

Incorporated  
January 4,  
1945



"Welfare  
of State  
and  
Employee"

Published monthly by the Oregon State Employees Association  
320 North Church Street, Salem, Oregon - Phone 4-3325

LINCOLN PFEIFFER - - - Director of Public Relations  
V. G. O'NEIL, President - - - GERTRUDE CHAMBERLIN, Secretary

Opinions expressed herein are not necessarily those of the Association.  
Address communications to Oregon State Employees Association  
320 North Church Street, Salem Oregon - Phone 4-3325

### SALARY REVIEW

On Friday, June 17, 1955, the Emergency Board gave its stamp of approval to a revised State salary schedule. This represented at least a partial conclusion to a long discussed, and much publicized, matter.

Many individuals (too numerous to identify by name) deserve much credit for the salary improvements attained. Certainly members of the Legislative Interim Committee on Retirement and Compensation worked hard and long toward development of a more equitable salary structure. The Sub-committee on Salaries of the Legislature's Joint Ways and Means Committee took over when the Interim Committee was dissolved at the beginning of the recent session. Members of this Sub-committee met evenings, on Saturdays and at early morning hours in an effort to develop a salary program that was both fair to employees and economically feasible. Finally, the proposal of this Sub-committee was passed on to the Ways and Means Committee as a whole. The strong endorsement of members of the Ways and Means Committee was followed by an appropriation that was speeded through the Legislature in the closing days of the session.

Members of the Oregon State Employees Association deserve much credit for keeping the urgency of the need for an improved salary structure constantly before the Legislature. Department heads and other State officials strongly urged the need for more competitive salaries. Members of the Civil Service Commission gave much of their time to meeting with Legislative committees and holding hearings.

The appropriation of \$2,774,000.00 was made to the Emergency Board, but was clearly ear-marked for salary adjustments. The Civil Service Commission was instructed to prepare a revised salary structure, within the limitation of funds made available, and present recommendations to the Emergency Board. This was accomplished on June 17th.

The plan that was presented to the Emergency Board is based on all salary information that has been accumulated by the Civil Service Commission over the past several years. Recommendations that

were submitted by various state agencies at the time of the review of salary proposals contained in the Barrington Report were carefully considered. Also, further comment and suggestions were invited from departments and employee organizations on the proposals developed by the Civil Service staff. All suggested revisions were reviewed, and many were adopted. Therefore, the plan as submitted can reasonably be labeled as one that has been cooperatively developed by all of the administrative agencies of State government. Without the splendid cooperation from State agencies that the Civil Service Department has received there would have been no possibility of having a new salary schedule adopted by July 1, 1955.

The new salary plan is, in my opinion, a substantial improvement over the one we now have. Features of the new plan are:

- (1) A moderate upward adjustment has been proposed for most classes of positions.
- (2) Increases are greater at the maximum range than those at the minimum. This tends to increase the earning potential of career employees without substantially increasing salaries that will be paid to employees who leave the State service after a few years of employment. This feature should have the effect of reducing, to some extent, costly turnover. Also, it should reduce the pressures that sometimes exist for unjustifiable upgrading of positions in order to prevent excessive turnover.
- (3) There are some instances of fairly substantial increases in ranges. These represent attempts to correct inequities, or to adjust rates to reasonably competitive levels.
- (4) There are a few recommended reductions in rates. These represent instances where, from all information we have been able to obtain, current rates are unjustifiably high.

No claim of perfection is made for this plan. In spite of the best efforts of the Civil Service Commission and its staff we are quite certain that it contains weaknesses. Our efforts to correct inequities, as they are found to exist, will be continuous. Still I believe it reasonable for everyone who played any part in providing improved salary rates for State workers to expect good returns on the money invested.

Conscientious efforts on the part of each employee to render better service is the only expression of appreciation that has any real meaning. This is true because the type service rendered is the gauge by which the tax paying public measures the value of such services. In the long run their opinion has a great deal of influence on levels of pay for all State workers. Public opinion can assure continued progress toward equitable salaries or it can have the opposite effect. We cannot too often be reminded of this fact.

—Charles W. Terry

Voice over the phone: "I sent my Johnny to your store for 5 pounds of apples, and I find on weighing them that you sent only four and a quarter pounds."

Grocer: "Madam, my scales are regularly inspected. Have you weighed your Johnny?"

Too many people stop seeking employment after they've found a job.