

DOUBLEFILLED POSITIONS

REPORT OF FINDINGS

JUNE 1996

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[State Administrative Rule 105-40-070](#) permits state agencies to employ two or more employees in a position as a doublefill. The employees must meet the minimum qualifications of the position; be appointed in accordance with applicable recruitment and appointment rules, policies, or collective bargaining agreements; and their appointment must not be used to permanently increase legislatively authorized staffing levels.

The doublefill method of filling positions may be used for the following purposes:

- To cover for an employee on leave when a temporary appointment is not appropriate and a vacant position does not exist,
- To transition an employee on a short-term basis into a position for the purpose of training or pending a vacancy,
- To cover while a position establishment or modification is pending the Position Inventory Control System (PICS) update, or
- For a job share not exceeding 1.0 FTE.

This audit reviewed state agency practices and procedures regarding the use of the doublefill method of filling positions. As of April 1, 1996, there were 31 agencies using doublefills totaling 383 positions (not including job shares). Thirty-two agencies had 193 job-shared positions. The audit resulted in the following findings:

- Two agencies had seven job-shared positions (4%) filled inconsistent with the administrative rule.

Of the 383 non job-shared positions:

- Twenty-five agencies filled 122 positions (32%) in accordance with the administrative rule.
- Eight agencies with 99 positions (26%) had either received special authorization from the Department of Administrative Services or the Emergency Board to doublefill for reasons other than those given above, or had incumbents working part-time without exceeding their authorized FTE count.
- Twenty-one agencies had 162 positions (42%) doublefilled inconsistent with the administrative rule or without special authorization.

- Inconsistencies were found with the administrative rule and certain administrative procedures and practices.

Additional recommendations are made for the appropriate DAS entities to work toward bringing their rules, guidelines and practices into consistency, including necessary policy/rule revision or clarification.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion:

Twenty-five agencies were using 122 doublefill positions (not including job shares) for reasons covered by the rule. The greatest use was for positions pending the PICS update (55 positions) followed by 49 positions covering for employees on leave. Eighteen positions were filled with employees who were preparing for pending position vacancies.

As of December 1995, there were 33 agencies using 188 positions for job share purposes. There were 354 employees job sharing (1.88 employees/position). Four agencies were asked to provide information regarding nine job shares that exceeded one FTE per position. Two agencies reported recording errors and corrections were made. One agency reported temporarily using five job-shared positions while pursuing necessary position establishments to meet its operational needs resulting from a reorganization. These positions are scheduled to be eliminated. The fourth agency had two positions miscoded and will make the necessary corrections.

Recommendation:

Agencies are generally following the specified requirements for doublefills that are made in accordance with the administrative rule. There are indications that there is a need for clarification and coordination of instructions that agencies are receiving regarding the appropriate use of doublefills. This is discussed in the following conclusions.

Conclusion:

There are 99 doublefilled positions classified as "special situations." These are cases where special authorization has been granted by DAS or the E-Board, or where incumbents are working part-time and the authorized FTE count is not being exceeded. There were eight agencies reporting 311 employees in these positions.

Recommendation:

It would be unrealistic to say that the need for this category can be eliminated. However, we recommend that there be an on-going analysis of the circumstances under which these exceptions are made to determine if changes to policy or procedures are indicated.

Conclusion:

There were 162 positions and 330 employees double- or multi-filling positions that did not comply with the administrative rule and that did not have special authorization.

Recommendation:

Agencies should establish internal procedures, if not currently existing, to ensure that positions are doublefilled in accordance with the administrative rule.

Conclusion:

There are indications that HRSD (Program Administration and Support, Personnel systems, and Labor Relations) and Budget & Management Division (BAM) are providing conflicting advice to agencies as to the appropriate use of doublefills. There may be disagreement between the HRSD administrative rule and the BAM budget instructions and advice being provided to agencies.

Recommendation:

HRSD, BAM, and the agencies work together to identify and resolve differences with regards to the use of doublefills.

Conclusion:

While comparing the reasons for doublefilling as given in the administrative rule and the codes for doublefilling as listed in the Personnel Action Manual discrepancies were discovered. Particularly in the use of the code "A" = Administrative, "P" = Part-Time, and "T" = Training. The "A" code is becoming a catchall code and through use appears to be used in situations other than defined in the Manual. Code "P" represents multi-fills that exceed 1 FTE, a situation that is not in accordance with the current administrative rule. Code "T" indicates usage for training alone. The administrative rule includes training as part of the short-term transitioning into a new position only.

Recommendation:

HRSD, Personnel Systems and the agencies need to work together to identify and resolve inconsistencies in the coding for use of doublefills between the administrative rule and the Personnel Action Manual.