

Labor and Public Employees Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HB-6273

AN ACT CONCERNING DISCLOSURE OF SALARY RANGES ON PUBLIC AND

Title: INTERNAL JOB POSTINGS.

Vote Date: 3/23/2023

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/7/2023

File No.: 482

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Labor and Public Employees Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This proposal requires employers to disclose the wage or wage range of a position as well as a general description of benefits for a job posting. This legislation seeks to address the gender wage gap present in the state through increased transparency of compensation and benefits an employee should expect to receive in a specific job.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Tanya Hughes, Executive Director, CT Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities: They offered testimony in support of this legislation, stating that it would serve as an important step towards closing the gender wage gap in the state. They highlighted that historically women are less likely to receive promotions compared to men and are more likely to be viewed as overly aggressive when negotiating pay while seeking a new job. They cited that women earn \$0.83 for every dollar paid to men while Black, Indigenous, and Latina women earn substantially lower. They strongly urge passing of this legislation.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Aziz Dehkan, Executive Director, CRCJ: They offered testimony in support of this legislation. They argued that disclosing salary ranges in job postings promote equity in recruitment and salary negotiation. Additionally, they stated that increased transparency would help reduce pay disparities based on gender, race, or ethnicity.

Ed Hawthorne, President, CT AFL-CIO: They offered comments in support of this proposal. They emphasized that providing salary ranges on job postings would empower applicants to advocate for themselves. They highlighted that when applicants are informed they are more successful at salary negotiations, which in turn helps close the existing gender and racial wage gap. They also highlighted that without salary information women often ask for less money than their male counterparts, even when they are more qualified for the position.

Andrea, Johnson, Director of State Policy, National Women's Law Center: They strongly support this proposal, claiming that pay transparency serves as the leading tool for closing gender and racial wage gaps. They stated that similar legislation is becoming more common across the nation, in addition to the wage gap solution, it serves to attract and retain talented employees, and increases efficiency in the hiring process. They stated that employers who include pay ranges in job postings have a competitive edge and can avoid wasting time and resources interviewing someone who would not accept the position. Lastly, they cited research that pay transparency leads to a reduction in gender pay gaps and increases wages for women.

Nicole Sanclemente, Policy Manager, CWEALF: They provided testimony in support of this legislation. They stated that Connecticut has a gender pay gap where women earn significantly less than men, with Black and Latina women facing a greater wage gap. They cited research that showed women often ask for less while negotiating, and women who negotiate their salaries are often disadvantaged as they come across as a demanding and less desirable candidate. They argued that this proposal would strengthen existing law by increasing transparency and ensure continuous progress towards salary range transparency. They emphasized that this legislation does not remove the ability for employers to negotiate, but rather creates a building block for negotiation with a prospective employee. Lastly, multiple states have already taken up similar legislation and it has shown to be an important tool to benefit both employees and employers.

Jess Zaccagnino, Policy Counsel, ACLU CT: They offered testimony in support of this legislation, arguing that it would address the substantial gender and racial wage gap in the state. They claimed evidence suggests that pay transparency policies have been very successful in achieving pay equity, and this bill would benefit women, men of color, LGBTQ+ people, and others who face discrimination. They stated that this bill would build on past legislation which only required disclosure of salary ranges upon request or before making a job offer. They strongly urge that the committee pass this legislation and take this needed step towards pay equity and transparency.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Diane Paskiewicz, Consulting Opthamologists: They offered comments in opposition to this legislation. They stated that this proposal would harm recruitment practices and strongly believe it should not be changed. They argued that the current system better allows them to have a discussion with potential employees and tailor their offer based on experience and skill set.

Garrett Sheehan, President/CEO, Greater New Haven & Quinnipiac Chambers of Commerce: They opposed this proposal out of concern that it could prevent employers from paying employees who show more effort, skill, and productivity more than those who don't

perform at the same level. They stated that this would create a less competitive hiring process, and negatively impact employees who is working harder and can't receive competitive pay.

Eric Gjede, VP, CBIA: They offered testimony in opposition to this legislation. They argued that it would removes an employer's flexibility to adjust a positions salary to suit a candidate or a change in business fiscal outlook. Additionally, they stated that this legislation may deter highly qualified candidates from applying for a position with a salary range posted. Lastly, they believe that it would create a barrier to candidates with lesser skills being considered for a job, as employers would be unable to adjust salaries to reflect the jobs requirements.

Reported by: Sebastian Musante, Assistant Clerk Date: 4/3/2023