enforcement of civil rights law. A lack of adequate training on civil rights laws for state employees. A lack of education in the area of civil rights in the Kentucky educational system.

Because there is no enforcement there is a lack of confidence in the application of the effective EEO system. There is also a lack of adherence to goals and time tables set within the plan. There is a lack of knowledge and confidence in the complaint procedure, and I am speaking particularly of the EEO procedure.

There is also inadequate training for agencies on affirmative action, and the affirmative action plan.

Agencies are not made to take responsibility to implement the plan, and thereby identify needs.

There is also a fear of political retaliation, if it complies accordingly, or if they set the pace for compliance. Agencies are also reactionary. Many fail to take a pro-active approach in this matter.

The EEO complaint procedure that is identified in the plan does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Kentucky Personnel Board.

Last, minorities have little political power to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

demand a share of high paid political positions.

In regard to the effectiveness of the system for filing and resolving complaints of discrimination or unequal treatment, the one in the plan, because of its lack of legal standing, is inoperable. It is based upon good faith and commitment which indicates that it is designated to frustrate or dissuade individuals from filing complaints.

Also many employees, including management, are unaware that the EEO complaint procedure exists.

In order to alleviate disparities, or discrimination in state employment we recommend the following. Staff, fund and implement the needed civil rights and affirmative action programs. Create an EEO compliance and enforcement office which reports directly to the Commissioner of Personnel and that has the necessary authority to perform his duties.

Enforce, identify goals and time tables that is listed in the plan. Encourage the federal agencies to fulfill their responsibility to monitor and require compliance by the state agencies. Provide the recovery of legal fees for those who successfully pursue civil rights claims before the Kentucky Personnel Board.

Publicize the need for equality in all personnel activities, especially discipline towards lower level employees. Require government agencies to carry the burden

of proof in discrimination cases. Provide penalties for those who wilfully violate and refuse to comply with civil rights laws.

Provide training or education in the area of civil rights. Provide a salary improvement fund for black employees. Recruit, hire and promote blacks in management positions, both merit and non-merit. Enforce sanctions with state employees who fail to comply with federal civil rights laws. Penalize agencies that fail to comply with Kentucky's affirmative action plan. Revise and utilize the State's skills bank in recruiting and hiring practices.

Create a clearing house for all professional and managerial position openings which would disseminate the information to minorities and women in a timely manner.

Allow the active involvement of blacks in government, and the creation and implementation of an effective affirmative action compliance program.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that although on paper Kentucky has an affirmative action plan, realistic implementation and compliance by Kentucky state government agencies is improbable because of the lack of complete implementation and enforcement.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much.

Any questions from the committee?

MR. MULDROW: You have been very helpful,

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

Ms. Walker, in presenting specific recommendations regarding problems that your organization sees.

Have you had the opportunity to discuss these with the Commissioner of Personnel, or any other official responsible for implementing the plan?

MS. WALKER: We have not had an opportunity to discuss this particular thing with them. We have talked with the Commissioner of Personnel, we have talked with the Deputy Commissioner of Personnel on various topics, but not all of these things in specifics.

We do offer, and are open to the opportunity to do that.

MR. MULDROW: You have not specifically requested, in other words, a discussion with the Commissioner of Personnel who is responsible for implementing the plan?

MS. WALKER: We have not done that this year, no. We have, last year, made attempts to speak with either the Commissioner or his Deputy, and they have been favorable in terms of speaking with us on a one to one basis.

We have invited the Deputy Commissioner as well as the Commissioner to come and talk to our organization about our particular concerns in these particular areas.

We have also addressed the Personnel Board in terms of administrative regulations in regard to promotion.

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

MR. PEEPLES: Is there a possibility for a black in state government to participate on the affirmative action committee that was mentioned earlier this morning by the Commissioner?

MS. WALKER: To my knowledge we are not on that committee. We do have, and I think to my knowledge, unless he has appointed someone within our ranks, that I am not aware of that. There is a member who is an EEO coordinator. So, we may have some representation, but no specific representation

MR. PEEPLES: I ask that because having sat in this position for the last several years I am a step forward in saying that this is probably the best documented and prepared testimony that I have seen brought to us that addresses the issues, and has taken the time to go a step further and say, "We recommend", based on our experiences.

I am thoroughly pleased with this, and I am also pleased to note that Ralph has said they will take that under advisement.

MR. STEWART: You stated that you have reported discrimination to various agencies, the EEOC and the Commission on Human Rights. Have you sent in a response, and if you have, have you received a response?

MS. WALKER: To my knowledge we have not had a response. Also those inequities have been reported not only

by use, but by other individuals as well. They are aware of them, I believe. Mr. Hatterick eluded to the fact that they were aware of the disparities in terms of disciplinary actions.

I have spoken and they have talked with me, but we have not had any particular conversation.

MR. PEEPLES: No other questions?
Thank you very, very much.

Next, George Parsons, President of the Kentucky Association of State Employees. I do not see Mr. Parsons nor Ms. Maxberry. So, what we are going to do is take a fifteen minute recess to see if either of our next presenters come in.

(Whereupon, short recess taken.)

MR. PEEPLES: We will now call this hearing back in session.

We will call on Ms. Charlesmarie Maxberry, President of Womens Network.

MS. MAXBERRY: I am Charlesmarie Maxberry,
President of Women in State Government Network. Our
organization is about three hundred strong here in
Frankfurt, and about a hundred throughout the state.

We are women that are concerned about the plight of other women, of all women. Most of the programs and activities are designed to enhance the professional growth

د پرین د پرین

of women.

Most of us have met through the organization, however, when we discuss our plight in state government or our experiences, our experiences are quite similar. In fact, alarmingly similar.

An example of the similarities came up recently at a discussion of women being interviewed, job interviews. Two women related that during an interview they were asked if they intended to become pregnant in the near future. This apparently was the criteria for receiving the job. One woman was asked if she was using birth control pills. Several women have been asked if they are still in their child bearing years.

These things are repeatedly happening. No one was surprised in the room. We were in the room with about seventy-five women, and no one was surprised. You would think that these were questions that were asked twenty years ago. These are questions that were asked in 1987, and 1988.

You wonder why these women have not filed complaints about this unequal treatment. The reason is, they do not want to become known as trouble makers, or if they were believed at all, many times it is a long process, they cannot afford it if they have to have it inside the grievance procedure within state government.

These are things that really do not come out, or

you will not find anyone that is going to come here and stand, and explain that knows a lot about it. But, you can get it from the average employee that you talk to on the street.

You have asked for suggestions on how certain things can be done. It is my opinion that in terms of how the affirmative action program is working, the implementation throughout state government, and the results and things, I think you would get better answers if you took maybe a hour at each state office building, and just stopped people on the streets and ask them.

What do you know about the plan in your agency, in your cabinet? Have you been approached, have you seen the plan? Have you been told about it? Who is your EEO coordinator? Things like that.

That is I think, in my opinion, where you really get answers. The people that are here today have been asked to come. We have prepared comments, and we have probably geared them at being tactful.

But, these people would at least say, "No, I don't know about the plan". "Yes, I do know about the plant", and go from there.

So, in my opinion that is where you get your real answers.

Like I say, I am here representing women in state

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

government. However, as you see I am a minority also. Many times we discuss our plight in state government, and the thing that you hear most is, that women and minorities want an opportunity to compete. They want to know about job vacancies. That is the number one comment. People want to know about job vacancies. Some areas do advertise job vacancies, others you never hear anything about it. So, that is a major concern.

Our organization recently did a promotional opportunity survey. I have the results here today, and I am going to pass our copies. One of the things that women said, the majority of the people that were surveyed said that they were classified as professional or administrative. However, they did not feel that they were supervisors or managers.

In my opinion I think that they are not considered when decision making takes place. So therefore, they never feel like they are in the positions they have been put in.

Another sad part of it is that eighty percent of those surveyed felt there are not adequate promotional opportunities in their agencies, and in state government. Some feel like that they are even willing to take a cut in pay or demotion to be able to get into an area where they can move higher. So, these are things that we concern ourselves with in the Network.

Some other major themes that we do discuss is the operation of the affirmative action plan, or just the treatment of women, or whatever, throughout state — government. We, at least, have a member in every cabinet, every constitutional office, so we all get together and compare notes.

One major cabinet is conducting training sessions for their EEO staff and their management staff. Not many others are doing that at this time. In my opinion it should be done. It would prevent a lot of things from happening that do happen.

For instance, one person mentioned that at the meeting that she was told the reason she did not get a certain job and a man did, which would have been a promotion to her, was that he had a family to support, and he needed the money.

Another person stated that a cabinet secretary told her that if she was interested in more money why did she not get a husband. The same cabinet secretary said that women that are secretaries should not aspire to be anything but secretaries. Yet, these women do not want to do anything about it. They fear doing anything about that.

The affirmative action plan says that we should feel free to file grievances. That we should not be intimidated. However, there must be some problems out there



3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the people do feel intimidated because they are reluctant to do this.

With that I think I have completed my comments.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you.

Are there any questions from the committee for Ms. Maxwell?

MR. MULDROW: I was surprised to hear you say that it is difficult to learn of job openings. How are the job openings made known? Does each agency announce its own positions, or is this done through a central office? How does it work?

MS. MAXBERRY: I do not know a lot about that. However, in my agency we do post them. However this is only open to those within the agency unless you have a networking group that gets the word out to others. This is what we are asking for, is that these jobs somehow or another be circulated throughout state government, and people be permitted to compete for them.

MR. MULDROW: How about women applying for jobs from outside of the government. How do they learn of openings?

MS. MAXBERRY: Through advertisement mostly, I would say.

MR. MULDROW: The jobs are advertised in the newspaper?

MS. MAXBERRY: Right. However in state

government there is not a vehicle for this, and this is what

we are asking. Possibly someone from that area could answer

it better than I, but this is something that our

organization has repeatedly asked for.

MR. MULDROW: One of the striking statistics that

has been given to us is that disparity in the wage level of

women and male employees. Is this because most women are

employed at the lower job levels, or is there a disparity in

salary levels within the same job classifications?

MS. MAXBERRY: I would say both, and I would say

MS. MAXBERRY: I would say both, and I would say that has to do with accountability in a sense. In that these things are happening, and we as women, as I said before, some actually leave their jobs, they are not going out on a limb and call attention to inadequacies that they know about.

MR. MULDROW: You have listed quite a few perceived problems in the system with women.

MS. MAXBERRY: Well, I think they are more than perceived.

MR. MULDROW: Has the Womens Network done anything systematically in bringing these to the attention of the Commissioner of Personnel, or any other responsible authority?

MS. MAXBERRY: On the 28th of last month we met

range Tarang with the Personnel Commissioner, and discussed these things with him and are following up our comments, and his comments with a letter to him this week.

MR. MULDROW: What was his response to your negotiation or discussion?

MS. MAXBERRY: Well, he tried to address the areas that we brought before him, and discussed guidelines that he is working under, that the state is under. He gave us suggestions on how we can go about improving the situations. We will continue to communicate with him.

MR. STEWART: Could you give us a little more information on specifics in regard to the filing of grievances and appeals, and why their is a feeling of despair. What is the reason for the despair? Is it because of the time it takes for grievances? We heard earlier that they are approximately a year behind on grievances and appeals.

MS. MAXBERRY: Well, one procedure is that you go to your immediate supervisor, and it goes through the levels. If that grievance had anything to do with your immediate supervisor you do not really go to a person to complain about that person. Some people have had some problems with doing that I am told. Or with complaining about how things are.

As you know, it is sort of human nature, that you

1 become known as the trouble maker, and you are ostracized 2 and the word gets around, and things are not so good for you after that. 3 4 MR. STEWART: So, the fear of repercussion is 5 present? 6 MS. MAXBERRY: Causing people not to complain. 7 To accept it and try to get around it through other means. 8 But, these are things we are working towards trying to alleviate. 9 10 MR. OBERST: As I understand it, the whole 11 personnel system depends on your dealing with your immediate 12 supervisor? 13 MS. MAXBERRY: Right. That is where the problem 14 is. 15 MR. OBERST: You are saying that is a hopeless effort to have a grievance? 16 17 MS. MAXBERRY: In some instances, yes. 18 MR. OBERST: How high do you think you ought to 19 go? How far away from your office? 20 MS. MAXBERRY: Well, I would say start with that 21 person's supervisor rather than the immediate supervisor. 22 Your second line supervisor possibly. 23 As I say the Personnel Commissioner has been quite 24 receptive to our comments, and at this time we will present

him a letter and continue to communicate with him.

25

•

MR. SCHWEMM: Do you know if there is any way, following up on your examples of these interview questions, that someone such as the Personnel Commissioner, or somebody else in state government, even though there was not an individual complaint, might send out a newsletter or something of that nature for people who are in the interviewing position?

To say for instance, "It has come to my attention that these examples take place, and I am telling you that they are inappropriate".

I mean, part of what is going on, it seems to me, is you have individual isolated examples that your group shares with each other, but there is never any person either through the complaint process or anywhere else telling the offending individual that you should stop doing that.

Now, I think one of the things we would be interested in hearing is if you have any ideas as to how we can past this kind of stuck position that we seem to be in?

MS. MAXBERRY: Well, we have not arrived at that point yet ourselves. But, we are open for suggestions also.

MR. SCHWEMM: The picture that I am seeing you paint is that the person who is asking these questions must not think that they are inappropriate questions.

MS. MAXBERRY: True.

MR. SCHWEMM: The only way that person is going

to be educated, if you will let me use that word in a very broad sense, is if there is some mechanism to call inappropriateness to those questions to, I assume, his attention.

So, you are still working on how to do that I assume?

MS. MAXBERRY: Well yes, we are. As tactfully as possible. But, we are working on it.

MR. SCHWEMM: You did not mention it, but do you see any evidence of increased or decreased sexual harassment on the job with your perspective as the leader of this group?

MS. MAXBERRY: No. We have not had that.

However, in Commissioner Greenwell's talk with us one of the members did ask him at the meeting if he would have someone to come there and discuss that, and tell us in terms of what our rights are, how to avoid it, or how in many instances to detect that is actually going on. Things like that.

But, we have not really discussed that.

MR. OBERST: One of the things that the Human Rights Commission has done is prepare or buy films which explain just exactly what people's rights are, and all that is improper. Maybe that kind of thing would help you with your questions and interviews.

MR. PEEPLES: Any other questions of

✓ Ms. Maxberry?

Thank you very much for your presentation.

Our next presenter is Mr. George Parsons who is the President of the Kentucky Association of State Employees.

Welcome Mr. Parsons.

MR. PARSONS: A I am George Parsons, Kentucky
Association of State Employees.

Concerning a request for information pertinent to implementation of the affirmative action plan and efforts to insure equal opportunity in state recruiting, hiring, training, and promotional practices the Kentucky Association for State Employees offers the following response.

The number one topic addressed in the letter was an assessment of the plans effectiveness. The response is that the state affirmative action has not been implemented. The state agencies have tried to send out public statements indicating commitment to equal opportunity, but little effort has been made to recruit, hire, or promote minorities to management positions. The same holds true for women and handicapped applicants and employees.

Next is implementation by the various state agencies in their compliance with the provisions of the plan. Few employees have seen the state affirmative action plan, and few state agencies have fully complied with it.

An indication of what progress has been made toward assuring non-discrimination and how this is evaluated, we have seen little indication of progress toward assuring non-discrimination. We have found no clear policy or direction from the State's executive staff.

What problems and barriers are there in the achievement of goals? There has been a lack of commitment, leadership, funds and staff to implement an effective effort to provide for those protected by the many civil rights laws.

The effectiveness of the system for filing and resolving complaints of discrimination or unequal treatment. There are three basic avenues for state employees to pursue civil rights concerns. The Kentucky Personnel Board, the Federal EEOC, and the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights. Each of these avenues has serious drawbacks.

The State Personnel Board is not staffed to investigate and monitor civil rights violations, and the Board will not allow a successful complainant to recover legal fees. Consequently the cost of those civil rights actions before the Board must be borne by the complainant.

The Federal EEOC cannot enforce the finding of discrimination against state agencies, therefore state agencies feel little need to feel concerned about them.

The State Commission on Human Rights does not have

any of the above problems, but they are a state agency.

Many women and minorities indicate that they are reluctant
to pursue complaints against the state. The Human Rights

Commission seems to have authority to choose the

complainants to be assisted.

Suggestions or recommendations for alleviating any disparities or discriminations in state employment, we recommend that the Governor and all executive officials be advised and implement the law.

We recommend that the state and federal civil rights enforcement agencies, and state federal grant agencies be petitioned to carry out their enforcement and compliance responsibilities.

We recommend that the state hire on the basis of merit in an open and competitive manner. We recommend that the reason for the unusual number of disciplinary actions, disciplinary activities toward minorities be investigated, and that some remedial action be taken.

We recommend that all employees be given an equal opportunity for promotions and other salary increases.

I hope that this information will be of assistance to you. I would like to point out one personal note if I may. In working with handicapped people as a vocational rehabilitation counselor in addition to working with the Kentucky Association of State Employees, it was an idea of

our professional association that perhaps the authority of the Human Rights Commission should be extended to cover handicapped. It does not address handicapped in the Kentucky civil rights legislation.

We recommend that the one word be added,

"Handicapped" to the civil rights legislation. That was met
with some very serious, very strong opposition. The

Executive Director indicated that that would cost a lot more
in staff. They were not qualified to handle that sort of
thing, and that it would better suited in the Department of
Labor.

The Department of Labor will not, and it cannot do anything about discrimination in housing, voting, education and so forth.

In addition to, and I want you to understand that in addition to the Human Rights Commission, being able to select which complainants they will assist, they are also able to avoid any provisions in the law to assist the handicapped.

Can I answer any questions?

MR. MULDROW: Mr. Parsons, could you give some background on your organization. Who belongs to the Association of State Employees?

MR. PARSONS: The Kentucky Association of State Employees is open to all classified employees. We are

trying to expand membership to part-time and so on.

Preferably those who are not management oriented. But it is an association who is affiliated with AFL-CIO, so ours is a union.

MR. MULDROW: Is affirmative action specifically a part of your organization's agenda, or are the points you are making growing out of your general experience with the association, and general involvement with the State? What connection does your association have specifically with the affirmative action plan?

MR. PARSONS: Just from working with state employees. We are a small organization and probably not a significant forum for complaints in that we probably do not have any authority to resolve. We do hear complaints, and those complaints where the management people, or Civil Rights Commission has declined to act, then those things are brought to our attention.

But, my concern has just been in working with state employees, and listening to the concerns that they bring to me, and trying to address those concerns.

Recommendations to the Personnel Board, the Commissioner.

We

try to attend the public hearings, present information, facts and so, before various legislative committees.

So, the Association is just concerned with

employee problems. We do not have an affirmative action plan, we do not have that many employees. We only have three employees. My largest concern is the issues and concerns employees bring to me.

MR. MULDROW: How do you deal with complaints that are brought to you which are not handled by the Kentucky Commission or internal offices?

MR. PARSONS: Our assistance is pretty well limited to helping the person file the grievance, and go through the appropriate channels. We do have a legal defense fund that is certainly limited, and we try to restrict that to people who have some severe disciplinary action.

But, it is a matter of concern. I do not know how much assistance we can be if this individual likes to go on past the grievance, through the administrative channels and go into court. I am not sure that we have the funding to assist them any more than that.

MR. SCHWEMM: You mentioned that you thought most of the state employees had not even seen the affirmative action plan. How large physically is that? I am leading up to the question, why does not state government make a copy of that available to each individual employee? How large is the affirmative action plan information?

MR. PARSONS: It is a booklet. I would say fifty

or sixty pages, something like that.

MR. SCHWEMM: That may be part of the answer. I guess the crux of my question is I think it is terribly important, that comment that you made, be addressed, because people cannot very well understand what their rights are if they are not able to see it.

I am sure there would be some cost to distributing it to every employee, but I like the idea. Is it available upon request, or all the materials are at each agency?

MR. PARSONS: I am sure it would be available on request. You would have to know who to request it from. It is a matter of finding it, and if you have a request from all the different employees that I would that there would be some reluctance to furnish that many copies. If I requested it, and if I could find the proper person to address that request to, that I have been able to get copies of what I have needed.

MR. STEWART: One other question. Do you have any problems getting recognized by the State Personnel Board in presenting your grievances, or when you do present them?

MR. PARSONS: I am not putting the grievance in for myself.

MR. STEWART: No. When you said you would assist them in filing the grievance, some of the employees.

MR. PARSONS: Well, the grievance procedure was

promulgated as an administrative regulation by the Kentucky Personnel Board as an administrative channel. It goes only to the appointing authority. After that the employee, if he is still dissatisfied, can appeal before the Personnel Board. At that point he can only be represented by an attorney, or represent yourself before the Personnel Board.

So, we are not able to represent them or assist any further than the grievance procedure, unless we can provide legal assistance for the person going before the Personnel Board.

MR. STEWART: My last question would be, do you have an agreement for your organization with the State Personnel Board?

MR. PARSONS: We have no formal agreement, no.

Any other questions?

MR. SCHWEMM: One other question. By coincidence I happen to be the Vice-Chair of the State Human Rights Commission, and I thought I would share with you what my understanding is of how we choose complaints, because I think it might be a little different than what I have heard you say.

My understanding is that we do not have a policy against, or in any way choose what cased to hear except on the basis of whether or not there is evidence of probable cause. If that is different I certainly would like to be

informed of that. I mean, you are suggesting to me some of your members think that the Commission, as a matter of policy, does not want to hear from you folks, and I certainly do not know of that policy and I wanted to share that with you.

I would be happy to have them make whatever complaints that I think are appropriate, and if there is probably cause found that is the only barrier to proceeding. Is there is not evidence of probable cause we cannot proceed. But, if there is evidence of probable cause I assure you that we will either proceed, or I will find out why we are not proceeding. I certainly do not want your membership to misinformed.

MR. PARSONS: I am certainly going to relay that to them. But again, it does not address any handicapped issues.

MR. SCHWEMM: That is right. Now, let me make one other comment about that, and I am sure that even my Executive Director would agree with.

I do not know of any success in civil rights that ever happens without a struggle. I suggest to you that if you feel strongly about this, and if there has been a set back once, you try it again.

MR. PARSONS: I will.

MR. SCHWEMM: I think you might find some allies,

even amongst the Human Rights Commission.

MR. PEEPLES: Any other questions?

Thank you very much. ...

We have exhausted the morning agenda. We want to thank all persons who have made presentations to us, and would invite you back to join us when we reconvene in this room at 1:00 p.m.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, lunch recess taken.)

MR. PEEPLES: Now that the members have taken their places we are going to call to order our afternoon session which begins with community organizations.

Our first presenter is Mr. William Coefield, state President, NAACP. Welcome, Mr. Coefield.

MR. COEFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I must admit that the last communication I received said that I was to make my presentation at 12:45 p.m. I must say to you that I was in here at 12:45 p.m. and made my statement. I hope that you enjoyed it. Just a little humor there.

I do have prepared remarks for you. I represent an organization that is the, as we look at it, the most loved and of course the most hated. The most feared, revered, the largest, and oldest. We think also the best. The most talked about, the strongest civil rights organization in the world.

 In this country there is over twenty-five hundred branches and a few units in foreign countries. In Kentucky alone there are sixty-five adult units, college chapters and youth counselors representing thousands of concerned citizens both black and white in this Commonwealth.

We are now celebrating our 80th anniversary. We were founded in 1909 in the State of New York by white liberals and black militants.

We are meeting in a regional convention in Louisville starting on the 16th of this month, and going through the 19th. We are inviting all of you to come and share with us. We are bringing all of our staff in, the national staff, because it is one of our training sessions that we have every year. Ben Wilson will be there on Saturday evening to give the Freedom Fund attest.

I must say in Kentucky, because of the fact that our Governor, or cannot succeed themselves at this point, we do a little research in the second year of each Governor's term, and our present Governor is in his second year now, and so we during our convention in October we will paying him a visit, as well as the cabinet secretaries, and each division of the cabinets as best we can. We will be willing to share whatever we find at that time.

The Kentucky's affirmative action plan acts to identify the administration's commitment to insuring that

employment opportunities in state government are free of discrimination.

The major thrust of an affirmative action—plan must be recognition and removal of all barriers to equal employment opportunity.

The credibility of this plan is predicated upon the adherence to the goals the affirmative action plan establishes.

The current Kentucky affirmative action plan became effective July 15, 1988. Its time tables call for full implementation of its program by June 1989. The plan instructs each governmental agency to formulate its own affirmative action plan compatible with the state plan.

These agency plans were to contain measurable goals and time tables, and this way implementation of the state plan objectives would be most effective in employment practices, especially recruitment, hiring, training and promotional efforts and could be monitored toward achievement in a specific manner.

A review of the status of minority employment, before and after implementation of the plan, shows as follows.

We are talking in terms of two years here, 1983, prior to the affirmative action plan, and of course 1988, with the current plan.

*%

In 1983 there were four agencies that employed no minorities which represented 13.8%. Also at that time we had no minority cabinet heads, and we know that in Corrections at that time Mr. Wilson was heading it, but there was some controversy relative to Mr. Welch's position as opposed to Mr. Wilson's.

There were sixteen agencies that employed a 1% to 7% of minorities, and that represented about 55.2%. Nine agencies employed greater than 7%, and that was 31%.

However, in 1988 two agencies employed with this plan zero minority, that is 5.7%. Of course we have one minority cabinet head which is 2.9%, and twenty-two agencies employed 1% to 7% minority, and that is 62.9%. Ten agencies employed greater than 7% minority, which is 28.6%.

The work force in 1983, minority composed 6.8%, and of course in 1988, it is 7.8%.

The goal of the affirmative action plan, the Kentucky state government minority work force, is that Kentucky state government minority work force be representative of the State's work force was achieved. The gains of minority employment are represented by an increase of 1%. The goals of the affirmative action plan made a difference in this regard.

There are other gains to be noted that were not specifically addressed as goals of the affirmative action

plan, which nonetheless are brought about by deliberate equal employment efforts. As noted, the number of agencies employing no minorities decreased with implementation of this plan.

These agencies are slowly making their way toward compliance with the State's goal of 7.4% minority work force as evidenced by the increase of agencies employing 1% to 7% minority after implementation of the plan.

The number of agencies employing greater than 7% minority increased by one. Indications are that this goal is slowly progressing toward actuality.

The plan also established goals of 7.4% minority employment in each of eight job categories. A further review of available information did tell us the status of these goals. Again, I will use the 1983, and the 1988.

Job categories of officials and administrators, in 1983 we had 2.9%, and in 1988 3.0%. Professionals 4.7% in 1983, and 5.2% in 1988. Technicians 5.7% in 1983, and 5.8% in 1988. Protective services 6.6% in 1983, and 5.7% in 1988. Paraprofessionals 13.4% in 1983, and 12.6% in 1988. Office and clerical 8.1% in 1983, 7.3% in 1988. Skilled craft 4.1% in 1983, 6.2% in 1988. Service and maintenance 19.4% in 1983, and 16.75% in 1988.

Minority employment decreased in four of the eight categories from 1983 to 1988. This trend does not suggest

individual agency efforts toward achievement of these goals.

The plan does not define non-compliance, nor does it speak to any actions to be taken toward agencies which are not demonstrating a good faith effort toward achievement of the goals. In this one regard the plan lacks direction.

State agencies are required by the affirmative action plan to develop agency plans with action plans specifying how goal attainment is to be accomplished.

The action plan is to include a sequence of activities, date of projected completion, and person responsible for completion.

As mentioned before, without an enforcement mechanism gains made are on tenuous ground.

Most minorities in state government, according to the above cited information, are employed in the job categories of protected services, paraprofessional, office/clerical, and service maintenance, with the majority in the last category.

These jobs are the lowest paying ones being such positions as library assistants, medical aids, messengers, clerks, custodial workers and general laborers.

According to a 1986 Kentucky Commission on Human Rights report although minorities were comprising 7.4% of the work force they received 5.6% of the payroll. Surely imbalances such as this are affected by the types of jobs

performed by minority employees.

The plan should address this concern by devising, implementing, and monitoring a career advancement program. Increase emphasis and support on training, particularly along a specific career path will enhance the pool of qualified minority applicants.

The suggestion is not for a program solely for minorities, but for any fully utilized career development employment will aid in career progression for all employees, including minorities.

The Commissioner of Personnel assisted by the state EEO coordinator is responsible for the implementation of the State plan. The agency EEO coordinators under his direction are to communicate the State's commitment to equal employment opportunity to every manager and supervisor, making them accountable for attainment of the goals. It is the manager or supervisor who is usually regulating every day employment activities.

For the past two years the Department of Personnel had coordinated training conferences for EEO workers and management personnel. The last conference was a collective effort of several of the state government largest employers. This encouraged participation from all levels of government. Training in human relations and affirmative action trends are some of the topics that were presented.

ie. P Although some progress has been made by implementation of the plan there are areas of concern. An employee has several avenues for filing and resolving complaints alleging race discrimination. The grievance procedure, state EEO complaint process, the Personnel Board, Kentucky Commission on Human Rights, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The latter three agencies are administrative bodies who processes can take a year or more. The state remedial avenues are the most swift for an appealing party.

The Department of Personnel does not keep records regarding the number of grievances filed alleging race discrimination. The system is an important one, but its reliability and effectiveness is not demonstrable at present.

A state EEO coordinator with strong experience in affirmative action, equal employment opportunity is necessary for the cohesiveness of the State's affirmative action plan. A liaison is needed to monitor the progress of each cabinet toward goal achievement.

To assist in recruitment efforts, maintain current statistical data on the plans effectiveness in all areas, including upward mobility, disciplinary actions, and dismissals. Note deficiencies and offer recommendation toward correcting deficiencies.

The position of the EEO coordinator is currently vacant.

The issues of actions toward agencies in—
non-compliance should be explored. For example the Natural
Resources cabinet and Legislative Research Commission
maintain a minority work force of less than 3%. However,
the Energy cabinet has zero minority according to the latest
report available.

Commitment to achieving results is the key to the success of an affirmative action plan. The commitment must start with the chief official and filter throughout the work force. Without the commitment of top officials the effectiveness of the plan is nullified. The commitment of Kentucky's top officials was demonstrated by Senate Bill 163, which makes the affirmative action plan law.

We wish to thank this committee for convening to discuss the issues presented here today. The efforts and interest such as yours are needed to boost state government's upwards to creation of a discrimination free work environment with periodic focus monitoring of the goals, and achievement of the plan.

The continuation of the good faith efforts demonstrated thus far by Kentucky state government, the idealism embodied in the plan, will reach completion.

Again, thank you very much for allowing me to come

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

and make these few remarks.

q

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much Bill.

Are there questions of Mr. Coefield from the committee?

MR. STEWART: You made a statement that the EEO coordinator office is vacant at the present time. How long has that been vacant, or, has it been appointed to?

MR. COEFIELD: I would imagine it has been vacant two months at the most.

MR. PEEPLES: We might be able to ask Ralph. Was the information we were given this morning regarding that position, was that the announcement of the filling of that position?

MR. HATTERICK: Yes.

MR. MULDROW: Mr. Coefield, a couple of the presenters this morning voiced complaints about difficulty in knowing about job openings, and implying some deficiency in the recruitment process.

Does the NAACP assist in this effort in any way?

Are they problematically geared to helping to provide

applicants for state jobs in any way?

MR. COEFIELD: We can assist and we do in certain situations. Of course, if we know about them. Even from the national viewpoint we have John Johnson, who heads up our labor area, who sends periodically to us jobs that have

submitted to him. Of course, we disseminate that material to our membership.

If there are those positions that are there, and we know about them most assuredly we do inform our people.

MR. MULDROW: * I guess what I am getting at. Does the State in any systematic way contact your organization as part of a recruitment network?

MR. COEFIELD: Systematically no. Because of the fact that I do know people in personnel, in many instances have some knowledge of what is there. We are able to contact our members throughout the state.

MR. MULDROW: In talking with you on the telephone prior to this conference did I understand you to say that you have had some discussions with agency leaders regarding affirmative action and equal opportunity?

MR. COEFIELD: We go back over each administration, which we do our study of each administration, that kind of thing. That is what I was referring to.

MR. MULDROW: What has been the results of those? Have they receptive, responsive to your suggestions?

MR. COEFIELD: Most assuredly. What has happened, it has kind of tightened them up to the extent that they have moved forward. In each administration you see a degree of improvement, and I think you can attribute

part of that to the fact we do a monitoring process.

MR. PEEPLES: Any other questions. Thank you very much, sir.

Representing the next community organization, Dr. Betty Sue Griffin, National Council of Negro Women.

MS. GRIFFIN: On behalf of the National Council of Negro Women I would like to thank Mr. Muldrow and the members of the advisory commission for inviting us to share information with you this afternoon.

I have come to do two things. The first is to share with you the fact that we recognize that there is a serious problem when it comes to employment practices, policies, and the way in which they are implemented.

Secondly to talk about what the National Council of Negro Women is designed to do on a national level, and what it is doing locally to try to fill in the gap.

I suppose we are very proud of the fact that there is an annual conference each year, among many other activities that take place in Louisville.

We just finished with the sixth annual conference, and those conferences are designed to do several things. This year we have two major focuses, and one of those was employment, what could we do to try to address the issues, and second, which is not totally alienated from the first as an objective, what can we do to prepare our youngsters to

enter the employment work force.

It was very interesting when we were educated as members of the organization to the problem that existed.

Not just here in Kentucky but nationally. Most of us are native Kentuckians, so we are very proud of what we represent, and many times we feel very uncomfortable when we find that we are still in trouble.

We discovered, unfortunately, that of the 37,000 employees in state government, many of them located in Louisville, that only 2,751 were black.

We were equally shocked when we discovered that for new hires who happen to be black, they make on the average of \$1,400.00 and \$8,600.00 less per year that has nothing to do with degree status, or the amount of previous experience that they bring.

One of the interesting things about the council is its creation of a data base from surveying its members relative to the amount of experience they have, what they bring to a job, their degree profile. We discovered some very shocking and disturbing facts that some of the people with the highest degrees and the greatest number of experience was making the fewest number of dollars.

In order to try to see if we had some one that agreed, we discovered that our data was not as complete as it should be. We looked at two sources of data compiled by

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

T.

**

 the Human Rights Commission here in Kentucky. One of those is the status of women in Kentucky state agencies, that I am certain you are familiar with, and the other is black employment in Kentucky state agencies.

From those reports we discovered that we are not getting better, that we were getting worse. As it relates to black females, of the 1,815 females employed by state government there are only 493 who represent the gender or the race of black.

Again, the average black female makes in state government \$14,000.00 a year, while the average white female makes \$17,000.00 a year for the same job.

Now, this is not new. This is not new data, and as I said, our data was not as recent or current as we thought it was, and we were shocked at ours. So, when we picked up the reports we discovered that we needed to do a little bit more in this regard.

Again, it is not new. I think Dr. Bethune recognized this years ago when she founded the organization. She said simply your legacy is to do something to fill in the gaps, not just when it comes to education, but when it comes to employment, when it comes to keeping your members current, and doing something for self.

That conference in Louisville is a prime example of what the organization is doing to overcome these

problems. Several of the work shops were designed with these very topics in mind. To provide leadership skills, to provide information about jobs through networking. —

As an example, one of the conference work shops was entitled, "The Skies the Limit, Breaking the Glass Ceiling". This was designed for those individuals who happen to be in management positions, saw the top but could not get there.

So there, techniques, ideas and strategies relative to what one needs to do in order to network within the corporate structure, or state government structure as well as how one deals with stress.

Another topic that I think you might find most interesting that took place was called, "Reaching Back, Leave No One Behind", which incidently was Dr. Bethune's motto when it comes this. Under that guise not only were there five hundred young people there on a Saturday morning that we involved in career leadership kinds of things, but also to talk about developing skills in mentoring.

Improve the wage earning power was another topic that addressed specifically what is happening in state government. Not necessarily from the standpoint of having to go out and moonlight.

Office protocol and imaging was most interesting, and certainly working with difficult. Attitudes, politics



1:--

and other hidden agendas that provide barriers to employment

It was decided in many of those work sessions that one of the things that we needed were the dollars, or grants. Monies that would come into the organization that would allow for a complete data base. Monies that would come in that would allow for youth employment from individuals that we could screen and refer for summer employment, especially in state government.

Our compliment of young minorities in state government, and especially female is unacceptable. At the same time we are most concerned with continuing the kinds of activities that the council is now involved with.

I will be happy to try and answer any questions that you may have about anything that I have said, or something that I have left out that maybe you are interested in relative to the council activities.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Are there any questions?

MS. CLEMONS: I would like to ask you about the statistics that you gave on the female employment within the state. I was not quite clear. Are we speaking of 1,800 or 18,000.

DR. GRIFFIN: 18,000. Thank you.

MS. CLEMONS: So roughly half of the employees in the state are white females? DR. GRIFFIN: Yes. MR. STEWART: I have been kind of skeptical. Would you be afraid to say that one of the criteria for employment in state government is political activities? there favoritism? DR. GRIFFIN: On a personal level I could not agree with that. I am from Kentucky. I returned five years I have no political affiliations. In fact, I did not even know who the Governor was at that particular time.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the things that I have discovered, however, it was not so much political affiliation as it was just general information about how one goes about applying for a job in state government, which is totally different than anything that I have experienced before.

Prior information is certainly helpful in that regard, and that is one of the things the council has attempted to do.

Most of the employees that work in the particular cabinet that I represent as a state government employee, were hired through the system. They were not appointed to the position. So, I am afraid that on a personal and professional level I could not speak to that.

> MR. MULDROW: Does the council in any way have a

systematic tie with state government in terms of assisting with the recruiting process, or for women, especially minority women in state government?

DR. GRIFFIN: There is no formal system that is designed at this particular time. However, through the individuals who work with state government I am called quite frequently and asked about available positions. I call individuals quite frequently.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much.

I would like to just speak for a minute, a question to you Bill about the state recruitment process, or any systematic methods of doing that.

I am of the contention that it takes creativity and innovative methods to deal with problems of recruitment the kind of problems that we have in state government. I would like to give testimony just to one.

Recognizing just several years ago when the Department of Transportation in connection with some of its recruitment efforts with the Urban League realized a deficiency they had with particularly black females.

We put together an internship program. First, we had women who graduated from our computer training operation, and they created positions within the department for them to do a ten week internship with the anticipation of the enrollment into permanent jobs. We had a high degree

of success with that.

The Department of Transportation, in its own wisdom, decided to fund that and they provided a grant to the Urban League that we used to defray the travel expenses of the young ladies, to assist them with their babysitting and to provide them minimum wage for the ten week period.

We found that is has been beneficial to all concerned. They win because they got access to employees, we win because they get an opportunity to work, and we found it to be a very good program that is now probably about five years old.

We are now trying a pilot of that with another department. I say this just to say that when you recognize those kinds of problems you have to put your creative hats on and let your creative juices flow to make those things happen. When you want to do it I think there are ways to make it happen.

Next, we are going to move to the section of our program of legal services. We will have

Mr. Daniel Goldberg, who is the directing attorney for the Appalachian Research and Defense Fund of Kentucky.

Mr. Goldberg.

MR. GOLDBERG: I am here to discuss my involvement in the federal court case of <u>JoAnn Bowe vs. The</u>

<u>Department of Parks</u>, that culminated in the entry of a

consent decree in November 1987.

I am the directing attorney of the Columbia office of the Appalachian Research and Defense Fund, and I have been working on the <u>Bowe</u> case since I joined the organization in January 1982.

Applered, as we are sometimes known, is a rural legal services program funded by the Legal Services Corporation. Before coming to Applered I was employed by the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights for three years as a field investigator and staff attorney.

In July of 1980, JoAnn Bowe, with the assistance of my office and Robert Bertram, a private attorney in Jamestown, Kentucky filed a compliant of employment discrimination in the U.S. District Court in Bowling Green.

Ms. Bowe, a black woman worked in the laundry at Lake Cumberland State Resort Park for the previous four years as a seasonal employee. In 1980 the park at Lake Cumberland had no blacks on permanent status year around, as opposed to just a seasonal work force.

Ms. Bowe alleged in her complaint that she had been denied advancement to a permanent position because of her race, and her complaint was later joined with the complaint of Wilbur Wooldridge, who was in a similar situation.

Through discovery and other information we learned

that at the peak of the summer season in 1980, the

Department of Parks statewide employed sixty-four out of a

work force of 2,931. 2.18%.

In a three year period, 1978 to 1980, out of 268 individuals who received permanent full-time appointments five were black. Less than one half of one percent.

In the higher positions officials earning \$16,000.00 or more, professionals, technicians, paraprofessionals, there were zero blacks out of a 106 positions. It seemed that the few blacks who were employed by the Department were relegated to a relatively few job categories, and according to a report of the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights in 1979 blacks occupied positions in only twelve of the 165 total job classifications.

Armed with these figures we asked the court to certify these two individuals, Ms. Bowe and Mr. Wooldridge as representative plaintiffs in a class action so that we could challenge the under representation of blacks throughout the Department's statewide work force.

It may surprise you to learn that the District Court never did certify that class, and in 1987, after seven years of filing motions and responses, and Motions to Reconsider, and expert data analysis and so forth on the class certification issue, we were faced with the prospect of going to trial on the two individual cases, and having to

1-

3

4

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sixty Circuit.

Then something unexpected happened. Henry Curtis, the Department's attorney, and June Hudson who was Commissioner of Parks must have come to the conclusion that the Department's employment of blacks, which was still stuck at the 2% level, was a disgrace.

litigate the issue of class certification in an appeal to

Finally, as a result, in November 1987 we signed off on a consent decree in which the Department of Parks promised to increase black employment from 2% to 7.2% with all deliberate speed.

The plan seems to be working, and it is working without strict hiring quotas or rigid time tables. plan, and this is somewhat of an oversimplification, but basically has four key elements.

First, and overall, the hiring percentage goal of 7.2%. The second, a recruitment plan for disseminating information about job vacancies to the general public with emphasis on minority recruitment resources.

Third, implementation of additional record keeping at the individual park sites with each park maintaining a list of black applicants.

Fourth, something we call the special notice provision for permanent positions, and what this provision says, and in effect it creates a preference for hiring

blacks because it requires that if a black applicant is within the top five names on the eligibility register for a permanent job and is rejected, then the plaintiff's attorney has to be notified of the reasons for the rejection.

Finally, the decree will terminate when the hiring goal has been reached, or in five years, if despite good faith efforts, the goal cannot be reached in that period of time.

The only monitoring of the decree that we anticipate consists of our reviewing the annual reports that are to be submitted under the decree with the possibility that we could then go back to court if reasonable progress is not being made, or if it appeared that a particular with a particular job category was still closed to black employment.

What message does the Park's experience hold for other state agencies? As a plaintiffs attorney perhaps I should say to those agencies, if you do not clean up your act bad things are going to happen to you in Federal Court.

My experience in this case, however, is that progress has been made. Not because the court was going to compel it, but because the responsible official wanted to make it happen, and were willing to make it happen.

Prior to the welcome arrival of Mr. Henry Curtis on the scene two propositions were taken to be true by the

4-3000

attorneys representing the Department. First, that there were hardly any blacks available for employment in the rural counties where the parks are located. Second, that there was nothing that the Department was doing, or could do in Frankfurt that could possibly have an affect on hiring around the state.

To illustrate these attitudes let me quote directly from a brief that was filed in the <u>Bowe</u> case in June of 1982. "Because the resort parks are located in remote areas of the state where few blacks reside, and because the pay available for park employees offers little incentive for relocation, few blacks have applied for positions in the state park system, see Exhibit B showing availability of blacks in counties where resort parks are located."

The next quotation, which is really stunning and I do not even know what he meant to say, but his is what it says. "Mr. Faust is the personnel director for the Department of Parks, and in that capacity has absolutely no input into, or involvement with the hiring, promotion, or firing of park employees."

Yet, when the Department got serious about hiring blacks, and hiring for the 1988 summer season it placed 149 blacks out of the 1,053 new hires, thereby raising its seasonal work force in one stroke of 14%.

Similar progress has occurred in the permanent job categories in which despite a much slower rate of job turn over, black employment has gone from 2% to 5% in just a little over a year.

These results, I think, offer proof that the previous excuses that had been given were false. That blacks are available for the jobs, and that actions taken in Frankfurt can make the difference.

For years, it seems to me, Frankfurt has paid lip service. You might have had a dose of that this morning to the notion of affirmative action. Now, Henry Curtis, who I think does deserve most of the credit, has shown that it is possible to do something, and I am certain that taking on this new project has not made Henry's life any easier, but as he knows, and as I think the people here would agree, the appointing authority should do the publics work in the publics interest, and not because it is the expedient thing to do but because it is the right thing to do.

Thank you.

MR. PEEPLES: Any questions?

MR. MULDROW: That is a very encouraging picture you outlined there of what has happened. I am wondering, Mr. Goldberg, are there incidents of this nature that you have dealt? I mean, is it a rare thing for you legal services to deal in matters involving state employment? If

someone has a legal problem can they come to your organization for help in this regard?

MR. GOLDBERG: My office is just a two attorney office, and we represent a six county area, and we have to handle the routine divorces, consumer complaints, social security cases, and everything else that there is.

So, it is pretty rare that we can take on a major case of this nature. Generally, if someone comes to us at a minimum we try to steer them in the right directions. If it is employment discrimination we refer them to the State Commission, or to the EEOC to file a complaint, and then in some cases we would follow-up on it, or pick it up later after they receive a right to sue letter.

But, there really have only been a handful in the seven years that I have been there. We have had three or four federal court cases involving job discrimination.

MR. MULDROW: One of the concerns raised by a previous speaker was the lack of legal resources to pursue complaints beyond the initial stages. I am just wondering if there are resources that are available which might not be well known, including those of your organization.

Are there other sources that you know of that would help?

MR. GOLDBERG: To pursue court action?

MR. MULDROW: Yes. Or even legal representation

of the appeal process in the processing of a complaint?

MR. GOLDBERG: Well, of course the legal services community is complaining about a lack of funds, and that is real. Of course we deal with poor people, but in the job discrimination cases the people who need help tend to be poor.

There is a minimum access idea that if you had two attorneys for every ten thousand poor people then you could give minimum access to the courts.

At this point, after Mr. Reagan's cuts, we are at about half that level at my office. I think that is a problem.

There is a possibility of a court awarded attorney fee in these kinds of cases, so there are a few private attorneys who will take these on in hopes of getting a fee down the road. But, I think you will find there probably are not the resources available, and that before any private attorney is likely to take the case they are going to have to be convinced that it is a real strong case, and I suspect a lot of people get lost in that process.

MR. PEEPLES: Did I hear you say that at the time of the decree the percentage was 2%, and in a years time it jumped to 5%?

MR. GOLDBERG: Henry Curtis would be the one who would have the exact, up to the minute figures. But, that

運

1-

is about right. I think I read the figure from 1980 where it was 2.18%, and I am pretty sure it never got higher than that. In later years, before the decree, it was 1.9%. It was still right around 2%.

MR. PEEPLES: 1 It just appears to me that that is a model that should be repeated.

MR. GOLDBERG: I think it just simply depends on the attitude of the people who are doing the hiring. If they want to do it responsibly and in the publics interest there is nothing preventing them.

Now, maybe we helped facilitate parks because they had this class action sitting there, so they could therefore justify it to personnel or whoever, to say we need to do this because we are in court.

MR. PEEPLES: It may have been generated for the wrong reason, but it worked for the right reason. That is what I am saying, it should be able to work for the right reason for everybody else.

MR. GOLDBERG: I think that is right, although it is not going to be entirely without pain, because I think Henry has had to face reverse discrimination complaints, and what not. But basically what is required is the commitment, and I think if you have that everything else should follow.

MR. STEWART: Was there any increase in the percentage of areas that was alleged to be non-existence of

2 3 anything on that? 4 MR. GOLDBERG: 5 6 7 8 9 being left out. 10 MR. SCHWEMM: 11 12 13 14 might make? 15 MR. GOLDBERG: 16 say on that. 17 MR. PEEPLES: 18 19 20 Mr. Curtis when he comes in. 21 22 Cabinet for Human Resources. 23 MR. EGBERS: 24

1

25

increase in summer hiring in those areas, or do you have I cannot not quite say I do not

blacks in some of the rural counties? Was there any

have the figures because I have been delivered a printout of the entire work force. But, we have not had a chance to go through that to really see. That is one of the things we really want to look at, is to see whether any areas that are

How do you get what Mr. Curtis did, and he may be able to answer this, how do we get that into the other leadership positions? Do you have any suggestions as to recommendations that you might make, or other people

I really do not know what I can

Thank you very much.

We now move to the category of state agencies, and we will move on to the next presenter, and pick up with

Mr. Daniel Egbers, attorney of the General Council

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

In Henry's defense I should say that the reason he is probably late is because I sold him my car a couple of

> Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

(Carrie

years ago, and he brings that point to my attention every now and then.

I would also just like to follow-up on something that Dan mentioned before. My cabinet is a party in a way to the consent decree because one of the functions of the Cabinet for Human Resources is in manpower services throughout the state, and Henry, I can recall, sat in my office on many occasions brow beating me until I agreed to recommend that my cabinet facilitate the implementation of his consent decree.

I do not mind telling you I was a little reluctant to do it because of the two Supreme Court cases that say that you cannot have these extra special circumstances in the absence of a finding or a showing of historic race discrimination, and to that point there was no formal finding that the court had made.

Nevertheless, because of Henry's persistence I finally caved in and as I understand it we have a symbionic relationship, and I am glad to here that it is having good results.

I am Daniel Egbers, and I am an attorney for the Cabinet for Human Resources. Dr. Cowherd, who is our secretary, has asked me to represent him here today. Also to express his regrets about not being able to appear in person.

I have represented the Cabinet for approximately eight years in civil rights and personnel matters. I have to confess that I am a little uncomfortable in standing up here before you simply because as a defense lawyer I suppose it is possible that one might question my perspective on

some of the issues that you are discussing today.

I will admit that in the numerous position papers and pleadings that I have filed with the EEOC, and other agencies over the years I have never had occasion to admit that the complaint of discrimination against an institution, or an individual supervisor was well founded. This is not to suggest that in investigations that we have conducted over the years we have never found disparities in hiring or promotion, salary, discipline, reclassification, or other areas of employee movement or individual attitude.

But there have been instances in my experience in which allegations of racial and sexual discrimination were brought to our attention, and in which we made an attempt to address. There have been several instances in which we have taken disciplinary action against supervisors, and their supervisors for fostering what we believe to be hostile racial and sexual atmospheres within the work place.

So, it has been our practice, I believe of the years which I have been associated with the Cabinet, to encourage people to go ahead and file their grievance if

they have a legitimate basis for it, and to take prompt action upon those allegations. I am rather proud of our record in doing so.

Every cabinet secretary under whom I have served has charged my office with one guiding principal. That has been that where we find evidence of discriminatory conduct we are to take action to correct, and take no action to justify it.

The attorneys on the panel know, there is a special provision in the Code of Ethics for attorneys that charges them to seek justice rather than to use the superior force of their public trust in order to delay or suppress it. That has been our charge, and my personal philosophy in the cases in which I have been involved.

It is a deep and abiding concern to me when people are not judged on their individual merit. In my judgement few things in the types of cases in which I have been associated, however have done more to suppress the advancement of the civil rights movement, and civil rights litigation than the frivolous filing of civil rights

complaints.

You heard Mr. Hatterick this morning telling you about the backlog that he has with the Personnel Board, that it takes a year to get a case to trial. That there is a 350 case backlog, and that is true. I practice primarily before the State Personnel Board, and it is extremely frustrating to listen to the cash register continue to jingle while these cases fall back upon one another.

We have recommended, and I believe that the Board is looking at the possibility of structuring there order of hearings in such a way that they no longer take cases on a first come first serve basis, but rather take and hear cases first in which individuals have been removed from the payroll. I think that is an appropriate way to go, and I hope the Board will see fit to do that in the future.

There have been occasions in which individuals have attempted to use minority status of one sort or another either as an excuse for poor work performance or misconduct in disciplinary cases, or to gain an advantage over others in promotional decisions.

I believe that to be empathetical of the civil rights movement, and suggest that it only serves to demean valid complaints. What we wind up doing because of the tremendous numbers that we have to investigate is shove some of the legitimate ones on to the back burner. They are not

E

1=

given the full treatment that they deserve, and frivolous complaints just tend to log jam the process.

In my cabinet when a request to take disciplinary action is reviewed in Frankfurt, the practice has been to make no independent inquiry as to the race of the employee making the request for disciplinary action, or the employee who is the subject of the request.

The final decision in Frankfurt is based upon the written reports, and we do not know nor do we want to know what the race of the accused, or the accuser is unless, of course, race has been an issue in the case itself.

For example the ones I mentioned before when we took disciplinary action against a supervisor for fostering a hostile atmosphere. It is a little sad to me when on occasion I am served with notice that we have been accused of discriminating in discipline cases, and to hear some of the comments that I have heard this morning, that rather in glittering generality terms suggested that is all discriminatory in character.

There is a lot more things that have to be looked at in discipline cases that do not lend themselves very well to statistical analysis. It has been our practice to address those types of cases on an individual basis, color blind to the individuals concerned.

The problem that I have seen is that in dealing

with investigators for the Human Rights Commission over the years some of them have been overburdened, and I am afraid, although they probably would not admit it if you asked them, may turn a jaundice dive towards some of the complaints that they are asked to investigate just because of the tremendous numbers that are involved and the frivalousness of some of the appeals.

The Commission has an advantage over the Personnel Board in that respect. In 1986 the Legislature amended the State Personnel Board statute to prohibit the Board from dismissing any appeal unless it was based on a failure to file on a timely basis.

The Personnel Board may not consider from an agency a motion to dismiss the appeal based on a failure to stay the claim, or grounds that it is legally insufficient. What this does is force the Personnel Board to hold a full evidentiary hearing on every case that comes before it, and I suggest to you that that tends to delay the process.

In theory, if you do not like the color of your desk and you are a state employee, you can get a full evidentiary hearing with the State Personnel Board if you are willing to wait for a year or so.

As far as the Human Rights Commission is concerned, in the past, I know I have signed off on twelve sometimes more consecutive time waivers because the staff is

so overburdened that they could not get their job done within the period that they had to. That time waiver business has now gone by the wayside due to a Court of Appeals case. So, hopefully they will begin to move a little bit quicker.

I wanted to give you a few examples because I think my client has done so to take action in the area of eliminating discrimination.

I mentioned before the park situation in which we agreed, despite my initial disinclination to cooperate with the Parks Department in recruiting to solve their problems.

The U.S. Department of Labor has ordered the Cabinet for Human Resources to screen job corp applicants for Aids. We have steadfastly refused to do that, and have risked the loss in federal funds in doing so because it is our position that CDC in Atlanta indicates that there is no reason whatsoever for screening job corps applicants, and that there is a problem with placing the stigma on an applicant who answered the question honestly. So, I think we have done something in that area.

There is currently pending litigation in which a better qualified white applicant has brought an action the Cabinet and the State Personnel Board alleging that he was passed over in favor of a less programmatically qualified but more senior black applicant, and we are in the process of

litigating that particular issue.

I mentioned earlier that we have disciplined supervisors in the past for failure to maintain the proper atmosphere. This is by no means a comprehensive list, and as my position would suggest I cannot be a font of information, for information derogatory to my client. But, I think that this is indicative of the actions that we are trying to take.

As an agency we have gone on record as opposing what we perceive to be protective regulations which would prohibit consideration of outside applicants for agency vacancies, and to limit the availability of those positions to people who are already inside the agency. This is because there are classifications in which, as you know, minorities are underutilized, and we recognize that as long as they are underutilized as a whole, strict limitation of opportunity to those already within the state government would inhibit opportunities for recruitment of qualified minority applicants and would only serve to institutionalize the inequity.

This is not to suggest or to claim that the Cabinet has been successful in meeting all of the affirmative action goals established by the Governor's plan. I am not an expert on it, and I cannot speak very well to the imperial statistical data which you should have before

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

you.

But, from this recent information that was presented to me was that in terms of minorities the Cabinet has underutilized in one category, and that is officials and administrators. Out of the 11,599 employees, we have 12.26% minorities. We are underutilized in terms of female employment in three categories, that is officials and administrators, and also protective service workers and skilled craft workers. I believe the tendency has been to close that gap somewhat.

I think I have probably just about run out of my time. If there is any at all left I would be happy to answer any questions.

MR. PEEPLES: Questions?

MR. SCHWEMM: I have a question. Referring to the Personnel Board, do they hear all cases as a full Board?

MR. EGBERS: No, sir, they assign a hearing

officer. They could, in theory, hold two or three hearings in one day. The hearing officer then makes a written report to the whole Board, and the Board votes on that.

MR. SCHWEMM: The hearing officer is a Board member?

MR. EGBERS: Not always. They have some contract attorneys. They have a statutory general counsel. The Executive Director is also empowered to hear cases, and any

Board member except the voting members may hear a case.

MR. OBERST: I do not mean to minimize the consideration of cost when it comes to state government because they are very important, but the system implies to me that if there were more dollars for more hearing officers that the backlog could be brought up.

MR. EGBERS: Absolutely. What the Legislature did in 1986, in my estimation, was attempt to correct what they saw to be some abuses in the system. In the past you could make a Motion to Dismiss an appeal for lack of subject matter, jurisdiction, or any number of other things, and those motions were frequently successful. They cannot do that anymore. Now there has to be a full blown hearing on every issue.

The next thing that they did in 1986 was allow an employee to appeal directly to the Board if they did not like their evaluation. So, you may have an evaluation where you are rated as being superior in four out of five categories, and "meets" in the last category, you can get a full blown evidentiary hearing to the Board to contest the judgement of your supervisor on that point.

So, what the Legislature did was tremendously expand the Board's jurisdiction. Prohibit them from weeding out, and they did not give them any money.

MR. PEEPLES: Would that fall into the category

that you used several times as frivolous?

1-

g

MR. EGBERS: In my judgement, yes, sir.

MR. PEEPLES: Cite for me just a few more examples of what would be frivolous.

MR. EGBERS: Well, the incident with the evaluation is one. We have frequent use of misnomers with the term discrimination tagged to it. For example, recently we gave a class grade increase to RN's and psychologists because they are extremely difficult to recruit, and we were loosing them. In the same hospital you had some social workers. There was not enough money to give a class grade change to the social workers.

I know have sitting on my desk nine brand new appeals from social workers who claim that they have been professionally discriminated against because they did not get the same grade change as the other folks did. They brought it all the way through the grievance process, and that will go to the Board.

Recently we had thirty-seven appeals. Individuals who had gotten exceeds on their evaluations. At one point there was a million dollar pot that was to be divvied up among everybody that got a year-end exceeds. But, because of the budgetary shortfall the Governor, and the Secretary of Finance and Administration recaptured that money, and I did not get mine either. It was done in a proper legal way.

2 they wanted to appeal to the Board. 3 So, we have thirty-seven cases, and incidently, 4 you cannot consolidate cases unless everybody agrees to it. 5 So each one of them has to be heard individually on the same 6 legal basis. I said at the time when the Legislature passed the 7 statute that it was insane, but they did not listen to me. 8 9 Maybe they will the next time around. 10 MS. CLEMONS: It is interesting to me some of the 11 things that you have mentioned. Your report is a very 12 excellent report as for the gentleman who preceded you, his 13 report was very good. I wish that some of these people that work for 14 15 state government would come and work for the proper world. 16 Where the people that get the money are the ones that are 17 supply and demand. 18 But, I would like to ask who wanted the job corps 19 people tested for Aids? 20 MR. EGBERS: The U.S. Department of Labor. 21 did not want them tested, they wanted them screened and 22 there is a big difference. 23 MS. CLEMONS: What is the rationale behind that? 24 MR. EGBERS: Well, because these job corps

Nobody argued about that. They are just made as hell, and

1

25

applicants were going to be living in a dormitory during the

المراجعة

initial phase of their employment, and there was some concern that there would some sexual hanky panky, and if they had Aids they would spread it around.

MS. CLEMONS: I see. I happen to be on the Job
Corps Board out at Whitney Young, and there are enough girls
around there. Are they going to test the girls also?

MR. EGBERS: Every applicant for Job Corps is to be screened according to this Directive. We refused to do it, and they wrote us and threatened us. But they have not followed up on it just yet.

MR. MULDROW: Mr. Egbers, according to the statistics which have been given us, and some of which you have indicated also, the Cabinet for Human Resources stacks up very well in terms of its overall employment level of minority employees. It is higher, by far, than any other cabinet.

On the other hand the salary differential between black and white employees is considerable in your department, and the gap has worsened over the past two years. How do you account for that diversity?

MR. EGBERS: Well, clearly the majority of the minorities employed within the cabinet, in terms of just raw numbers, are at the lower end of the pay scale. You have quite a bit of turn over at that level so they may not stay in very long and get the increases as they go along.

The top end of the pay scale generally are career employees. You have a considerable number of career employees there who just by virtue of annual increments over twenty years of more, that gap widens.

I think that the Commission on Human Rights did a study on that a year or two ago, and certainly they would be more expert on why that occurs than I would. I believe that that was one of the findings that they made.

MR. MULDROW: Statistics do not tell everything of course, but it is puzzling as to why apparent progress, or the success in the overall employment level is so great, and yet is such regression in terms of salary differential.

Is there an effort to upgrade to minority employees? Is there an affirmative effort in the cabinet to upgrade or promote employees? To overcome the reason for the salary differential?

MR. EGBERS: I am not familiar with the formal program if that is what you mean. We are rather limited in our ability to change salary structure. For one thing, that is controlled by the Department of Personnel. There are three basic ways to do it, reclassification, promotion, and reallocation. You can only reclassify an employee if there has been a permanent, material change is his duties and responsibilities.

I do not know of any authority that we have now

that would allow the Commissioner of Personnel to put something in the compensation plan to close that gap.

MR. MULDROW: In your experience is the state affirmative action plan being aggressively implemented in your cabinet as well as in others? If so, how does this enforcement or implementation manifest itself?

MR. EGBERS: Well, in terms of promotion, and I have litigated a number of cases where that has been an issue, the practice has been and the directive has been from my office, that as between equally qualified candidates the key word is opportunity. You may have where you have one position and twenty applicants for it, and they try and break that down to maybe the last top five on paper that they are going to interview.

We have made it known to the supervisors that they are going to have to justify to us why they did not elect an interview, or at least give the opportunity to a minority for a particular classification.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much.

We will take a ten minute break at this time, and allow our other participants to catch up with us. We will reconvene at 2:30 p.m.

(Whereupon, short recess taken.)

MR. PEEPLES: We will go to Jack O'Nan, Branch
Manager, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection

Cabinet.

MR. D'NAN: I will be very brief. Our Cabinet, unfortunately, had a very lower percentage of minorities as compared to the rest of the state government.

When I came to the cabinet in 1977 one of my main goals was to recruit minorities, and help build those percentages up. They have come up some, but not nearly as much as we would have hoped to.

One of the biggest problems we have encountered in trying to recruit minorities is that our cabinet is very technically oriented, and even though we go out and try and recruit, try and bring minorities to state government and test for positions, it just does not seem like those names appear in our cabinet. We just do not get the minority applicants like we had hoped to.

That is where we are going to have to rely on the Department of Personnel and work with them in trying to build those numbers up, and try to attract people that we need to get into state government.

Our cabinet has got 1,400 employees, eight hundred of them are here in Frankfurt, and that leaves six hundred of them out in our field offices, and most of those are in eastern Kentucky and fairly small rural areas. That makes it tough to recruit people in those areas.

In our cabinet we have over 7% of our positions

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

that require at least a Bachelors degree, or some type of technical training, or professional management experience.

Again, it is hard to attract enough people to fill those positions.

But, there has been some improvement. By the end of 1988 our cabinet total for minorities was up to 2.23%, up from 2% in June of 1988. For women the increase was 2%, up to 34.89%. During the last six months of 1988 we hired two hundred five people. Of those 4.3% were minorities, and 44% were females.

Again, we have tried to recruit, go to colleges, to career days to try and attract minorities and females to our cabinet. When we go and recruit we have just not seen that many minorities, but we are going to try to do other things besides just going to colleges and participating in career days.

We are going to start working with the local employment offices. Work with other minority groups to try and get minorities in our cabinet, and just do whatever it takes to try and build our numbers up.

We are very low, we do not like being low and we are going to changed that hopefully in this year. It is not something we are very proud of. But, we do make an effort and sometimes it just takes awhile to show any results of that.

I will answer any questions.

MR. PEEPLES: Define or describe for us some of the technical jobs?

MR. O'NAN: The majority of our positions are either engineering types, or they require a Bachelors in some type of natural physical science, or BA in forestry, or a BA in soil science. The main categories is natural or physical sciences. Like I said, 7% of the positions in our cabinet require at least some type of degree in one of those sciences.

MR. PEEPLES: Who would you compete against in the private sector?

MR. O'NAN: It's consulting firms, just any of your bigger names companies. Ashland, or anybody doing any type of technical work. It is awfully tough to compete with those guys.

MR. PEEPLES: Salary then?

MR. G'NAN: Salary is just incredible. When I first started recruiting in 1977 I went to the universities to try and recruit engineers at \$862.00 a month, and we got a couple. They are still with us. But, it was not easy going in there and offering \$10,000.00 a year.

Now, we have improved. We are starting people out at anywhere from \$15,000.00 to \$18,000.00. But, as we increase so does private industry. We have made significant

progress, but still did not get some numbers.

MR. OBERST: Do you not have support personnel in the cabinet?

MR. D'NAN: Yes. But again, the support personnel either have to have the technical experience, and we have a few jobs that require an Associate degree. It is very technically oriented because we deal solely in environmental regulations, and this takes some kind of science background just to be familiar with it.

MR. DEN UYL: Is there any way to offer internship for something like that, where maybe people who are still college students, or interested possibly in science, or want this kind of background could come in and maybe over time through this process be employed?

MR. O'NAN: We do that. We work in conjunction with the Department of Personnel in identifying co-op names. We have had a number of co-ops from Kentucky State, U of L, and a few of those have come back to full time employment with us. The problem is they come and get co-op experience with us, and go over to Ashland Oil, or Dupont, or something like that.

MR. DEN UYL: Is there a significant number of minorities in these co-op programs?

MR. D'NAN: I am not sure how much the population is, but we do get a few persons who are involved with that

with Kentucky State.

MR. MULDROW: You use a lot of technical personnel which presents, perhaps, a different kind of recruitment problem. Do you not also have a large supporting staff? How do you fair in that area? Is it easier, and are you doing better in that area?

MR. D'NAN: Well, that is somewhat easier only because the bulk of those positions are here in Frankfurt, and there are just more people applying here in the Frankfurt area. We have a lot of field offices. Unfortunately out there you are either an inspector with some type of science background, or you are a secretary. There is not much in between.

We do have some lower level jobs in forestry, like forest guard, and forest ranger which just requires some experience in forestry. But, there is very, very few jobs that we have that do not require either a degree, or specifically related experience to that job.

MR. MULDROW: Has your agency developed an affirmative action plan as required by the State plan?

MR. O'NAN: Yes.

MULDROW: Are they able to provide you any assistance? How do you tie into them in terms of the implementation of that plan?

MR. O'NAN: Well, we adopt Governor Wilkinsons'

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

affirmative action plan, and we have sent a copy of that to all employees. We have told them about grievance procedures, told them who the EEO counselors are, tried to give them the same information everybody in Frankfurt has.

We sent this to every employee in our cabinet, all 1,400 of them. They know what their rights are, who they should contact if they have a problem. Since I have been in the cabinet since 1977 I do not know of any EED discrimination grievances that have been filed.

MR. MULDROW: Well, I was not thinking so much of complaints. I was just thinking of the total implementation of the plan in terms of goals, time tables, recruitment efforts. Do you get guidance from the Personnel Department in this area?

MR. D'NAN: Well, we are working closely with them. But, we are going to rely on the Department of Personnel to do the things that we need to be doing.

Getting out and recruiting more. I think they are going to start getting out more.

What we would like to see is just a very active part from Commissioner Greenwell's office in helping us meet these goals and time tables. We all get busy doing other things, and do not always get to do everything that we need to do. But, that is the one suggestion I would make is full time involvement from his office with all the agencies.

MR. MULDROW: We heard this afternoon some of the things that the Parks Department is doing. It seems to me they are in a similar situation in terms of employment in some isolated areas, and also technical personnel. They have considerable success, I understand, in their recruitment program.

MR. D'NAN: One of the other things that we have been doing is posting vacancies. To make sure that everybody has an equal opportunity to apply for these vacancies. It may get to the point where we will have to post those vacancies in local employment offices, or colleges to help attract minorities.

As I understand it, the Parks is under a different mandate, a court order if you will.

MR. MULDROW: Who is responsible for your hiring and recruitment? Is that your responsibility?

MR. D'NAN: Well, it comes under my responsibility that we implement the Governor's affirmative action plan. But, I do not have the say so as to who we hire. That is up to our cabinet secretary. We work together on that.

MR. STEWART: You say that the information is assimilated and distributed to college campuses?

MR. O'NAN: I say we may get to the point where we may have to post vacancies at colleges, or at local

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)



1.

employment offices.

Now, summer employment they always find us. When May or June rolls around everybody knows to contact a state agency somewhere. That has really never been a problem that I know of.

MR. MULDROW: Do you get many calls from minorities, or do you have those statistics?

MR. O'NAN: Well, we do not get that many calls from minorities.

MR. MULDROW: Well, maybe that is my point. They are not getting the information.

MR. D'NAN: It could be. At this point we try and get that out with whatever means we have. There are so many applicants, probably two or three hundred this summer.

MR. MULDROW: That would come through the Department of Personnel?

MR. O'NAN: Through Personnel and through people contacting us directly. They come both ways.

MR. PEEPLES: If I may be allowed to build on that point. It seems pretty obvious to me that most of the kids who are probably you, and you said they are calling you in bunches, are probably calling you because of some direct ties that they already have through family or friends who lets them know about the system?

MR. D'NAN: Right.

1

MR. PEEPLES: In that way you are building, basically, a future work force. If there was some way that we could not start getting to the minorities at that age, and start building a future work force in that particular group, you would probably find yourself with not in the same situation with the empty reservoir.

I just think that we have to have creative ways of developing the pools, because obviously the traditional system of reaching out is not enough. We probably got to educate some high school students as to the kinds of jobs that are available in the area. It is probably totally foreign to them as to what may be available.

MR. D'NAN: It probably is. Most of it is relied upon just friends, or they have known somebody that has worked in a particular office, or relatives. But, we do need to get more than we have been.

Any suggestion would be helpful to us, because we are trying to do our best.

MR. SCHWEMM: Of the 1,400 employees approximately how many each year turn over? Do you know that?

MR. D'NAN: No, I do not. A ballpark figure would probably be fifteen to twenty percent.

MR. SCHWEMM: You mentioned the Parks experience and the fact that they were under somewhat different

> Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

7

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sec. 200

circumstances because of the court order. If your personal goal was to increase minorities and women in the Natural Resources Cabinet would you be helped by being sued, and this is hypothetical, so that you could be then under the same situation as the Parks Department found itself?

MR. D'NAN: A hypothetical answer. I suppose we could.

MR. SCHWEMM: You understand why I asked the question. The way you came through in comparing yourself to the Parks Department was in a way they had a certain odd advantage that you do not have.

MR. O'NAN: The advantage that Parks has over us, though, is that they have so many jobs located throughout the state government that are not technically required.

MR. SCHWEMM: Right, that is another difference. But the difference that you mentioned, that I have heard, is in addition to all that they have the advantage of having been sued.

MR. D'NAN: Right. But, if we were sued, we were required to go through the process that they were, if we had to fill a number of vacancies out in our field offices it would slow things down considerably.

MR. SCHWEMM: It is kind of an irony that you might be helped in an odd way by being able to involve yourself with the court.

MR. G'NAN: I know Parks has increased their statistics, but it is unfortunate that you have to go that way.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much.

I would like to take a moment here to introduce another member of the committee who has come in,

Mr. Ron Nash, who has joined us.

I also want to announce that on the agenda you see for 5:10 p.m. we have an open session. That is for anyone who is not listed on the program who has an interest in addressing the committee. You should either contact Mr. Muldrow or register with the young lady out front in preparation for that time period.

I think we now have Mr. Curtis, attorney chief, Department of Parks.

MR. CURTIS: Chairman Peeples, Director Muldrow, and ladies and gentlemen of the committee and the Commission, thank you for the opportunity to come and thank you for allowing me to come out of time.

I had a JCC Board meeting and I missed a few meetings prior to today, and I looked in the statute and found I had a duty, so I thought I had better get down to Louisville and touch bases there.

The Parks Department consent decree is the outgrowth of the law suit filed in 1980, and a second law

suit filed in 1981, by plaintiff's Bowe and Wooldridge.

The Department of Parks litigated for approximately seven years. In the meantime the case had not come to trial. Circumstances in the Commonwealth had changed somewhat so that by the time I arrived at the Department of Parks we had adopted in the Department a departmental affirmative action plan effective October 15, 1984, pursuant to the Commission of Parks order of August 30, 1984, which was pursuant to the Secretary of Tourism's order of July 30, 1984, to implement the Governor's executive order of July 1, 1984, which required goals and time tables, and the affirmative employment of ethnic minorities and women.

So, the time was right to take a look at the possibility of not litigating any further, and we knew that if Parks lost we were going to have a huge attorneys fee, and we knew that we possibly could have had a federal magistrate sitting in the Department of Parks telling us what the next personnel actions would be.

So, we decided that we would begin to negotiate.

Our negotiations began about 1985, and we negotiated and

litigated, and eventually signed the final order in the

United States District Court sitting at Bowling Green on

November 16th and it was entered November 19th. So, we have

been under a consent decree from that period to the present

time.

The key features that we were able to achieve in our negotiations were that we brought in third parties, and those third parties were two state agencies. The Department of Personnel, and the Department of Employment Services of the cabinet for Human Resources. Those two agencies have given us recruitment assistance, have given us technical assistance in testing and advising applicants, and certifying the list of eligible minority and female candidates for open positions.

The Department for Employment Services has twenty-eight regional substations, or outposts, or offices in the community where they normally do some recruiting for corporate agencies. They test, and they hand out employment insurance, and hold hearings.

So, they allowed us to plug into their existing standing operation in the field, and posted our announcements when open positions were available. They tested for us and did a multitude of things that helped to establish our network.

So, the consent decree is a simplistic document, we feel, as streamlined as possible with as few details as possible, just a few extremely important provisions.

First of all, from the Parks point of view it has an escape mechanism, and it is the defense called the good

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

faith effort. In the event we fail to do any of the things
that we have committed ourselves to do we are entitled to go
back to the United States District Court, and say that we
did the best we could and we have documentation and records
which will show that we have made a good faith effort.

12 ...

To that extent the record keeping is a second major consideration. We are required, under the consent decree, to keep records at the Park level, at the central office level, and then to report to the plaintiff's attorneys annually, on July 15th, of our results and our progress.

The next interesting feature is that, again this is a community wide effort, and so paragraph No. 7 of the consent decree has what we call, "The Outreach Agencies", of the recruiting agencies. These agencies consist of such entities as the Job Corps centers, and there are five in Kentucky. The NAACP branches, and there are some thirty-five or more active branches. There are two urban league agencies in Kentucky. There are sixteen regional vocational schools, and we have used six major state universities. We have some special interest groups which may be one of a kind.

So, that in every instance where there is an open position we send a copy of the job announcement to each of these agencies. We ask these agencies to help us identify

the eligible candidates for open positions, and to help people looking for work, looking for state government employment match up with these open positions.

We feel that the network that we have created is probably the second most important feature of the consent decree.

Our numbers were roughly 1.96% ethnic minorities at the beginning of our implementation of the consent decree. We are now somewhere in the range of 5% ethnic minorities. We feel that we are on schedule in terms of being able to complete our goal of implementing affirmative action in the Department of Parks.

I will stop here and yield to any questions.

MR. PEEPLES: Mr. Curtis, let me tell you that Mr. Goldberg has already pretty much said he praises you before this group on your improvements.

One of the things that certainly impressed me is this record, this movement from 1.7% to 5%. One of things that I think I asked him, and I would talk to you about is will it be your recommendations as the attorney of record for the state that what you all had to go through could be replicated such that it becomes a good faith effort for everybody in state government?

MR. CURTIS: If you are asking, perhaps, the same question that the speaker heard, whether he ought to be

sued, I would say, no, sir.

MR. PEEPLES: No, that is not what I am talking about. I am saying that your good faith effort as a result of being sued could become everybodies good faith effort without being sued.

MR. CURTIS: The good faith effort was to keep me from getting shot if this did not work, as I hoped it would, and I had to have an escape route because I had my top administrators hanging out there a little bit.

This is kind of new, and I asked them to trust me because I thought I saw a possibility here. It is kind of scary. So, the good faith effort could work in an affirmative sense, but it was purely defensive from our point of view at that time.

I am not smart enough to see whether or not it would work for those agencies that do not have the leverage of the Federal District Court. So, I am ducking that question. I do not know the answer.

MR. MULDROW: Would you say the heart of your success is the recruiting network that you have built up? Is that the basis for your success?

MR. CURTIS: It is probably the heartbeat. We could not make it work if the folks were not calling, and saying that they were interested and heard about the job. So, we believe that those agencies that we have been sending

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

those job announcements to must be doing something really good for us.

We could not have made it without the Department of Personnel. We could not have made it without our sister agency, DES. The administrators of the Department have sincerely said, "We are going to give this a fair try". So, we could not have made it without those top administrators telling me to show them.

We have been pleasantly surprised. We have two black park managers for the first time in the history of the Department, and these guys turned out to be really super administrators.

MR. PEEPLES: Are they in rural areas?

MR. CURTIS: They are in rural areas. All of our parks are in rural areas except one recreation park.

MR. MULDROW: What are the educational requirements? What is the level for that position?

MR. CURTIS: Well, both these gentlemen happened to have Masters degrees, but they were walking around out there without jobs at the time that we put this decree into affect, and we preached the idea that ethnic minorities should not have to take their college degrees and experience and go to Los Angeles or Detroit to get a decent job.

The feedback that I am getting from my top administrators is that they are extremely pleased with these

two park administrators, who have to function independently who have to make decisions without help sometimes, and have to be good in public relations, and keep up with money.

One more thing I am awfully proud of is that we have added two ethnic minority business administrators, and we have a history of promoting from within, and so that means that these two accountant trainees, or business trainees who are business managers, number two in command at major parks, are now well on their career tracks for advancement in the Department.

We feel that is consistent with our personality, so this thing kind of fits us.

MR. PEEPLES: What would the average educational level of the park managers be?

MR. CURTIS: The two we have I have happen to have tracked a little bit because I was kind of interested in seeing that they got a shot at it, and I happen that they have got extremely good credentials.

I have not looked at the files of the other park managers.

MR. MULDROW: Could you just briefly elaborate on your network. What agencies are you contacting in your recruiting efforts specifically?

MR. CURTIS: The Urban League has two agencies in Kentucky. One in Lexington and one in Louisville. There

 are five Job Corps centers. There are vocational schools by regions, and I believe there are sixteen of them. So, we send our announcements to the top administrators of sixteen regions in the vocational school system.

The six major universities that we send these announcements to are UK, U of L, Kentucky Westland, Moorehead, Eastern, and Western.

There are special interest groups such as Roundtable in Louisville, and that is an interesting network of a cross section of ethnic minority activists and administrators, so we send a copy to them.

There are junior colleges throughout the state and we send a copy to each of the junior colleges. I do not remember how many we have.

MR. STEWART: When you were naming colleges you missed Murray. Do you contact Murray?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, sir. We do send Murray. I have had some extensive discussions with the administrator about his placement officer being a little more active in participating.

That reminds me of some of the other groups. We have identified major universities that have special minority retention, recruitment, or support programs such as UK, Western, and U of L. So, in addition to the main placement officer we also send to the minority specialist

placement officers. We get excellent feedback.

MR. SCHWEMM: I would like to ask a little bit about your own background. Were you a long time employee of the Department of Parks, or did you come from a different part of the state government to the Department of Parks, or from private practice?

MR. CURTIS: I came from the cabinet of Human Resources. I was associated with Mr. Dan Egbers, and one day my boss told me that he had something for me to do, and he told me he wanted me to go over and be Parks counsel. I came over to Parks in late 1985, and I had been there about three months, and an assistant Attorney General came in and brought me two large boxes, and this was about April. I was told that I was about the fifth lawyer on this case, and it had been litigating for six years, and he told me he was retiring in August and thought I would like to have the Bowe and Wooldridge case.

MR. OBERST: When you use the term junior colleges does that include community colleges as well?

MR. CURTIS: I should have said community colleges. That is what our Kentucky colleges are.

MR. PEEPLES: Mr. Curtis, thank you very much.

Next is Mr. Louis Mathias, attorney for the Department of State.

MR. MATHIAS: Commission, Mr. Director,

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

commission members. On behalf of Michael Troop who is the Secretary of Justice and the acting Commissioner for the Kentucky State Police I wish to thank the commission for the opportunity to make this presentation.

As some of you the Department of State Police is both a Chapter 16 agency, and a Chapter 18 agency. We have two separate types of personnel governed by two separate statutes and policies.

I want to go through first here and answer some questions that have been raised earlier in the day.

Initially I want to make it clear that the Department of State Police is committed to affirmative action, and we have an affirmative action plan.

Commissioner Troop has by memorandum and through the department newsletter informed all employees of the State Police and the Justice Cabinet of the plan. In addition to that he has appointed EEO coordinators at both the cabinet and department level.

In addition to that he has also appointed what is known as an employee assistance counselor, and the duties of this individual is to aid and assist all employees with problems of whatever nature they might have. As an assistance between the EEO coordinator and the supervisor level personnel.

The present EEO coordinators are reviewing the

ا المراجع المرا

3

 affirmative action plan which we have, and also old tests and selection mechanisms to insure equality. We are being assisted in this endeavor by the able assistance of Lynette Taylor and Mr. Cunningham over at the Department of Personnel. We hope to issue a revised plan with a clear and definite breakdowns within the next several weeks.

The Department of State Police presently has 1,600 employees. 890 of these are sworn officers, or Chapter 16 personnel. Of this 890 we presently have forty minority offices, and thirteen female officers. We have one minority officer holding the rank of Lieutenant at this time.

Additionally, we have 544 civilian employees, and of this number there are twenty minorities, and 321 females and I believe we have two minorities at a supervisory level

In doing the affirmative action plan we have conducted a review of our recruitment, promotion, and disciplinary process. For the sworn personnel we have a recruitment team, and this team consists of two white males, two females, and two black officers of the department. They are assigned to go to the various areas of the state and contact the schools, the churches, the minority groups and seek out candidates for the position of sworn officer in the state police.

They also send letters to all colleges, universities, minority groups in the area, and the

surrounding state areas to get minority applicants.

The only problem in reviewing the affirmative action that we noted, is that we loose a large number of applicants to better paying jobs in other departments in the large city of Louisville and Lexington.

We have a Chapter 16 class beginning in July, and at the present time we hope to have ten minorities in that class out of a class of fifty. There will be five black males, two black females, one white female, and I believe two others for a total of ten.

In the promotion area, in review of that, we noted one distinct problem and that problem is getting the people to take the test. An explanation of that simple sounding remark, the officers when they have been on the department for a year or so they get seated into an area. They know if they are promoted that means they are going to be transferred to another area where there is a supervisory vacancy to be filled.

Many of them, rather than get the small increment after promotion, would rather stay where they are at and not take the test.

Commissioner Troop has attempted to overcome this to some degree by making available some training sessions at each post. Make it a little easier on the individual. He does not have to study himself, he can study with groups.

 We also have some plans in the works, depending upon budgetary problems, we would like to see if we cannot get some of the supervisory level positions raised in pay to make it more attractive so some of our officers, including our minority officers, will be willing to take the test and seek the promotions.

We also reviewed our disciplinary area for the prior year, and we find no indication of any problem there. The majority of the disciplinary actions taken were reprimands, and there are very few of those. Maybe one or two are minorities, and I have included a breakdown of that in the handout.

Commissioner Troop has not actually placed any limitations on the EEO coordinators. He has indicated clearly that he is dedicated to the affirmative action plan, and he has indicated that whatever resources are required will be made available, and he wants a meaningful plan in place, and he wants to strive to achieve reasonable goals.

MR. ROSENBLUM: Are you working out of this proposal for developing selection? Has that been adopted?

MR. MATHIAS: Yes, we have a contract with that company, and they are going to redo all of our testing procedures, and hopefully tell us where they find any weaknesses, and is there anywhere that we can improve on the overall of the minority recruitment.

MR. ROSENBLUM: I ask that question because in tracing the history of the state police we found that recruiting is not the problem as it is elsewhere, but the oral examination tended to wash out an awful lot of people. Is that continuing?

MR. MATHIAS: No. I think since your meeting that has been resolved. They have created panels, and most of the panels we have, in the oral portion, we have a minority representation on that panel. I think that is not a problem anymore. The big problem is getting people to come and take the test.

MR. PEEPLES: Any other questions?
Thank you very much.

Next we will hear from Angela Koshewa.

MS. KOSHEWA: Good afternoon.

On behalf of Galen Martin and the Commissioner on Human Rights I am very pleased to be here before this committee to address the issues of women and minorities in state government.

The State affirmative action plan, which was finally officially enacted into law in 1988, does not directly involve the Commission in either an advisory or monitoring capacity.

However, as many of you are aware, the Commission has taken that role upon itself long before the State

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

affirmative action plan came into being, and has issued thirteen reports on the status of blacks in state government, and eight reports on the status of women in state government.

The most recent of those two reports, they are done now every other year, on blacks in state government was in 1988 based on data as of November 1, 1987, and the most recent report on women in state government is a little bit older, it was the year before. A 1987 report based on data as of November 1, 1986.

Our research department is currently in the process of preparing the latest report on the status of women in state government, which will based on the data as of November 1, 1988, and that report should be out within the next few months. But, we do not anticipate there will be any great moves one way or the other in that report.

I would like to comment some first on the area of blacks in state government, and say that overall we are pleased with what has happened in the movement in narrowing the salary gaps between blacks and whites in state government, and also in increasing the numbers of black employees in state government.

However, the overall picture perhaps masks some problems that we do perceive, and that is that there are some cabinet agencies that are doing remarkably well, and

others that are not.

In general, the salary gap between blacks and whites, the actual dollar amount increased from 1985 to 1987, but so far as the percentage of white income blacks had moved a little bit closer with blacks earning 77.7% of the average white salary, which is an improvement from 76.8% in 1985.

The percentage of blacks in the work force has remained essentially unchanged from 1985 to 1987. I know Mr. Curtis was in here talking about some of the strides that the Parks Department has made, and that we are hoping, of course, be reflected in our next years report, and we are very pleased and encouraged by the efforts that Henry, himself, had made in the numbers of that particular cabinet.

The percentage of black females has dropped slightly in the state work force. Not significantly however. There have been some increases in the numbers of blacks as officials and managers, but most of the blacks are still concentrated in the low paying jobs as is demonstrated by the fact that while 7.3% of the state work force is black, they earn approximately 5.7% of the total state payroll.

Of the sixteen cabinets in state government, so far as salary goes, the Labor Cabinet, Commerce Cabinet, Corrections Cabinet, and Tourism Cabinet have led the way in

narrowing the salary gap. In some cases no gap at all, and we are very encouraged by that.

The Energy Cabinet, as of our statistics in 1987, had no black employees. It is a very small cabinet and it employs thirty-nine person. So, there were no black employees in 1987. That is also the cabinet which has the highest annual salary averaging around \$25,000.00 a year.

The worst cabinets so far as the salary gap goes were the Finance and Administration Department, the Cabinet for Natural Resources and Environmental Protection.

Transportation, while it was good on salary gap, it is low numbers of employees in that they are concentrated in the low paying areas.

Half of the state cabinets had employment rates of under 4% of their total work force. The Energy Cabinet, as I have said previously, had none. The Cabinet for Natural Resources had a black employment force of 1.2%. The Revenue Cabinet had 2.5% percent, which is a decline from their 1985 numbers. So, we are somewhat concerned there.

In the Human Resources Cabinet it continues to be the leader in black employment in state government, with approximately 11.9 % of its work force being black. There was a slight decline from 1985, but not significantly so.

Also blacks in the Human Resources Cabinet earn 80.2% of the average white salary, which is better than the

overall state average.

The Transportation Cabinet, which has made significant gain since 1985, and should be applauded for that when it was the worst employer of blacks. It has come to be the second best employer of blacks. The salary gap, however, is still a bit of a problem.

Our main concern with the affirmative action plan and blacks in state government probably lies in the fact that the overall goal of in excess of 7% of blacks in the employment force for the state at large allows areas where the work force is greater than that percentage to under employ blacks.

One of the most notable examples if Franklin

County, right here in Frankfurt where many state offices are located. The work force in Franklin County for the state government is approximately 5.4%, but the actual percentage of blacks in the work force is 7.5%. There could be an additional two hundred plus blacks employed in Franklin County to bring that up to the actual level of blacks in the available work force here.

This is one concern about having statewide quota for blacks in state government, because obviously in some areas of the state there are very few blacks in the available work force, and areas such as Jefferson County, Franklin County, Fayette County, Christian County, there are

Now, the state black work force in Jefferson

County exceeds the percentage of blacks in the work force.

Our work force in Jefferson County is 21%, while the county

labor force so far as blacks is concerned is 14.5%.

The same is true in Fayette and Christian counties. The Employment of blacks by the state in those two counties actually exceeds the percentage of blacks in the work force.

Moving on to the area of women in state government. As I stated the report will be coming out. We do not see any major movement one way or the other. The salary gap, as of our last report, had narrowed slightly. But, at the rate that it was narrowing, it would take at least twenty years for that gap to close entirely.

So far as improvement in narrowing the salary gap the General Government Cabinet was the number one agency, followed by Energy and Justice.

In the Transportation Cabinet the gap was later, as was failure to utilize women in certain areas.

What does remain, and is still very much of a concern to us is that black females are still making the lowest salaries. They are making lower salaries as compared to white females. That gap is narrowing somewhat, but it still exists.

The new hire salary gap has narrowed between females and males. To females being hired in at 86.9% of what male new hires are paid, that is up from 81.8%. That is a significant improvement.

One of the things that contributed significantly to reducing the salary gap in state government, so far as women are concerned, was the adding between the years 1984 and 1986, the adding of 2,100 women to professional jobs. That did help significantly to reduce the salary gap.

Our major concern in the area of women and state government is that more than one third of all state job classes employ no females.

Our suggestions for improvement in that area first would be to revise the state affirmative action plan to include some specific goals for recruiting, and education of existing employees. Encouraging women to train, and to take tests if necessary. To move different job grades and different job classifications.

The areas are traditionally male areas, Fish and Wildlife, and some of the areas in the Transportation Cabinet like highway workers. Some are entry level jobs for which there is no real barriers.

We think that if the movement is made, and it is a positive one, much as has been done with the Parks

Department, that state government can certainly improve the

1 =||

under representation and frequently non-representation of women in some of these traditionally all male areas.

Overall the outlook is good. We are encouraged and applaud those cabinets that have made very positive steps towards narrowing both the salary gaps and increasing the employment of blacks, and the full utilization of the female work force.

We would encourage those who are not quite as progressive to get a move on, and join the rest of the cabinets in making these strides forward.

But, overall we are pleased. I would be happy to answer any questions if I can.

MR. PEEPLES: Any questions?

MR. MULDROW: How do you account for the difference in the employment levels of minorities and women in the various agencies? There are dramatic differences ranging from 12% down to zero.

Since there is one state affirmative action plan, why are there such wide diversities?

MS. KOSHEWA: The report does not address that, but I will take a shot at it. Part of it, I would think in looking at Natural Resources, which is very low on employing minorities, some of it might be that the jobs, many of the jobs are concentrated in areas where there are larger black populations.

I think that part of it, though, just has to be that it is not that some jobs are traditionally white jobs or black jobs, that it really is the individual efforts of those people in those cabinets. Once you do as the Parks Department, you can achieve what you decide to do if you set the goals. I think the goals are maybe not being set as high as they should be, and maybe it is not as top a priority.

Some very well, though, may have to do with geographic locations, and not so many blacks in the population in those areas.

MR. MULDROW: That kind of leads me into the next question. The viewpoints of the affirmative action plan have been very diverse. On viewpoint is very optimistic in that it is really a fine plan, and it is well on the way to implementation, and that good things are going to result from it.

The other view we get from the employee organizations is that it looks good on paper, but it is not being put into effect. There is a lack of effort by individual state agencies to implement it and to incorporate it.

What is your view on this? How effective is the plan, and how well is it being implemented? What kind of effort is being made? How is it being evaluated? You must

2 3

4

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

have some feel as to how this is going.

Well, as I have said, I think that MS. KOSHEWA: the plan itself is good, and has already in some areas led to some very positive results.

But, it is only as good as those people who are implementing it. The Human Rights Commission is not directly involved in the day to day implementation. We can only look at the numbers and go back and hindsight.

I think that it is more the efforts of the individuals implementing it that we need to look at, and at this point I would say it is premature to say it is not working, because we have seen improvements. The gaps are narrowing.

There are still those cabinets that we have concern about, and I think that should be concerned about themselves. But, I think overall the plan is a good one.

MR. MULDROW: How can this diversity exist? Is there a defect in the plan? If the plan is being enforced how can this diversity exist? I mean, is it being enforced unequally?

Well, we are seeing improvement. MS. KOSHEWA: When I say that one cabinet is not as good as another cabinet, that is obviously on a comparative basis.

But, there is positive movement. There are sometimes declines where work forces are just cut back, and

 that would cause a temporary decline. But there is some positive movement overall, which is why we are encouraged.

The disparities that have existed between the cabinets, and among cabinets, are not going to magically disappear. They are going to stay and gradually, we would hope, narrow.

So, I do not think that we are going to have an overnight solution here.

MR. MULDROW: What kind of complaints do you receive in terms of state employment? What is the basis for them, and give us some idea of the volume and the issues that are involved?

MS. KOSHEWA: We process in a year an average of 112 to 120, somewhere in there. Of those, and this is going to be a rough estimate, I would say maybe three of those would be from state employees.

Now, realizing of course that every complaint that is filed is not necessarily one in which we determine that there is evidence to support the allegations of the complaint. About half of our complaints do eventually get dismissed.

Of the complaints, just thinking back over the last couple of years, we have had some sex discrimination, some race discrimination, and some of those have been dismissed.

As I say, we have had race and gender complaints filed. I do not think we have had pregnancy discrimination.

MR. MULDROW: You said you have had three complaints? It is a very small number really.

MS. KOSHEWA: It is very small. I think that is, in part, a tribute to the internal grievance process that is available.

Also, sometimes people will call us and tell us that they are having a problem, and they think it is because they are black, or because they are a woman. We will encourage them, if they feel that they can, to go back and talk with the supervisor about a problem, and things frequently get resolved that way.

So, I think the message is out, and people are trying to be more cooperative and work together so complaints do not have to be filed with us.

Now, I have no idea about numbers of internal grievances that have been filed, but we are sort of a last resort, because in the state system people do have the grievance process that they can go to.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much.

We will next call on Ms. Phyllis Alexander, representing the Executive Director on the Kentucky Commission on Women.

MS. ALEXANDER: Thank you for inviting me to

address the committee today, and a couple of you I know and it is nice to see friendly faces.

I tried to direct my answers to the questions that were in the letter that you sent me, Mr. Muldrow, and I too studied and read the report from the Human Rights

Commission, and feel that probably you all know what is in there, and I was encouraged by some of the things that I did read of the progress that is being made for women, and I am specifically addressing women right now.

I think the hiring of women has improved, particularly over the 1984-86 period of time this book addresses.

I have talked with the Labor Secretary,

Carol Palmore, and we do not have a lot of real recent

statistics. I was trying to ask around and get information

from other people as to what is going on in their agencies.

As some of you may know the Kentucky Commission on Women is an agency of four people at this time, and I am new to this job and I had to do a little digging as well. So, I may not be as versed on some of these questions as maybe I will be this time next year if we do this again.

But I think that the gap between mens salaries and womens salaries is narrowing, however I think it is distressing that it is not closer, and that is nation wide and not just in Kentucky. I would like to see that.

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

S. Laire

1-

I think most cabinets are hiring women. I think what we are seeing overall in state government is that the jobs that have traditionally been male jobs are pretty much remaining male jobs, such as state troopers, highway and construction jobs.

From what I am understanding I think there are inroads that women are making into these categories, but again, probably not enough yet.

I do not know how to answer the question about how non-discrimination is assured, or evaluated in the cabinets.

I think that there are many women in the traditionally female roles.

You were asking, Mr. Muldrow, about complaints. I have had two women call me, and both of them were older women, and I spoke with both of them about their problems on their jobs. Both of them had, what the felt, legitimate complaints and talked to me about the appeal process.

What I recommended to each of them was to go to their immediate supervisors, talk with them, and then go through the appeals process step by step with the chain of command if they remained dissatisfied.

One had lost her job, but had been off the job for more than a year for medical reasons, and did not fall within the categories of her particular area and had even talked with the attorney of the cabinet in the area which

she worked.

I felt like they were taking the right direction, but did call the Commission on Women to ask if this was something that we could help them with.

At this time I do not know what we are going to be able to do. I hope that we see things that we are going to be able to deal with, and things that we can do possibly in the future.

I do think progress is being made, and I like that part of it. I think not only Kentucky, but nationally I think women are making improvements, making strides but have a long way to go at the same time.

As far as recommendations I think the educational process, much like we are doing here today, is probably as effective a way as any we have right now to get the word out. That we need more women. That we need to get them into professional positions, managerial positions, and positions where they get paid more money.

I think it is a little bit misrepresented to say that 48%, wherever women are in state government today, as far as numbers of women in the work force, we are not making fifty percent of the take home pay, and I think that is where we need to look at the differences and work on those.

I was thinking about your questions on how do we evaluate, how do we get the people to do what they are not

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

1 2

_

doing? Again I think educating them, having maybe a watch dog group or organization, perhaps a central place to address complaints may be perhaps what we could be using.

But I think it is not only important but imperative to high women, and hire them in jobs where the pay is better, the position is better. As long as they can do the job I would like to see them there. This is black women, white women, just all of us.

Can I respond to questions? I am not sure I can give answers, but maybe respond to them.

MR. MULDROW: I realize that your appointment if fairly recent to the Commission. But, I would ask you general impression as to the reason for the salary gap. Is this because women are being employed generally at lower paying levels, or is there an element of inequity in there in terms of comparable work or pay equity? The ones that are employed, are they getting equal pay for the skills that they have equivalent to men?

MS. ALEXANDER: I think probably, as far as a cabinet such as Human Resource, they all get paid the same.

I do not imagine that a man comes into that position and gets paid anymore than a woman to do the same job.

I think jobs that are defined exactly the same, and a man or woman can fill that job, I think probably the pay is the same.

I do not know the reason for the wage gap. Maybe we have settled for less. As far as comparable work, as far as I know, if a job description is the same then I think the pay is the same. I do not know of any discrepancies there.

I do not think that jobs such as clerical jobs, as opposed to someone who works on a highway job, I do not know how those can be compared and addressed exactly the same. I think that would be much more difficult, and I am not sure what the answer is to that.

MR. MULDROW: I think it is significant that
Kentucky does have a Commission on Women. How do you feel
about it? What kind of support do you get for your agency?
Do you have a free hand in dealing with issues that you feel
should be of concern?

MS. ALEXANDER: So far. Actually, every state does have a Commission on Women. Some are called Commission for the Status of Women. Some states such as California will have seven, or eight, and some will have three or four.

We have only one Commission on Women in Kentucky, and through this office I think we can address a lot of women's issues. I feel that the office has a lot of autonomy, and I also feel that we have a lot of support from this administration. From the Governor, and from the people with whom we have to work. I am feeling very positive.

Again, I knew that so far I feel good about what

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

1 2

we are doing.

MR. ROSENBLUM: What kind of response are you getting from the administration not filling the gap of the diversity of you Commission, which I understand is short handed?

MS. ALEXANDER: We have everyone on staff now.

MR. ROSENBLUM: The compliment of Commissioner's,
is that not short changed?

MS. ALEXANDER: Yes, we are. I think we are. I would like to see more women commissioner's.

MR. ROSENBLUM: There are thirteen or fourteen allowed? Commissioners?

MS. ALEXANDER: Board people, we have twenty-five positions and those are all filled. Those were filled before I came on board.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much.

We now come to the last presenter in the enforcement agency category, Mr. Paul Gholston, area director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

MR. GHOLSTON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Regional Director, and ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was created by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended. Its mission is to eliminate and prevent employment discrimination.

The Commission enforces Title V11 of the Civil Rights Act, the Age Discrimination Act, and the Equal Pay

The Commission has the power to accept and investigate charges and complaints against branches and divisions of state and local government.

The Louisville office of the Equal Employment

Opportunity Commission is responsible for the enforcement of the above cited statutes within the State of Kentucky.

At this time I would like to cite for you some statistics regarding the employment of blacks and females state and local government within the State of Kentucky.

The statistics that I shall review were developed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission based on information provided to the Commission by various branches of state and local government.

The statistics are based on information submitted to the Commission for fiscal year ending September 1986.

That is the latest batch of statistics that we have compiled so far.

We examined the eight general categories of employment which are designated as officials and managers, professional workers, technical workers, protective service workers, paraprofessional workers, office and clerical workers, skilled craft workers, and service and maintenance

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

workers.

We analyzed these figures in some of the categories based on white male representation, black male representation, white female representation, black female representation, white representation as a whole, and black representation as a whole.

We also made some comparisons with respect to median salary, and the representation in the different pay grades within some of those categories.

We found that there were a total of 66,689 persons employed at the time this survey material was presented.

Over 60,000 of those persons are about ninety percent of the total employment of white males. While roughly 5,920 or 8.9% were found to be black. 36,000 or 54% of the employee were identified as white females. While 3,431 or 5.1% were identified as black males.

Approximately 24,000 or 36% of the group were made up of white females, while 2,489 or 3.7% consisted of black females.

The median salary for all employees was \$15,676.00 per year. For white employees it was \$15,959.00 per year, and for blacks the median salary was \$13,546.00 per year.

We also looked at the different job

classifications within government from the standpoint of the
highest level of management. We found that the highest

level management classification was that of officials and managers. There were a total of 4,387 persons working in that classification as of September of 1986. 4,178 or 95.2% were white males. While 199, or 4.5% were identified as black. Females, as a whole, accounted for only 29.6% of the total employees in the officials and managers category.

We also took a look at the highest pay grade in the officials and managers category. 84.7% of white males were employed in the top pay grade, while only 11.5% of the females were employed in that particular pay range.

Of course, only 3.0% of the black males were in the top pay grade, and only one half of one percent of the black females were employed in the top pay grade.

Next we looked at the job category that had the highest representation of blacks and women. First we looked at one that appears to have the highest representation of women, and that brought our attention to the area of office and clerical. In that category there were 14,032 people employed. The median salary was \$13,829.00 for all employees. For white employees it was \$13,594.00. For black employees the median salary was \$12,932.00 per year.

We found that women accounted for 11,272 of the 14,032 positions, or 80% of the people employed in the clerical and office category. A total of 1,117, or 8.0% of the total employees in this category were black.

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

Finally we took a look at the top pay grade in this category. We found that 85.2% of the employees within the top pay grade were white males. While only 14.8% of the females employed in that category were paid in the top grade. Black males were represented by 1.1%, and black females were not represented in the top pay grade.

The median salary for all employees in the office and clerical category was \$13,829.00 per year. For whites it was \$13,937.00, or about a \$100.00 higher than the median. For blacks it was \$12,914.00 per year.

Finally it should be noted that while over 73% of the employees in the office and clerical category were females, only 19.7% of the employees in that category were males, and males received the highest amount of pay. As wa stated above, 84% of the male employees were in the top pay grade, while only 14.8% of females were in the top pay range.

The next interesting category that we looked at was the professional category. We noted that females made up 45% of the employees in that category, while males made up 54.9%. That is a pretty good ration. White males represented 52.4%. White females were represented by 42%. Black males with 2.3%, and black females with 3%.

The median salary for all of the employees in this group was \$20,847.00 per year. White males, it was

\$22,385.00 per year. For white females it was \$19,585.00 per year. For black males it was \$19,061.00 per year, and for black females it was \$18,000.00 per year.

In our examination of the service and maintenance category we found that the highest concentration of blacks appeared to exist there. For example, 16.5% of the total employees within the service and maintenance category were black. While blacks made up only 8.9% of the total employees in the survey.

However, the majority of the blacks were concentrated in the lower three pay grades, and that pay range extended from \$8,000.00 to \$11,900.00 per year. 53% of the blacks were assigned to that pay range.

However, in the top three pay grades beginning with \$25,000.00 and topping out at \$43,000.00, we found that a total of six blacks were represented there, as compared to a 112 white males.

To summarize briefly, 54% of the 66,000 employee reported in the survey were identified as white males. A bit over 36% were identified as white females. Right around 5% were identified as black males. 3.7% were identified as black females.

The median salary for all employees, according to that survey, was \$15,676.00. The median salary for black employees was approximately \$2,000.00 less, or \$13,546.00

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202/628-4888)

per year.

The highest ratio of female representation to male representation, of course, was in the professional_category.

As we stated earlier, males represented 54.9% of the persons employed, and females represented 45.1% of those employees.

However, only 12% of the females were represented in the top pay grade while males made up 87% of the people represented in the top pay grade.

In the service and maintenance category we stated that the highest percentage of blacks are represented there.

But, the interesting fact is that 53% of the blacks were assigned to the lowest three pay grades ranging from \$8,000.00 per year, to \$11,900.00 per year. There were only six blacks in the top pay grade as compared to 112 whites in the top pay grade.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is my testimony.

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you.

Are there any questions?

MR. MULDROW: During the past year how many complaints of employment discrimination against the State of Kentucky have been sustained by your agency?

MR. GHOLSTON: By sustained do you mean that we found a violation?

MR. MULDROW: Yes.

MR. GHOLSTON: I simply cannot give you that

2 MR. MULDROW: It is privileged information? 3 MR. GHOLSTON: Yes, sir. Let me ask you another question. MR. MULDROW: 5 Do you have any role in reviewing the implementation of the State affirmative action plan for the State? 6 No, we do not. We are available 7 MR. GHOLSTON: 8 to provide technical assistance if we are asked. But, our office does not have an official role in that. That is 9 10 relegated to our Washington office. 11 MR. MULDROW: Do they have a role in Kentucky? 12 MR. GHOLSTON: Yes, they do. However, I believe 13 it is strictly voluntary. If a state agency would request 14 information they have an entire division that is available 15 to provide whatever assistance is needed. I do not believe 16 there is any monitoring process or things of that sort. 17 MR. MULDROW: Are there federal guidelines that 18 the State is required to follow in developing and 19 implementing the plan? Is it not the federal requirement 20 that the state have such a plan? 21 MR. GHOLSTON: I am afraid I am unable to answer 22 your question. I simply would be getting into an area that 23 I am not entirely familiar with. My area if primarily 24 enforcement. I do not know whether there is a federal 25 requirement.

I wish I could.

1

information.

1	MR. MULDROW: Can you tell us what kind of
2	complaints? What is the nature of the complaints that you
3	may handle with regard to state government? -
4	MR. GHOLSTON: What comes to mind is complaints
5	alleging discrimination based on age, and discrimination
6	based on race. Those appear to be the majority of the types
7	of complaints that we receive.
8	MR. MULDROW: Do you have a work-share with the
9	State of Kentucky?
10	MR. GHOLSTON: Not a work share agreement. We do
11	defer by law, in accordance with Section 706(b) of the
12	statute, we are required to defer to the State and we do.
13	MR. MULDROW: What do you mean by defer to the
14	State?
15	MR. GHOLSTON: Any charge found under Title VII
16	of the Civil Rights Act that we receive is required to be
17	referred to the State for a period of at least sixty days
18	for the State to determine whether or not it wishes to
19	process that complaint.
20	MR. MULDROW: If they do not choose to process
21	it, then it comes back to you for processing?
22	MR. GHOLSTON: Right.
23	MR. MULDROW: They can opt out of processing? It
24	is a voluntary decision on their part?
25	MR. GHOLSTON: That is correct.

individuals? affirmative.

MR. SCHWEMM: State law does not address handicapped discrimination in employment, and I was wondering whether you had an opinion if it would be a wise thing if the state law did, in fact, address handicapped individuals?

MR. GHOLSTON: Yes. My opinion would be in the

MR. SCHWEMM: Do you sense, or have any information that there is a problem with respect to handicapped discrimination in Kentucky in employment?

MR. GHOLSTON: I do not have hard statistical information, but based on telephone calls that we receive in our office, letters that we receive, I think that there are problems that certainly are hoped to be addressed.

MR. ROSENBLUM: In that category of professionals where the ration was pretty good. Could you name what is responsible for what kinds of jobs?

MR. GHOLSTON: It is strictly a guess on our part because these broad categories were developed some years ago by the Joint Reporting Committee, and it is my belief that the agencies that report pretty much decide what classifications they will lump into the various broad categories.

What comes to mind is, of course, attorneys and jobs of that nature.

2

MR. PEEPLES: Thank you very much.

We will now go to our open session, and we have Rev. Godfrey Kaufman who has asked to address.

REV. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman, committee persons.

My topic for you is pitfalls and stumbling blocks. There is a law on the book that says, "Positions, when they become vacant, must be posted for competitive bidding". That is the law on the book.

When a position becomes vacant someone fills that position before it is posted as being vacant. What criteria is used in selecting that person for that position? The law says open bidding and best qualified.

Temporary positions are acting positions. They call it acting. The state says we do not have acting positions. What criteria is used in selecting acting persons? There is a law on the book that says that divisions and departments can raise its salaries.

Pitfalls and stumbling blocks. To the committee I ask that you can address the issue. Somewhere I know that you can do something or say something that will allow persons in certain positions to do their job without fear and reprisal from the people they work for.

MR. PEEPLES: Is there anyone else that is interested in addressing us in this open session.

There being none we are officially be adjourned.

I want to thank all of you who have come and participated with us today.

I want to thank my fellow committee members who have put forward the presentations and listened.

We will be performing our role as committee members to have this report put together and forwarded to Mr. Muldrow's office and the Washington office.

Thank you very much.

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

CASE TITLE: Kentucky SAC Forum on the Employment of

Minorities and Women in Kentucky State

Government

FORUM DATE: Tuesday, March 14, 1989

LOCATION: Frankfort, Kentucky

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence herein are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above Forum of the United States Civil Rights Commission and that this is a true and correct transcript of the Forum.

Date: March 14, 1989

Official Reporter

Heritage Reporting Company

1220 L Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005