

INFORMATION SYSTEMS SPECIALIST SERIES

REPORT OF FINDINGS

AUGUST 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State policy prescribes the responsibilities of the agencies and the Human Resource Services Division (HRSD) regarding the allocation of positions to classifications. These responsibilities are further defined in ORS 240.215(2).

"The allocation of positions within the various operating agencies to the classifications in the classification plan shall be performed by the agency appointing authority with post-audit review by the division. Agencies shall allocate positions to the available class that most accurately describes the work based upon the assigned duties, authorities and responsibilities..."

Classification audits are conducted pursuant to this statute and to [State Policy 30.000.01](#). The Classification Guide provides further direction in both classification development and position allocation.

State agency appointing authorities are also responsible for determining the overtime exemption status for their employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). The state is considered as a single employer and must comply with provisions of the Code of Federal Regulations and Oregon Administrative Rules.

The classifications selected for this review were Information Systems Specialist 1-8. As of April 31, 1998, there were 1001 positions with incumbents in 52 state agencies in the subject classifications. A sample of 66 positions was reviewed. The reviews included an analysis of the current position descriptions (PDs), interviews with incumbents and their supervisors, the application of FLSA job duties tests, and consideration of additional information submitted by agencies.

The following findings were made:

- 30 positions (45%) were correctly allocated.
- 3 positions (5%) were not in the appropriate classification.
- 33 positions (50%) were not in the appropriate level within the series.
- 58 positions (88%) were correctly FLSA designated.
- 8 positions (12%) were FLSA misdesignated.
- 41 of the PDs (62%) were complete, accurate, up to date and in the current format.
- 25 of the PDs (38%) were either in the old format, incomplete, outdated, or inaccurate.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion:

Thirty-six (55%) of the 66 audited positions in the Information Systems Specialist (ISS) classification series were found to be misallocated.

Recommendations:

Each of the affected agencies has been advised of the misallocations and their responsibility to initiate corrective action consistent with considerations regarding represented or unrepresented employees. Corrective action may include such alternatives as reclassification of the position or reassignment of duties, authority and responsibilities.

Appointing authorities should review position allocations periodically and correct any allocation errors as required by [State Policy 30.000.01 \(Position Management\), Section \(1\)\(e\)](#). This process is accomplished by some agencies at the time of the annual performance appraisal, and is a specific "check-off" item for supervisors at the time of the performance review. This ensures that a position description review is made at least annually. We recommend that agencies adopt a similar practice, if one is not now in place.

Conclusion:

Of the 66 positions audited, 8 (12%) were incorrectly designated under FLSA.

Recommendations:

Agencies conduct regular reviews of the work being assigned to and performed by their employees to verify FLSA designations and make corrections as necessary. Whenever a PD is revised because of a change of duties or reclassification, the FLSA designation should be verified. These reviews should include interviews with incumbents and their supervisors. Agencies should check with their assigned labor relations manager in the case of represented employees, especially when changing from nonexempt status to exempt status.

Conclusion:

The FLSA designations for 5 (8%) of the 66 positions were in disagreement between the PDs and the Position and Personnel Data Base (PPDB) and three of the position descriptions were missing the FLSA designations.

Recommendations:

As stated in the HRSD Classification Guide, the PD is the primary document

of personnel administration in the State. It must be current, accurate, and complete. Agencies should establish internal procedures, if not currently in place, to ensure that information recorded in the PD is accurate and complete and that it is in agreement with the PPDB.

Conclusion:

Twenty-five (38%) of the 66 PDs were not complete, were outdated, inaccurate, not signed and/or dated by one or more of the required signatories (incumbent, supervisor, appointing authority).

Recommendations:

Agencies establish internal procedures, if not currently existing, to ensure that position descriptions are reviewed at periodic intervals. At minimum, descriptions should be reviewed annually as part of the employee performance review process. They should be reviewed for completeness and accuracy and to ensure that all signatures are in place.

Conclusion:

For the most part computer operators statewide are allocated inappropriately.

Recommendations:

Most positions performing this work belong at the ISS 1 level. Agencies need to correctly apply the ISS allocation guide and appropriately allocate these positions.

Conclusion:

Concern about the information technology (IT) crisis fueled high allocation of positions. These concerns included fear of losing employees, Year 2000 (Y2K) issues and IT staff critical to providing and enhancing business services.

Original allocations of positions were changed based on other agency allocations and/or compensation issues.

Different agencies are allocating the same type of job to different levels within the series. As a result, employees are moving from agency to agency seeking higher pay for similar work.

Recommendations:

HRSD request agencies to reevaluate positions placed in the ISS series and provide consultative services to assist in that process. Agencies should correct those allocations that are not appropriate. Also, HRSD continue to take steps to alleviate compensation and retention concerns for ISS positions

Conclusion:

A survey of a representative portion of state agencies found that, overall, agencies feel the allocation tool and methodology is complex, difficult, time consuming and learning-intensive. It was also very difficult for human resource staff to be able to use independently with any level of confidence.

Recommendations:

Classification section, with assistance from agency personnel staff, work to further reduce the terminology level of the allocation tools and simplify the process so that personnel officers can independently allocate positions.