



The Politicians

On June 29, 1984, the General Assembly voted \$650,000 to evaluate the state's job classification system and identify policies that inhibit pay equity for women. On July 25-26, North Carolina Insight asked the leading candidates for governor and lieutenant governor three questions. John Carrington, the Republican candidate for lieutenant governor, chose not to submit answers. The other responses follow (with gubernatorial candidates in alphabetical order).

1. Do you support this study?

For Governor:

Rufus Edmisten (Democrat). I support equal pay for equal work and the establishment of an objective, quantitative job evaluation system to provide internal pay equity for all employees of state government. It is my understanding that this is the purpose of the project funded by the General Assembly.

James Martin (Republican). I am in agreement with the general guidelines set forth in Section 146 of HB 80 for conducting a general examination of the pay equity issue. I applaud the General Assembly for requiring the inclusion of factors based on supply and demand of the relevant job market. The important issue to be stressed is to give appropriate weight to the free market forces of supply and demand and appropriate weight to job values.

For Lieutenant Governor:

Robert B. Jordan III (Democrat). Yes. The issue of pay equity deserves close attention by the legislature. The current classification system was implemented in 1949 and a study to look at possible inequities is long overdue. North Carolina's work force has changed dramatically since then, and the public sector must make every effort to recognize these changes, both in gender and types of jobs. Although the study will look for inequities in positions traditionally held by women, traditional male jobs stand to benefit from the study. A close look at fringe benefits and their

relative value must be included.

2. Do you favor making adjustments to the job classification system based on pay equity considerations?

Edmisten. It is my expectation that the classification system, which is simply one method of job evaluation, will be replaced by a point-factor or other quantitative system, and that the revamped system will analyze individual jobs and that these jobs will then be grouped for purposes of market comparisons. It is my further expectation and position that the state must be competitive with other public sector organizations and with the private sector and that pay for the job groupings, if it is out of line, must be brought into line if we are to maintain a first-rate work force. As a part of this effort, state employees must be provided with full information as to the rating of jobs, and each employee should have the right to appeal evaluation changes.

Martin. I am in favor of making adjustments to the job classification system to ensure the best possible pay system as can be provided within the means of the State of North Carolina. I would make adjustments based on the report of the consulting firm as outlined in HB 80, Section 146, and with the concurrence of the Pay Equity Advisory Committee and the General Assembly.

Jordan. Yes, adjustments need to be made based on a quantitative classification system using point factors such as experience, education, working conditions, levels of responsibility, and market supply and demand to determine salary levels.

3. Do you favor the legislature funding these adjustments?

Edmisten. If adjustments must be made, in order to achieve fairness, then I favor making necessary adjustments over a period of time.

Martin. I am in favor of the legislature funding any inequity within the State job classification system.

Jordan. The legislature must take responsible steps to fund the needed adjustments found in the study. A prospective phase-in of a new pay schedule with steps leading to parity would be the most reasonable approach.