

PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE/MANAGER C, D & E

REPORT OF FINDINGS

MARCH 1996

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 last 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. If a position is found to be misallocated, the agency shall change the allocation of the position to the proper class for the work, whether or not the assigned duties have changed since the previous allocation decision."

This audit was conducted pursuant to this new legislation, and to [State Policy 30.000.01](#). The Principal Executive/Manager classification series was selected for review, and positions at the C, D and E levels within this series were included.

There are 1133 positions with incumbents at the C, D and E levels in the forty-one agencies selected to participate in this review. A sample of one hundred eight positions was reviewed. These reviews included an analysis of written documentation submitted by the agencies including the current position descriptions and organization charts. Audit findings include the following:

- Ninety-one positions (84%) were correctly allocated
- Four positions (4%) were allocated to an incorrect level within the series.
- Ten positions (9%) appear appropriate for allocation to a classification series other than Principal Executive/Manager.
- Thirty-four position descriptions (31%) were not appropriately signed/dated by the required signatories.

- Two position descriptions (2%) in two different agencies appeared not to support the current Type of Service designation (e.g., management or unclassified service).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion:

Fourteen (13%) of the 108 audited positions in the Principal Executive Manager (PE/M) C, D and E classifications appear to be misallocated. This is attributed to these positions' lack of responsibility for management of both program and personnel (and therefore inappropriate for the PE/M classification series) or allocation at a level within the PE/M series that appears not to be supported by the documentation.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that agencies conduct allocation reviews, including desk audits, for the identified positions and take the steps necessary to correct misallocations.

It is recommended that appointing authorities 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 "checkoff" item for supervisors at the time of the performance review. This ensures that a position description review is made at least annually.

It is recommended that agencies incorporate a position impact review into any plan for reorganization or other evolution that may affect assigned duties of positions as prescribed by [State Policy 30.000.01](#). Section (1)(d) of the policy prescribes that planning should be accomplished regarding the impact on specific position classifications and related positions before modifying duties, authorities and responsibilities.

Conclusion:

In thirty-four cases (31%) Position Descriptions (PD) were not signed/dated in accordance with [State Policy 30.000.01](#).

Recommendation:

It is recommended that agencies establish internal procedures, if not currently existing, to ensure that new or revised PDs are reviewed at appropriate intervals for completeness and accuracy and that signatures are in place.

Conclusion:

Three positions were found to appear to have an incorrect Type of Service designation. One position, besides appearing to be in an incorrect classification, has no subordinates and appears to be incorrectly retained in the management service. For the remaining two positions, we question their continued placement in the Unclassified (Executive) Service since the documentation does not seem to support this placement under statutory requirements.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that agencies review the language contained in ORS 240.200, 240.205 and 207, 240.210 and 240.212. Position descriptions and organizational charts should then be reviewed as part of the annual updating process to determine which Type of Service is applicable.

Conclusion:

The evaluation of individual PDs included comparing them with existing benchmarks that are on file with the Classification Unit in HRSD. Comparison with benchmarked positions is an integral element in making allocation decisions for the PE/M series. Some agencies have regularly submitted positions for benchmarking because of organizational or other changes in duties, thereby maintaining an up to date set of internal benchmarked positions for on-going allocation efforts. Many agencies have not stayed current on their benchmarked positions, for a variety of reasons, including the anticipation over the last few years of significant changes in PE/M structure and administration. This has resulted in outdated benchmarks, which are inappropriate for use as internal benchmarks by agencies when making allocation decisions. This also results in a set of outdated central benchmarks used for comparisons across agency lines.

Recommendation:

Consistent with the financing available and the initiatives associated with civil service reform, it is recommended that HRSD continue to work toward the resolution of the classification and compensation plans that are to be used for positions now residing in the PE/M series, to establish a uniformly applicable and equitable process within the Executive Branch. This should include the development of plans to provide agency guidance for the allocation process, including the availability of technical assistance as needed.