

## **PROJECT COORDINATOR, GRANTS/CONTRACT COORDINATOR**

### **AND PROPERTY SPECIALIST SERIES**

#### **REPORT OF FINDINGS**

**SEPTEMBER 1997**

#### **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 were further defined during the 1995 legislative session. House Bill 2192 amended ORS 240.215(2) to include the following:

"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. . ."

The classification audit was conducted pursuant to this legislation, and to [State Policy 30.000.01](#). The classifications selected for this review are Grants/Contracts Coordinator 0430, Project Coordinator 0810, and Property Specialist 1, 2 & 3 0705 - 0707.

State agency appointing authorities are 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.

As of May 1997 there were 226 positions with incumbents in 36 state agencies in the subject classifications. A sample of 41 positions in 21 agencies 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:

- Thirty-six positions (88%) were correctly allocated.
- Three positions (7%) were not in the appropriate classification.
- Two positions (5%) were not in the appropriate level within the series.

- Thirty-one positions (76%) were correctly FLSA designated. Ten positions (24%) were FLSA misdesignated.
- Fourteen of the PDs (34%) were complete, accurate, up to date and in the current format. Twenty-seven of the PDs (66%) were either in the old format, incomplete, outdated, or inaccurate.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusion:

Thirty-six of the forty-one positions reviewed were correctly classified. All thirteen positions in the Project Coordinator classification were found to be appropriately classified. One of the fourteen Grants/Contracts Coordinator positions reviewed was found to be inappropriately classified. Of the fourteen positions reviewed in the Property Specialist classification series, two were found to be allocated at an inappropriate level within the series and two would be more appropriately allocated to a classification outside the Property Specialist series.

### Recommendations:

Each of the affected agencies has been separately advised of the classification 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 revision of assigned duties, authority and responsibilities.

We recommend that appointing authorities review position allocations periodically and correct any misclassified positions 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:

Ten of the positions audited were incorrectly designated under FLSA. These resulted mainly from FLSA misdesignations of eight out of thirteen positions in the Project Coordinator classification. Seven of these positions were designated by the agencies to be exempt but were determined to be non-exempt; one non-exempt position was determined to be exempt. Two of the fourteen Grants/Contracts Coordinator positions were misdesignated.

**Recommendations:**

We recommend that agencies conduct regular reviews of the work being assigned and performed by employees to verify the accuracy of the 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.

Suggested references for agencies to use when assigning FLSA designations are two handbooks available from the Bureau of Labor and Industries: *Wage & Hour Laws - A Handbook for Oregon Employers* and *The White Collar Exemptions - A Handbook for Oregon Employers*, 1996 editions. Another valuable reference is the Thompson Publishing Group's *Public Employer's Guide to FLSA Employee Classification*, 1995 edition. These are excellent references to augment applicable OARs and CFRs.

**Conclusion:**

The FLSA designations for five of the forty-one positions were in disagreement between the PDs and the 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-seven of the forty-one PDs were not complete, were outdated, inaccurate, not signed and/or dated by one or more of the required signatories (incumbent, supervisor, appointing authority). Six of the PDs were in an old format.

**Recommendations:**

We recommend that 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.