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Outline

➢ Addresses industrial proceedings in aged care in Australia, proceedings that resulted in a 15 per cent wage increase for all direct care workers in that industry

➢ Position this key decision, which explicitly recognised the historical undervaluation of the work, against the challenges in Australian labour law of addressing the objective of equal remuneration for work of equal or comparable value.

➢ Identify the analyses/evidence that were persuasive to the tribunal’s finding that the work was undervalued.

➢ Pose the question of whether the Aged Care decision constitutes a new approach to the resolution of gender pay inequity/gender pay inequality.
Awards – a feature of Australian labour law

- In Australian labour law, awards establish the minimum wages and conditions for those employers and workers that fall within the scope of that award. Awards are determined by a federal industrial tribunal – currently the Fair Work Commission.

- There are 154 federal awards in Australia, 70 per cent of which are industry awards (Stewart and Bray, 2020).

- The majority of workers in Australia fall within federal labour law jurisdiction (as opposed to state or provincial coverage).

- There are three awards with particular application to the aged care industry: the Aged Care Award; the Social, Community, Home Care and Disability Services Industry Award, and the Nurses Award (Stewart, 2020).
# Awards – multiple ‘minimum rates’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aged care employee—level</th>
<th>Weekly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>861.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>895.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>929.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>940.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>972.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1025.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1043.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Weekly minimum wages ($AUD), Aged Care Award, July 2022
Comparison of minimum, full-time weekly wages in the *Aged Care Award* and two-thirds of median full-time earnings, enrolled nurses, 2021-2022

Source: [2022] FWCFB 200 at [475]
Comparison of minimum, full-time weekly wages in the Nurses Award and two-thirds of median full-time earnings, enrolled nurses, 2021-2022

Source: [2022] FWCFB 200 at [476]
Explicit Equal Pay Regulation - Australia

- **1969-1974** From Equal Pay to Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value
- **1974-2008** National failures to establish equal or comparable value
  - 1986 Nurses Case: failure of ‘comparable worth’ approach
  - 1993 Legislative commitment to Equal Remuneration for Work of Equal or Comparable Value – capacity for equal remuneration orders – applicants required to show discrimination
- **2000-2019** State successes with Gender-based Undervaluation approach
  - 2000 NSW and 2002 Queensland Equal Remuneration Principles identifies state jurisdictions where the objective of equal remuneration could be assessed through the constructs of historical undervaluation of work and with a view to ensuring that the value of the work was properly set
- **2008-2021** Continuing national ambiguities with equal remuneration applications/cases
  - 2012 Social and Community Services case – some acceptance of historical undervaluation but remedy required applicants to quantity contribution of gender to undervaluation
  - 2015 Early Childhood Education and Care case – Federal tribunal assessed that the objective of equal remuneration for work of equal or comparable value required applications to use a ‘binary’ comparator (Smith and Whitehouse, 2020).
Aged Care Case
Barriers to Proper Work Value Assessment

Evidence addressed the barriers to proper work value assessment by tribunals in female dominated industries and the impact of these on setting award minimum rates.

Gender-based undervaluation

• and related terms refer to work value and wage setting practices that are impacted by gender and which contribute to a failure to recognise work value in assigned wages:-
  • the absence of work value assessments, incomplete or inadequate work value assessments
  • inadequacies in the description and classification of work
  • the effect of socially constructed understandings of gender on the assessment of skill and work value (Smith and Lyons, 2022).
Aged Care Case
Substance of Undervaluation

Work of Anne Junor (2022)
- Describing & applying the Spotlight invisible skills job analysis tool to provide data coded from completed questionnaires and interview transcripts
- Identifying any skills, effort, responsibility, and conditions of work of the aged-care workers who provided the data
- Identifying which skills were ‘invisible’ in the sense of being unrecognised.

Invisible skills:
- **Hidden** - diplomatically kept unnoticed or downplayed because it is ‘behind the scenes’
- **Under-defined** - non-verbal, applied in rapidly-changing situations
- **Under-specified** – seen as ‘soft’ or ‘natural’; misdescribed as innate and personal
- **Under-codified** - integrative, involves interweaving one’s own activities with others’ activities to maintain a workflow

+ Training and experiential learning not recognised in credentials
Aged Care – The Decision - Undervaluation

• “Undervaluation occurs when work value is assessed with gender-biased assumptions. The reasons for gender-based undervaluation in Australia include the continuation of occupational segregation, the weaknesses in job and work valuation methods and their implementation, and social norms, gender stereotypes and historical legacies.”

• “The approach taken to the assessment of work value by Australian industrial tribunals and constraints in historical wage fixing principles have been barriers to the proper assessment of work value in female dominated industries and occupations. In particular:
  • …. limited capacity to address what may have been errors and flaws in the setting of minimum rates for work in female dominated industries and occupations.
  • Errors in the valuation of work may have arisen from the female characterisation of the work, or the lack of a detailed assessment of the work. The time frame or datum point for the measurement of work value which limit assessment of work value to changes of work value … [have] mitigated against a proper, full-scale assessment of the work free of assumptions based on gender.
  • The capacity to address the valuation of feminised work has also been limited by the requirement to position that valuation against masculinised benchmarks. Work value comparisons continued to be grounded by a male standard, that being primarily the classification structure of the metal industry awards” [2022] FWCFB 200 at [758]
• “We also reject the Joint Employers’ characterisation of certain Spotlight skills as personality traits or dispositions. In doing so we note that such characterisation has led to the undervaluation of these skills. Further, we reiterate that the application of a skill in the context of a particular workplace, is an integral and essential aspect of assessing the value of that skill.” [2022] FWCFB 200 at [854].

• The evidence supported the applicant’s contention that skills exercised by Registered Nurses, Enrolled Nurses, Assistants in Nursing/Personal Care Workers in the aged care are not compensated by the modern award minimum rates of pay applicable to their roles [2022] FWCFB 200 at [857]. Accepted the evidence that the skills should be “brought to account in the assessment of work value” [2022] FWCFB 200 at [896].

• “Indeed it seems to us the mischaracterisation of the so called ‘soft skills’ as personality traits or ‘the simple cognitive activity of adults is at the heart of the gendered undervaluation of work.” [2022] FWCFB 200 at [848].
Aged Care Case – The Outcome

• Decision noted considerable common ground between the parties as to the aged care industry including that the work had changed significantly in the past two decades

• Tribunal was satisfied in respect of direct care workers in the aged care sector that the evidence establishes existing minimum wage rates do not properly compensate employees for the value of the work performed. [2022] FWCFB 200 at [899]

• Awarded an increase of a 15 per cent increase for direct care workers employed in the aged care industry across the three awards – full increase applicable from July 2023 – not phased in

• Australian government’s federal budget included $11.3 billion over 4 years to fund the increase (and other reforms)

• Scope for parties to make submissions in terms of classification structures, in addition to further submissions concerning the applicants’ original application concerning a 25 per cent wage increase
A future trajectory

Following the decision, key questions include:

➢ the capacity for such changes to address sameness/differences challenges in Australian labour law, namely women achieving equality only where they demonstrate a ‘sameness’ to men, or labour law struggling to afford work value to work that is ‘different’ from masculinised norms
➢ the capacity to review the valuation of work in awards given that recent eras of minimum wage regulation have limited the opportunities for increases in wages outside of annual wage reviews
➢ future coherence in classification structures across industry awards
➢ the future of equal remuneration orders – the latter having the potential to address gender-based disparities in paid rates remuneration.
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About this study

• Advocacy: Seattle Human Services Coalition (SHSC)

• Funding: City of Seattle Human Services Department

• University of Washington (Seattle) - led team of national and international scholars
  • Advised by a Steering Committee convened by the SHSC
  • Interpretations and conclusions are ours alone
When Aaliyah Bains was hired as a building assistant at the Bob and Marcia Almquist Place in July 2020, she knew it would be a tough job. She knew it was home to more than 100 newly housed, disabled people, most of whom had moved in after years in homeless shelters or the street.

She also knew she’d be making less than $40,000 a year and could only afford a 200-square-foot studio in the University District. But she was a college student and thought she could make it work. And for over a year, she...
Building on knowledge that non-profit human services workers are paid less than other workers in our region.

• **Study goals:**
  1. Estimate the wage gap
  2. Examine **comparable worth**
     • Comparable worth = “equal pay for equivalent work”

• **Methods: policy review plus original data analysis**
  • Market analysis
  • Job evaluation analysis
Human services workers
Human services workers

• Examples: youth services, older adult services, childcare, supportive housing, services for persons who are homeless
Human services workers

• Examples: youth services, older adult services, childcare, supportive housing, services for persons who are homeless

• Disproportionately in the non-profit sector
Human services workers

- Examples: youth services, older adult services, childcare, supportive housing, services for persons who are homeless

Analysis of 2005-2019 American Community Survey. All workers. Figure 1 in main report and Appendix 3, Table 1.
King County human services workforce is disproportionately female

Analysis of 2005-2019 American Community Survey. All King County workers. Figure 2 in main report and Appendix 3, Table 1.
King County human services workforce is disproportionately female, Black

Analysis of 2005-2019 American Community Survey. All King County workers. Figure 2 in main report and Appendix 3, Table 1.
King County human services workforce is disproportionately female, Black, and part-time.

Analysis of 2005-2019 American Community Survey. All King County workers. Figure 2 in main report and Appendix 3, Table 1.
Understanding wage structures
Penalties that depress wages for non-profit human services workers

Sexism

Racism

Care work under valued

Low client power

Non-profit sector
Market analysis

• What are human services workers in King County paid relative to workers in other care and non-care industries?

• Two data sources
  • American Community Survey (Census Bureau)
  • Washington State Employment Security Department
Industry and sector wage penalties, Washington state

Relative to workers in non-care industries...

Workers in Non-Profit+ Human Services are paid 37% less

Workers in Human Services are paid 30% less

Workers in Other Care Industries are paid 11% less

Multivariate analysis of American Community Survey data for full-time, full-year workers ages 18-64. Analysis controls for worker characteristics and time trends. Source: Appendix 3, Exhibit H.
Job switching analysis
Job evaluation analysis

- Compare different jobs based on characteristics
- In-depth examination of specific jobs
Job evaluation analysis

• Compare different jobs based on characteristics

• In-depth examination of specific jobs
Findings: King county non-profit human services workers are paid less for jobs that are as or more demanding than other jobs.
Findings: King county non-profit human services workers are paid less for jobs that are as or more demanding than other jobs.

### Table 2. Job evaluation (JE) scores and median King County salaries, non-profit human services jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JE score</th>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Area median salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>$39,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Youth Advocate</td>
<td>$45,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Office Assistant/Intake Coordinator</td>
<td>$43,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Early Learning Director/Site Coordinator</td>
<td>$41,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Case Manager</td>
<td>$66,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>$58,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Manager - Housing Services</td>
<td>$66,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Coalition Director - Programs and Membership</td>
<td>$66,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Children's Advocate</td>
<td>$55,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Director - Housing Services</td>
<td>$78,612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Job evaluation (JE) scores and median area salaries, comparator jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JE score</th>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Area median salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>$62,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Public School Equity Director</td>
<td>$76,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Journey Electrician</td>
<td>$79,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Dispatcher/Office Manager</td>
<td>$55,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
<td>$130,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Facilities Manager/Administrator</td>
<td>$81,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Private School Equity Director</td>
<td>$133,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>$129,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Employment and Diversity Director</td>
<td>$129,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Construction Project Manager</td>
<td>$104,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9. Teaching Assistant Job Comparison

Comparing job evaluation factor scores and pay for a non-profit human services job and a similarly-scored job not in human services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>TEACHING ASSISTANT NON-PROFIT SECTOR</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATOR/PROJECT MANAGER PUBLIC SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Median Pay $39,177/year</td>
<td>Median Pay $76,860/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Job Evaluation Score 404</td>
<td>Job Evaluation Score 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For People</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Supervision</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Financial Resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Physical Resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative/Independence</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Job evaluation scores from study analysis (see text and Appendix 4 for details). Human services salary data from 2021 King County Nonprofit Wage and Benefit Report (501 Commons, 2021). Comparison salary data from Bureau of Labor Standards (2022) for Seattle-Bellevue-Tacoma metro area.
Figure 10. Director of Housing Services Job Comparison

Comparing job evaluation factor scores and pay for a non-profit human services job and a similarly-scored job not in human services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DIRECTOR OF HOUSING SERVICES NON-PROFIT SECTOR</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGER FOR-PROFIT SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Score: 121/142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Score: 65/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Comm</td>
<td>Score: 65/65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Score: 26/39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Score: 20/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Score: 40/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Score: 40/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For People</td>
<td>Score: 65/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Supervision</td>
<td>Score: 65/39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Financial Res</td>
<td>Score: 52/65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Physical Res</td>
<td>Score: 39/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative/Independence</td>
<td>Score: 78/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score: 40/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Score: 716/710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Job evaluation scores from study analysis (see text and Appendix 4 for details). Human services salary data from 2021 King County Nonprofit Wage and Benefit Report (501 Commons, 2021). Comparison salary data from Bureau of Labor Standards (2022) for Seattle-Bellevue-Tacoma metro area.
Short-term recommendations

1. Raise real wage rates by a minimum of 7% for non-profit human services workers in the near term.

2. Adjust for inflation separately.

3. Maintain or improve benefits and job characteristics.

4. Consider wages in racial and gender equity work.
Longer-term recommendations

5. Substantially increase wages for non-profit human services workers to align with those of workers doing comparable work in other sectors and industries.

6. Create a salary grade system.

7. Use public contracts to further wage equity.
The math...

• Closing a 30% gap
  • $70,000 to $100,000 requires a 43% raise

• Closing a 37% gap
  • 63,000 to $100,000 requires a 59% raise
Longer-term recommendations

5. Substantially increase wages for non-profit human services workers to align with those of workers doing comparable work in other sectors and industries.

6. Create a salary grade system.

7. Use public contracts to further wage equity.
For more information, see https://socialwork.uw.edu/wageequitystudy
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Overview

• The nonprofit human services sector has grown steadily since the 1960s as public pressure has built to respond to critical and emerging needs.
  o Today, 80,000 NYC nonprofit sector workers are employed under NYC’s $6B in human services contracts.

• These contracts have been chronically under-funded with the result that predominantly well-educated women of color workforce are paid unusually low wages and 20-30% less than similarly educated City government human services employees, with inferior benefits.

• We’ll review the data documenting this significant pay disparity, the policies that produced this result, and possible strategies to correct these inequities.

➢ This presentation draws from an updating of the Center’s March 2022 report, The Case for Ending Poverty Wages for NYC’s Human Services Workers, prepared with my colleague Lina Moe.

Why and how has the human services sector grown?

- **Rapid growth in nonprofit human services sector**
  - Long history of service provision by settlement houses
  - Contracted out in part to limit further growth in municipal unions (& do it for less $)
  - Partly as a means to decentralize service provision in a very large city
  - As public commitment to address human services has expanded, so has nonprofit workforce.

- **Multi-year contracts not based on the cost of providing the services**
  - City procurement system geared to low-cost bidder
  - Entered-into by mission-serving nonprofits (some of which can supplement with philanthropic $).

- While the dollar amount of contracts has always been less because of the lower pay for nonprofit employees, for many years there were regular pay adjustments in line w/ municipal labor contracts (that ended in 2007).

- City has backed away from limited efforts to provide health & pension benefits.
NYC core social assistance employment increased by 63% since 2000, more than 2.5 times the increase for all private sector employment.

Source: NYSDOL, QCEW, 2022
Women of color predominate among NYC core human services nonprofit workforce

Source: CNYCA analysis of American Community Survey 2021 5-year sample.
A greater share of full-time core human services workers has advanced degrees than in the city’s overall private workforce.

Source: CNYCA analysis of American Community Survey 2021 5-year sample.
In 2022, annual average pay in NYC core human services was $37,900—one of the lowest–paying of all sectors, and paid less than clothing stores and hotels.

Source: NYSDOL, QCEW, 2022
22% of NYC core human services workers receive SNAP assistance, and 24% have incomes below 200% of the FPL.

➢ In 2019, 2/3 of all full-time core human services workers had earnings below the City’s own near-poverty threshold.

Source: CNYCA analysis of American Community Survey 2021 5-year sample.
Core human services full-time pay significantly lags the pay of public and private sector workers at every education level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time workers</th>
<th>Core HS NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>$44,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>$31,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>$39,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>$49,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgrad</td>
<td>$63,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CNYCA analysis of American Community Survey 2021 5-year sample.
Pay gaps between core human services and gov’t remain sizable when holding education level constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median salaries, full-time workers</th>
<th>Core human services</th>
<th>Gov’t</th>
<th>% by which core human services pay lags Gov’t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors with B.A. degree</td>
<td>$49,809</td>
<td>$55,475</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors with a postgraduate degree</td>
<td>$53,948</td>
<td>$67,421</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers with B.A. degree</td>
<td>$46,421</td>
<td>$55,263</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors with a postgraduate degree</td>
<td>$60,406</td>
<td>$73,269</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CNYCA analysis of American Community Survey 2021 5-year sample.*
Under NYC’s service contract prevailing wage law, many less-skilled workers are paid better than the median hourly pay for full-time nonprofit human services workers ($27.00).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>selected occupational titles/ regular hourly rates</th>
<th>wage rate</th>
<th>supplemental benefit rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary office services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>$41.39</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer assistant</td>
<td>$35.87</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File clerk</td>
<td>$22.20</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>$23.29</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building service employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential building class &quot;A&quot; Handyman</td>
<td>$32.15</td>
<td>$14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential building cleaner/porter/doorperson/ elevator operator</td>
<td>$29.47</td>
<td>$14.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NYC Comptroller prevailing wage schedules.*
Human services workforce labor market challenges

• Even before the pandemic, poor pay resulted in chronic turnover and retention problems, often leading to discontinuities in service delivery and quality.

• Inadequate contract funding also means poor health and retirement benefits, and another reason workers leave to work for the City.

• Since nonprofits have limited resources to invest in training or career advancement, the City recently established a Human Services Career Advancement Scholarship, but it is limited and needs to be expanded.

➢ Pay inequities can only be addressed through government policy.
Solution may be driven by a racial equity imperative

- Traditional measures to raise pay not sufficient (annual COLA, minimum wage, living wage, prevailing wage).
- Governor Hochul pushed through a flawed min. wage increase this year.
- Puzzling that unionization hasn’t worked given NYC’s high union density.
- Historic 2019 starting pay salary parity agreement in ECE needs to go further.
- Procurement reform to mandate full-cost contracting would be step in right direction, but effects of occupational segregation have kept care-related pay artificially low.
- NYC formed a Racial Justice Commission in the wake of George Floyd’s murder and a citywide ballot initiative passed 70-30 in Nov. 2022 to establish the Mayor’s Office of Racial Equity (a Commission on Gender Equity had been estab. in 2020).
  - Elected officials voice support for addressing longstanding racially disparate pay practices; will they do something about it?
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