

Senate Staff Employment Study
Salary, Tenure, and Demographic Data:
1991-2001

A Congressional Management Foundation Report



513 Capitol Court, NE
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002
www.cmfweb.org
Ph: 202-546-0100
Fax: 202-547-0936
Email: cmf@cmfweb.org

Table of Contents

Introduction

Purpose.....	1
Methodology	1

Salary

General.....	2
Average Salary for all Senate Positions in 2001	2
Average Senate Salary for all Positions: The 10-Year Record	2
Consumer Price Index: The 10-Year Record.....	3
Pay Comparison of Congressional Personal Office Staff and Federal Workers: The 10-Year Record.....	4
Pay Comparison of Senate Personal Staff and U.S. Labor Force.....	5
Pay Comparison of Senate Personal Staff and U.S. Labor Force by Educational Attainment: The 10-Year Record.....	6
Gender.....	7
Average Salary for all Positions by Gender in 2001	7
Gender Pay Gap: The 10-Year Record.....	7
Gender Pay in U.S. Labor Force: The 10-Year Record.....	8
Race/Ethnicity	9
Average Salary for all Positions by Race/Ethnicity in 2001	9
Pay Gap by Race/Ethnicity: The 10-Year Record.....	9
Race/Ethnicity Pay Gap in U.S. Labor Force: The 10-Year Record	10

Tenure

Averages	11
Distributions.....	12

Demographics

Congressional Characteristics	13
Educational Attainment by at Least a Bachelor's Degree: The 10-Year Record	13
Marital Status: The 10-Year Record	13
Gender.....	14
Staff Location by Gender in 2001	14
Female Staff in Congress: The 10-Year Record	14
Female Staff in Private and Public Sectors: The 10-Year Record	15
Gender Type by Position: The 10-Year Record.....	16
Position Category Definitions	17
Race/Ethnicity	18
Staff Location by Race/Ethnicity in 2001	
Employment by Race/Ethnicity: The 10-Year Record.....	19
Race/Ethnic Staff in Private and Public Sectors: The 10-Year Record	20
Race/Ethnicity by Type of Position: The 10-Year Record	21

Introduction

Purpose

For the last decade, the Congressional Management Foundation (CMF) has been collecting data on and analyzing compensation and employment data of House and Senate personal offices. CMF hopes this 10-year retrospective document on the personal offices of Senators will provide Senators, Chiefs of Staff, Office Managers and Senate staff overall with a useful overview and analysis of key trends that characterize the Senate labor market and Senate office employment practices and policies. CMF believes providing this compilation of 10 years' of data to the managers of Senate offices and the officers of the Senate provides valuable data that should prove helpful in improving management practices and enhancing the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the U.S. Senate.

Methodology

In preparing this report, CMF compiled the aggregated and individual data of salary, tenure and demographic information reported in the six *Senate Staff Employment Studies* we published from 1991 to 2001. For each of these reports, CMF collected responses from 55 to 62% of all Senate personal offices. Over the decade CMF has collected information on 11,989 Senate, personal office staff. In this report, we have included aggregate data analyses we believe provide the most meaningful and useful management information to Senate offices. These findings are divided into three categories:

- ◆ Salary Data
- ◆ Tenure Data
- ◆ Demographic Data

To provide a useful comparison for analyzing this data, CMF includes comparisons of Senate compensation and other personnel practices to other labor markets, such as the federal executive branch, the U.S. labor force, and comparable House of Representatives data, where relevant and possible.

Salary: General Information

Average Salary for all Senate Positions in 2001

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
Average Salary 2001:	\$45,847	\$49,236	\$39,751

In 2001, Senate personal office staff earned an average of \$45,847. State office staff earn .81 cents for every dollar earned by Washington-based staff.

In comparison to the Senate, the average House staff salary in 2000 was \$42,314. Washington-based House staff had an average salary of \$46,598, and district-based staff earned an average of \$36,717.

Average Senate Salary for all Positions: The 10-Year Record

<u>Year</u>	<u>Avg. Salary</u>	<u>% Change Since Last Measured</u>
2001	\$45,847	9.1%
1999	\$42,037	6.3%
1997	\$39,534	6.3%
1995	\$37,209	1.0%
1993	\$36,844	11.3%
1991	\$33,094	N/A

Overall, the average salary of Senate personal office staffers increased by 38.5% between 1991 and 2001. This is equivalent to a 3.3% average annualized increase in pay.

Average House Salary for all Positions: The 10-Year Record

<u>Year</u>	<u>Avg. Salary</u>	<u>% Change Since Last Measured</u>
2000	\$42,314	8.1%
1998	\$39,132	6.6%
1996	\$36,728	3.4%
1994	\$35,510	6.4%
1992	\$33,388	13.0%
1990	\$29,542	13.1%

Between 1990 and 2000, the average pay of House personal office staffers rose by 43.2%. This translates into an average annualized increase of 3.7%.

Consumer Price Index: The 10-Year Record

<u>Year</u>	<u>CPI</u>	<u>% Change Since Last Measured</u>
2001	177.7	2.9%
2000	172.7	3.4%
1999	167.1	2.5%
1998	163.0	1.6%
1997	160.5	2.3%
1996	156.9	3.0%
1995	152.4	2.8%
1994	148.2	2.6%
1993	144.5	3.0%
1992	140.3	3.0%
1991	136.2	4.2%

From 1991 to 2001, the inflation rate, as measured by the CPI, rose 30.5%. This translates into an average annualized rate of 2.7%. Pay increases in the Senate over the past 10 years surpassed inflationary increases. The growing economy in the mid to late 1990s is the most likely reason why Senate salary increases outpaced the rate of inflation. While the good economy kept inflation low, it also kept unemployment low, especially among white collar or professional workers. This created a buyer's job market that resulted in the escalation of salaries, especially amongst white collar workers nationwide, well above the rate of inflation. This national labor market trend likely created pressures on Senate offices as well to raise salaries beyond the rate of inflation.

Pay Comparison of Congressional Personal Office Staff and Federal Workers³: The 10-Year Record

(Table shows average pay and the “gap” or percentage by which federal pay exceeds Senate pay)

Senate

<u>Year</u>	<u>DC-Based Senate</u>	<u>DC-Based Federal</u>	<u>Gap</u>
2001	\$49,236	\$64,969	32%
1999	\$45,223	\$59,745	32%
1997	\$42,343	\$56,191	33%
1995	\$39,414	\$51,376	30%
1993	\$38,971	\$46,783	20%
1991	\$35,802	\$42,413	18%

<u>Year</u>	<u>All Senate</u>	<u>All Federal</u>	<u>Gap</u>
2001	\$45,847	\$51,618	13%
1999	\$42,037	\$46,550	11%
1997	\$39,534	\$44,294	12%
1995	\$37,209	\$41,154	11%
1993	\$36,844	\$37,718	2%
1991	\$33,094	\$33,736	2%

House

<u>Year</u>	<u>DC-Based House</u>	<u>DC-Based Federal</u>	<u>Gap</u>
2000	\$46,598	\$64,615	39%
1998	\$42,558	\$58,170	37%
1996	\$40,112	\$53,539	33%
1994	\$38,807	\$49,243	27%
1992	\$36,618	\$44,758	22%
1990	\$32,297	\$39,472	22%

<u>Year</u>	<u>All House</u>	<u>All Federal</u>	<u>Gap</u>
2000	\$42,314	\$51,000	20%
1998	\$39,132	\$46,056	18%
1996	\$36,728	\$42,610	16%
1994	\$35,510	\$39,590	12%
1992	\$33,388	\$35,772	7%
1990	\$29,542	\$31,565	7%

Senate staff based in Washington have earned significantly less than have federal workers in the Washington area, though the pay gap has stabilized since 1997. For the entire decade, this pay gap increased by 14 percentage points. The gap between all federal workers and all Senate staff widened by 11 percentage points throughout the decade. As with the pay gap among DC-based

³ Comparative data is from Christine E. Steele, “Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees,” Office of Personnel Management (OPM), March 31, 1999, 1997, 1995, 1993; September 30, 2000.

workers, the most significant increases in this pay gap occurred in the middle of the decade and has since stabilized.

There are two likely factors that explain the sizeable increase in the pay gap that occurred over the past 10 years. First, congressional staff do not receive automatic COLAs (cost of living adjustments) based on any standard formula and, consequently, annual budget dollars appropriated to pay House and Senate staff COLAs can vary and even not be appropriated at all, as was the case in the Senate in 1994 and 1995. Second, federal executive branch workers receive a standard COLA that tends to be more generous than the COLAs provided to House and Senate offices for their staff.

This pay gap is also seen between House staff and federal executive branch employees. In fact, the gap between both DC-based staff and all staff is even larger for the House than it is for the Senate. The significant portion of the increase over ten years occurred in the middle of the decade, as it did on the Senate side. The increase in the pay gap on the House side has not stabilized in recent years, but has continued to grow. Currently, DC-based federal workers earn 39% more than the pay of DC-based House staff, up 2 percentage points since last reported. The gap between all federal workers and all House staff is 20%, up 2 percentage points since last reported.

Pay Comparison of Senate Personal Staff and U.S. Labor Force

(Table shows average pay and the “gap” or percentage by which Senate pay exceeds U.S. labor force pay)

<u>Year</u>	<u>All Senate</u>	<u>U.S Labor Force⁵</u>	<u>Gap</u>
2001	\$45,847	\$45,430	0.9%
1999	\$42,037	\$41,483	1%
1997	\$39,534	\$36,539	8%
1995	\$37,209	\$31,241	19%
1993	\$36,844	\$30,946	19%
1991	\$33,094	N/A	N/A

Senate personal office staff earned slightly more than that of the U.S. labor force worker in 2001. However, the larger pay gap Senate workers enjoyed over the U.S. workforce has disappeared. Earlier in the 1990s, Senate staff earned around 19% more than the pay of U.S. labor force workers. For full-time, year-round workers in the U.S. labor force, average earnings in 2000 were \$45,430, just slightly below the \$45,847 average pay of Senate office staff in 2001. The more generous formula for calculating COLAs in the executive branch and the decision not to provide COLAs to Senate staff in the mid-90s are the likely reasons for the elimination of this pay gap.

⁵ Bureau of Labor Statistics and Commerce Department .

Pay Comparison of Senate Personal Staff and U.S. Labor Force by Educational Attainment: The 10-Year Record

(by educational attainment of year-round, full-time workers)

Senate Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Bachelor's</u>	<u>Master's</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Doctorate</u>
2001	\$41,938	\$61,466	\$67,454	\$71,154
1999	\$38,223	\$55,780	\$62,378	\$62,047
1997	\$36,073	\$50,905	\$55,210	\$71,487
1995	\$34,134	\$48,662	\$56,052	\$62,102
1993	\$33,627	\$49,411	\$56,633	\$60,070
1991	\$30,908	\$46,376	\$54,088	\$53,431

U.S. Labor Force⁶

<u>Year</u>	<u>Bachelor's</u>	<u>Master's</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Doctorate</u>
2001	\$62,818	\$77,162	\$112,347	\$94,073
1999	\$56,655	\$66,694	\$113,700	\$92,647
1997	\$45,856	\$60,216	\$107,457	\$80,005
1995	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1993	\$33,000	\$40,000	\$75,000	N/A
1991	~\$26,000	~\$34,000	~\$57,000	N/A

While staff in the Senate are, on average, better educated than the national workforce (see chart on page 13), Senate staff are not as well compensated for their formal training as their counterparts in the national workforce. In 2001 among those with bachelor's degrees, Senate staff earn 33.2% less than comparably educated workers in the national workforce. Additionally, Senate staff with Master's and Doctorate degrees earned 20% and 24% less, respectively, than did comparably educated workers in the national workforce.

There was a spike in the pay gap between Senate staff holding Bachelor's degrees and comparably educated staff in the national workforce in the later half of the 1990s. However, probably due to the slowing of the economy, this pay gap increased by less than one percent between 1999 and 2001, up to 33.2% from 32.5% in 1999. This continuing differential in pay between well-educated Senate staff and the national workforce could encourage some Senate staff to leave Capitol Hill.

⁶ Bureau of Labor Statistics and Commerce Department.

Salary: Gender

Average Salary for all Positions by Gender in 2001

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
Female	\$42,236	\$45,845	\$36,923
Male	<u>\$50,501</u>	<u>\$52,876</u>	<u>\$44,845</u>
Differential	\$8,265	\$7,031	\$7,922

On average, in 2001 female Senate staff earned 84 cents for every dollar earned by male staff. Among Washington staff, the figure was 87 cents; among state staff, it was 82 cents.

The decrease in the gender pay gap since 1999 (see chart below) is likely explained by a 5 percentage point increase in the number of female staff in the highest paying jobs. See further analysis of the staffing among position levels on pages 16.

Gender Pay Gap: The 10-Year Record

(female pay as a proportion of male pay)

Senate Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	.84	.87	.82
1999	.83	.85	.86
1997	.88	.89	.92
1995	.87	.91	.83
1993	.81	.84	.77
1991	.78	.82	.75

House Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2000	.83	.86	.86
1998	.83	.87	.84
1996	.86	.89	.87
1994	.84	.86	.87
1992	.82	.84	.84
1990	.81	.84	.83

Over the decade, the pay gap between male and female staff decreased 6 percentage points. The gap has consistently decreased, with the exception of 1999. Additionally, the pay of DC-based female staff, as a proportion of male pay, rose 2 percentage points since 1999 and 5 percentage points since 1991. However, state-based female staff earn 82 cents on the dollar as compared to male staff, down 4 percentage points since 1999. This is the lowest reported level since 1993.

Gender Pay in U.S. Labor Force: 10-Year Record

	<u>Overall</u> ⁷
2001	.65
1999	.69
1997	.67
1995	.67
1993	.67
1991	.71

Between 1991 and 2001, women on congressional staffs have consistently earned more equitable pay in comparison to their male colleagues than have women in other sectors of the economy. In fact, while the pay gap between the pay of male and female staff in the Senate decreased over the decade, the pay gap in the overall workforce increased.

A comparison of the average pay of women in the Senate to the average pay of women in other sectors over the decade shows that female Senate staff earn comparatively higher salaries than do women in other sectors. Specifically, data for the year 2000 showed that in the full-time, year-round U.S. labor force women earned \$34,648⁸ vs. \$42,236 earned by Senate female staff.

⁷ Bureau of Labor Statistics and Commerce Department.

⁸ Annual Demographic Survey: March Supplement (2001): Table PINC-01; Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of the Census.

Salary: Race/Ethnicity

Average Salary for all Positions by Race/Ethnicity in 2001

Race/Ethnicity	Total	Washington	State
Asian	\$35,044	\$40,477	\$26,894
Black	\$37,690	\$38,685	\$36,260
Hispanic	\$35,829	\$40,876	\$32,780
White	\$47,271	\$50,462	\$40,976
Other	\$39,184	\$42,085	\$37,008

On average, in 2001 black Senate staff earned 80 cents for every dollar earned by white staff. Hispanic staff earned 76 cents, and for Asian staff the figure was 74 cents.

Pay Gap by Race/Ethnicity: The 10-Year Record

(as a proportion of the pay for white staff)

Senate Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Asian</u> ⁹	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
2001	.74	.80	.76
1999	.80	.76	.82
1997	N/A	.76	.85
1995	N/A	.79	.74
1993	N/A	.83	.75
1991	N/A	.83	.75

House Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
2000	.87	.95	.83
1998	N/A	.87	.88
1996	N/A	.92	.93
1994	N/A	.92	.86
1992	N/A	.93	.77
1990	N/A	.89	.82

From 1993 to 1999 there was a trend of declining black salaries compared to white salaries. This trend was reversed between 1991 and 2001. Black staff earned 80% of white salaries, an increase of 4 percentage points since 1999. However, for the decade, the pay of black staff as compared to white staff declined 3 percentage points (.83 vs. .80).

⁹ This is the second Senate survey to report this information for Asians; therefore, historical data for comparison is limited.

After declining 3 percentage points from 1997 to 1999, the pay differential between white and Hispanic staff declined another 6 percentage points between 1999 and 2001. With this 9 percentage points decline, the pay differential between white and Hispanic staff in 2001 was at nearly the same level as it was in 1991. However, as historically has been the case, the differences in Senate staff pay by Race/Ethnicity are largely due to differences in the jobs held by minority staff as compared to white staff. A chart on page 21 shows that minorities are under-represented in higher-paying positions and over-represented in the lower-paying positions.

In comparing the Senate and House, the gap between the pay of white staff and minority staff has historically been smaller in the House. The most noticeable difference is in the pay of black staff in comparison to white staff. In 2001, black Senate staff earned .80 cents for every dollar earned by white Senate staff, down 3 percentage points since 1991. In 2000, black House staff earned 95 cents for every dollar earned by white House staff, up 6 percentage points since 1990.

Race/Ethnicity Pay Gap in U.S. Labor Force¹⁰: The 10-Year Record

	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
2001	.72	.63
1999	.71	.66
1997	.76	.68
1995	.74	.71
1993	.74	.71
1991	.77	.69

Throughout the decade, the pay of minority staff in Congress was more equitable than the pay of minority workers in the overall U.S. labor force.

¹⁰ Bureau of Labor Statistics and Commerce Department.

Tenure: Averages

Years in Current Position

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	2.8	2.2	3.8
1999	2.8	2.3	3.7
1997	2.8	2.3	3.7
1995	3.3	2.8	4.4
1993	3.5	3.1	4.4
1991	3.4	3.1	4.0

Years in Current Office

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	3.6	3.1	4.6
1999	3.6	3.1	4.6
1997	3.6	3.1	4.5
1995	4.2	3.7	5.2
1993	4.4	3.9	5.5
1991	4.2	3.9	4.8

Years in Congress

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	5.3	5.0	5.8
1999	5.4	5.2	5.9
1997	5.6	5.5	5.7
1995	5.7	5.6	6.1
1993	5.9	5.6	6.5
1991	5.6	5.7	5.5

Over the past decade, there has been a decrease in tenure among Washington-based Senate Staff. Tenure in position has decreased 29%; tenure in office has decreased 21%; and tenure in Congress has decreased 12%. Among all Senate staff during the last 10 years, there has been a decline in average tenure in position (-18%), office (-14%) and Congress (-5%). As reported in 1997 and 1999, all three tenure statistics are at all time lows since CMF began collecting this data in 1991.

The decrease tenure could be caused by two factors. First, a large number of new Senators were elected in the 1990s and likely resulted in an influx of many new staff. Second, the high-educational attainment and government experience of Washington-based staff, coupled with the rising economy and continued increases in executive branch pay, may have provided an incentive for staff to seek job opportunities outside the Senate in the DC area during the last 10 years.

Tenure: Distributions

Less than 2 Years in Current Position

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	64.1%	69.6%	54.3%
1999	64.0%	70.3%	52.5%
1997	63.0%	68.9%	52.0%
1995	60.0%	65.8%	48.5%
1993	56.8%	62.7%	45.0%
1991	58.4%	63.4%	49.5%

Less than 2 Years in Current Office

<u>Years</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	53.4%	57.6%	46.7%
1999	53.6%	59.5%	43.0%
1997	51.5%	55.8%	43.1%
1995	50.2%	55.1%	40.2%
1993	46.1%	51.5%	34.8%
1991	49.3%	53.5%	41.6%

Less than 2 Years in Congress

<u>Years</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	44.4%	46.6%	40.3%
1999	43.6%	47.0%	37.5%
1997	39.1%	40.8%	35.9%
1995	40.0%	42.4%	34.9%
1993	36.8%	40.9%	28.0%
1991	39.8%	41.2%	36.2%

The above distribution tables highlight the lack of experience among Senate staff and the growth in their lack of experience over the decade.

Forty-four percent of staff have worked in Congress for two years or less, an increase of nearly 5 percentage points since 1991. Moreover, more than half of Senate staff have less than two years of experience in their current office – an increase of 4 percentage points since 1991.

Perhaps the most telling data is the low tenure in position among Senate staff. Nearly two-thirds of all Senate staff have less than two years of experience in their position – an increase of nearly 6 percentage points since 1991.

While the lack of experience is seen across the board, it is more prevalent among Washington-based staff.

Demographics: Congressional Characteristics

Educational Attainment of at Least a Bachelor's Degree: The 10-Year Record

	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Federal Executive¹¹</u>	<u>US Labor Force¹²</u>
2001	86.3%	40.5%	26.6%
1999	85.5%	39.9%	25.6%
1997	84.0%	39.4%	23.8%
1995	82.3%	38.3%	~20%
1993	81.3%	36.5%	~20%
1991	78.8%	35.0%	17.0%

Senate staff have consistently remained a very highly-educated group. The percentage of Senate staff with at least a Bachelor's degree rose 7.5 percentage points (78.8% to 86.3%) in the 1990s.

In every year reported, Senate staff had significantly greater educational training than had federal civilian employees, with the percentage of Senate staff holding at least a Bachelor's degree more than double the percentage of federal workers with at least a Bachelor's degree. Furthermore throughout the decade of reporting this data, the percentage of Senate staff with at least a Bachelor's degree has been 3 to 4 times greater than the percentage of workers in the U.S. workforce with at least a Bachelor's degree.

House staff are as highly educated as Senate staff. CMF's most current data reports that in 2000 82.1% of House staff held at least a Bachelor's degree.

Marital Status: The 10-Year Record

	<u>Married</u>	<u>Single</u>
2001	38.1%	61.9%
1999	36.8%	63.2%
1997	~39%	~61%
1995	37.6%	62.4%
1993	41.3%	58.7%
1991	43.1%	56.9%

Throughout the decade of the 1990s, the percentage of Senate staff who were single increased 5 percentage points.

¹¹ Christine Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees," Office of Personnel Management, 1991-2001.

¹² The Employment Situation, Current Population Survey, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Demographics: Gender

Staff Location by Gender in 2001

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
Female	57%	52%	64%
Male	43%	48%	36%

The overall gap in the total numbers of female and male staff is largely due to the almost 2 to 1 ratio of female to male staff at the state level.

Female staff in Congress: The 10-Year Record

(percent of staff who are female)

Senate Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
2001	57%	52%	64%
1999	58%	53%	67%
1997	56%	51%	64%
1995	56%	52%	65%
1993	60%	56%	68%
1991	62%	59%	68%

House Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>District</u>
2000	57%	50%	66%
1998	57%	50%	66%
1996	56%	50%	65%
1994	58%	52%	66%
1992	61%	54%	69%
1990	61%	54%	70%

After declining in the earlier part of the decade, there have been no significant changes in the ratio of male to female Senate staff since 1995. However, as reported on page 16, women no longer hold a disproportionate number of support positions as they did in the early to mid 1990s.

Female staffing levels in the House over the decade were roughly similar to those in the Senate. House Washington offices had a slightly lower percentage of female staff than had Washington Senate offices. However, House district offices had slightly higher percentage of female staff than had Senate state offices.

Female staff in Private and Public Sectors: The 10-Year Record

(percent of staff who are female)

<u>Year</u>	<u>US. Labor Force</u> ¹³	<u>Federal Agencies</u> ¹⁴
2001	47%	45%
1999	46%	45%
1997	46%	45%
1995	45%	45%
1993	45%	44%
1991	45%	43%

Overall, female staff are far more heavily employed in Congress than in other sectors. This has been the case throughout the decade. Over the decade, the staffing levels of women in the private and public sectors were more stable than the staffing levels of women in Congress.

¹³ The Employment Situation, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1991-2001.

¹⁴ Christine Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees," Office of Personnel Management, 1991-2001.

Gender Type by Position: The 10-Year Record

(In the table below, we have grouped positions of similar responsibility in the Senate (see next page) and disaggregated them by gender.)

	Females				
	<u>Executive</u>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Mid-level</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Overall</u> ¹⁵
2001	41.6%	42.5%	65.1%	59.4%	56.6%
1999	36.9%	43.2%	66.9%	61.7%	57.7%
1997	39.8%	39.8%	64.8%	58.6%	55.8%
1995	36.9%	43.1%	64.8%	71.6%	57.2%
1993	33.5%	40.6%	69.7%	74.5%	56.3%
1991	30.8%	39.1%	67.7%	82.1%	62.3%

	Males				
	<u>Executive</u>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Mid-level</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Overall</u>
2001	58.4%	57.5%	34.9%	40.6%	43.4%
1999	63.1%	56.8%	33.1%	38.3%	42.3%
1997	60.2%	60.2%	35.2%	41.4%	44.2%
1995	63.1%	56.9%	35.2%	28.4%	42.8%
1993	66.5%	59.4%	30.3%	25.5%	43.7%
1991	69.2%	60.9%	32.2%	17.9%	37.7%

In comparison to the overall composition of Senate personal staff, males hold a disproportionate share of executive and policy positions; females hold a disproportionate share of mid-level positions.

However, the proportion of female staff in executive positions increased by nearly 11 percentage points between 1991 and 2001. There was a steady increase (interrupted once, in 1999) in the representation of women in executive policies throughout the past decade. A possible explanation for such a significant increase was the election of 10 women U.S. Senators in the 1990s. The proportion of female staff in policy, mid-level and support positions decreased between 2 and 3 percentage points since 1991. The percentage of women in support positions has decreased nearly 23 percentage points over the last decade.

Data shows that throughout the decade women held a much higher proportion of top positions in the Senate than they did in the U.S. economy overall. The chart below provides 2001 figures for the representation of women in executive positions in the private and public sectors.

<u>Women in Executive Positions</u>	<u>Total</u>
U.S. Senate	41.6%
Federal Executive Agencies ¹⁶	25.2%
Fortune 500 Companies ¹⁷	12.5%

¹⁵ “Overall” historical percentages may not be consistent with other historical data due to different “Type of Position” category definitions in past reports.

¹⁶ “SES by Gender as of September 30, 2000,” U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

¹⁷ 2000 Catalyst Census of Women Corporate Officers and Top Earners

Position Category Definitions

Executive positions: Chief of Staff, Communication Director, Office Manager/Deputy Chief of Staff, Legislative Director, State Director.

Policy positions: the **Executive positions** plus Legislative Assistant and Legislative Counsel.

Mid-level positions: Constituent Services Representative (State), Constituent Services Representative (Washington), Correspondence Manager, Deputy Communications Director, Executive Assistant, Projects Manger, Regional Director/Manager, Field Representative, Scheduler, System Administrator.

Support positions: Assistant to the Chief of Staff, Computer Operator, Correspondence Assistant, Legislative Correspondent, Junior Legislative Assistant, Staff Assistant (State), Staff Assistant (Washington).

Demographics: Race/Ethnicity

Offices were surveyed as to staff membership in the following ethnic groups: Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, White, and “Other”. In the table below, we show the percentage of staff in each of these 7 ethnic groups. However, because the numbers of Native American and Pacific Islander staff in Senate personal offices is small, we have combined these two ethnic groups with the group titled “Other” for all the previous and remaining tables in this report.

Staff location by Race/Ethnicity in 2001

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>State</u>
Asian	1.0%	0.9%	1.2%
Black	8.3%	7.6%	9.5%
Hispanic	3.6%	2.2%	6.2%
Native American	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%
Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
White	85.4%	88.2%	80.5%
Other	1.2%	0.8%	1.9%

Staffers from minority groups tend to be much more likely to work in Senators’ state-based offices than in Washington offices. As seen on the chart on the next page, overall, minorities comprise 14.5% of Senate personal office staff.

Employment by Race/Ethnicity: The Historical Record
(percent of staff by race/ethnicity)

Senate Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Other Minorities</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>
2001	1.0%	8.3%	3.6%	1.6%	14.5%
1999	1.1%	8.4%	3.6%	1.3%	14.4%
1997	1.5%	8.3%	2.5%	1.3%	13.6%
1995	1.6%	9.0%	3.5%	1.3%	15.4%
1993	N/A	8.7%	3.1%	2.9%	14.7%
1991	N/A	8.1%	3.2%	3.2%	14.5%

House Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Other Minorities</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>
2000	1.2%	7.6%	5.3%	1.4%	15.5%
1998	1.5%	5.9%	5.7%	1.1%	14.2%
1996	1.4%	6.8%	5.2%	1.0%	14.2%
1994	1.5%	7.9%	5.4%	1.4%	16.2%
1992	N/A	9.9%	3.6%	N/A	15.5%
1990	N/A	9.4%	3.3%	1.1%	13.8%

Over the decade, there has been virtually no change in the ratio of white to minority Senate staff. There have been very small fluctuations in the number of minority staff in the Senate with a low of 13.6% in 1997 and a high of 15.4% in 1995. Fluctuations in the minority staffing levels in the House were greater over the last decade, with the percentage of minority staff increasing nearly two points between 1990 and 2000.

The Senate minority staffing level and House minority staff level both reached their peak in 1995 and 1994, respectively, and then both declined two years later (a decline of 1.8 percentage points in the Senate and two percentage points in the House).

Senate offices tend to have a higher level of black staff, as compared to the House, while House offices tend to have a higher level of Hispanic staff.

Race/Ethnic staff in Private and Public Sectors: The 10-Year Record
(percent of staff who are minority)

U.S. Labor Force¹⁸

<u>Year</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
2001	11.8%	11.2%
1999	11.9%	10.6%
1997	11.1%	10.0%
1995	10.1%	7.5%
1993	10.1%	7.5%
1991	10.1%	7.5%

Federal Agencies¹⁹

<u>Year</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
2001	17.1%	6.6%
1999	17.1%	6.5%
1997	17.0%	6.0%
1995	17.0%	6.0%
1993	N/A	N/A
1991	N/A	N/A

Historically, minorities have had significantly lower employment rates in Senate and House offices than they have in the federal government and in the overall U.S. labor force.

¹⁸ The Employment Situation, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997-2001. 1991-1995 data was reported in 1991 news accounts.

¹⁹ Christine Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees," Office of Personnel Management, 1995-2001. Previous CMF reports did not report this data.

Race/Ethnicity by Type of Position: The 10-Year Record²⁰

(In the table below, we have grouped positions of similar responsibility (see page 17) and disaggregated them by race/ethnicity)

	Blacks				
	<u>Executive</u>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Mid-level</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Overall</u> ²¹
2001	3.1%	3.9%	9.9%	11.4%	8.5%
1999	1.3%	3.0%	8.7%	14.2%	8.4%
1997	1.5%	2.6%	8.0%	14.0%	8.3%
1995	1.5%	4.6%	9.6%	21.6%	9.2%
1993	1.5%	3.6%	8.9%	20.8%	8.1%
1991	3.9%	3.6%	9.0%	17.9%	8.1%
	Hispanics				
2001	2.0%	1.6%	5.4%	3.6%	3.7%
1999	1.3%	1.3%	5.1%	3.6%	3.6%
1997	0.8%	1.0%	3.7%	2.2%	2.5%
1995	1.5%	3.4%	5.2%	4.5%	4.0%
1993	1.0%	1.4%	5.4%	2.4%	3.1%
1991	0.5%	1.7%	5.0%	3.5%	3.2%
	White				
2001	94.5%	92.9%	81.5%	82.2%	85.2%
1999	96.9%	92.1%	84.2%	78.9%	85.6%
1997	95.4%	93.4%	85.2%	81.4%	86.4%
1995	94.5%	90.6%	82.6%	70.7%	84.5%
1993	95.6%	91.6%	83.9%	73.3%	86.2%
1991	93.7%	92.5%	84.3%	75.4%	86.7%
	Other				
2001	0.3%	1.5%	3.2%	2.9%	2.6%
1999	0.4%	3.6%	1.9%	3.2%	2.5%
1997	2.3%	3.0%	3.1%	2.4%	2.8%
1995	2.5%	1.4%	2.6%	3.2%	2.3%
1993	1.9%	3.4%	1.8%	3.5%	2.6%
1991	1.9%	2.1%	1.7%	3.2%	2.0%

Whites hold a disproportionate share of executive and policy positions and minority groups hold a disproportionate share of mid-level and support positions. Whites, who represent 85% of total Senate staff, hold about 95% of executive and policy positions. Minority staff, who together comprise the remaining 15% of Senate staff, hold approximately 5% of the executive and policy positions and approximately 20% of the mid-level and support positions. The overall percentage of minorities among Senate staff has remained relatively constant at around 14% for the last ten years. Since 1999 there has been a significant increase in the percentage of black staff in the executive, policy, and mid-level levels.

²⁰ No specific historical data existed for Asians. All information for Asians is included in the “Other” figures for 1991-2001.

²¹ “Overall” historical percentages may not be consistent with other historical data due to different “Type of Position” category definitions in past reports.



513 Capitol Court, NE
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002
www.cmfweb.org
ph: 202-546-0100
fax: 202-547-0936
e-mail: cmf@cmfweb.org