

Compiled Agency Feedback on Draft Definitions and Distinguishing Characteristics Administrative Management Study FY07

We would like to thank everyone for providing feedback. The following departments commented on the draft definitions and distinguishing characteristics for the Administrative Management Study: Administration; Commerce, Community and Economic Development; Corrections; Environmental Conservation; Fish & Game; Health and Social Services; Labor & Workforce Development; Law; Natural Resources; Revenue; and Transportation & Public Facilities. In addition, comments were gathered from Classification staff during a test allocation session.

This document is a compilation of the feedback received regarding the initial draft definitions and distinguishing characteristics. The comments were carefully considered and incorporated into the draft class specifications where possible. Because the revised draft class specs address the feedback received, responses to the comments will not appear in this document.

Recap information:

- 02/16/07 Draft definitions and distinguishing characteristics and cover memo distributed to agencies. Administrative Management class study website established and announced. Summary of Feedback on Preliminary Findings Report posted.
- 03/06/07 Test allocations against draft definitions and distinguishing characteristics conducted with Classification Section analysts.
- 03/07/07 Study classifiers receive agency feedback on draft definitions and distinguishing characteristics.

Outline of comments received:

1) STRUCTURAL COMMENTS

Naming of the Job Classes

- Administrative Technician
- Administrative Associate
- Administrative Executive
- General Naming Comments

Proposed Structure of the New Class Series and Job Classes

- Administrative Technician
- Administrative Associate
- Administrative Executive
- General Structure Comments

2) DEFINITIONS & DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS COMMENTS

- Administrative Technician
- Administrative Associate
- Administrative Executive
- General Definition and Distinguishing Characteristics Comments

3) ADDITIONAL STUDY COMMENTS

Flexible Staffing

Recruitment and Retention

Salary

Minimum Qualifications

<h2>1) STRUCTURAL COMMENTS</h2>

Naming of the Job Classes

(Note: includes specific title suggestions as well as title comments)

Administrative Technician:

- Administrative Business Assistant
- Administrative Technician I
- Administrative Technician II
- Business Technician or Business Assistant
- Administrative Technician (affirming the title chosen in your draft)
- Administrative Support Assistant
- Administrative Associate
- Administrative Coordinator
- Administrative Assistant

- Title is too similar to Admin Support Technician, which is used for exempt positions.

- Administrative Technicians: This job title does not reflect the tasks or functions expected of the proposed position. As an example, an Administrative Technician “performing a variety of technical level duties in multiple administrative functional areas.” The position is expected to be generalist with various skill levels, but title implies a specialist.

- There was both, positive and negative feedback regarding the "technician" title.

- Some employees did not like the class title word “Technician” for several reasons. One, it loses the primary purpose of the position, which is to assist higher level administrative positions. Secondly, it connotated a demotion to some staff. In addition, the word Technician confuses the general expertise of this job class with other technician job classes (i.e. HR, supply, accounting, etc). ... the term Technician was not that bad since it matches other job classes: Supply Technician, Accounting Technician, etc.

- The first levels being Administrative Technician are not in line with their paraprofessional nature.

Administrative Associate:

- Administrative Business Associate
- Business Manager
- Administrative Manager

- Administrative Specialist
 - Administrative Operations Manager
 - Division Support Specialist
 - Division Support Manager
 - Operations Support Specialist
 - Operations Support Manager
 - Division Administrator (or something similar) I
 - Division Administrator II
 - Division Administrator III
 - Administrative Officer
- Most common response was, what does “associate” mean?
 - The title “associate” doesn’t convey that the position manages the administrative functions.
 - Administrative Associate: Similar to the title of the Administrative Technicians, the job title does not reflect what is expected of these positions. The term “Associate” implies an assistant position with no responsibility.
 - No one likes the Class title word “Associate” as it sounds like a Wal-Mart employee. It should be changed to something like Specialist or Analyst or Support Manager.
 - The Administrative Associate title is not in line with the professional aspects of the job. When someone thinks of an associate, they think of a Wal-Mart worker or sales associate (i.e. cashier) in a retail store. This will also become a huge issue for the future employment possibilities of some personnel who now find themselves being titled Administrative Manager and then will become an Associate. This gives the impression that they were somehow downgraded or demoted. A more appropriate title would be along the lines of Division Administrative Manager or Administrator or Division Administrator.

Administrative Executive:

- Administrative Business Manager
 - Administrative Operations Manager
 - Business Manager
 - Business Officer
 - Administrative Officer
 - Deputy Administrator
 - Administrative Services Supervisor
- Using the term "Executive" is more for Upper Management Levels (i.e. Directors, Assistant and Deputy Commissioners, and Commissioner).
 - Stronger titles are needed to more appropriately describe and express these positions as managers and executives.

- The title Admin Executive sounds like it would be a higher level than the position it reports to, Director or Admin Services Director.
- Administrative Executive: Similar to the other titles, it does not reflect what is expected of the position.
- The "Admin Executive" title received some negative feedback.
- Some employees did not like the Class title word "Executive" as it loses the primary purpose of the position, which is to manager one or many administrative functions or positions. In addition, the title sounds like a higher level position than the position's supervisor (i.e. typically Admin Director). Employees suggested Administrative Officer, which is used for the Exempt job classes. Also suggested were Admin Associate and Admin Support Executive. Other people liked Admin Manager, but thought the Admin Executive class title would work.
- The title Administrative Executive is acceptable, but should only have two levels not three as most organizations have one, possibly two, levels of executives. Even then the higher level is called a senior executive and the lower a junior executive. The executive levels must be available to division and/or departments also.

General Naming Comments:

- Each class should have a title that best reflects the position in terms that are meaningful and common to other organizations, even if it means duplicating existing titles. The use of good class titles is important in two respects. One is that people take pride in their job and title, and the prospect of a change from "Administrative Manager" to "Administrative Associate" causes many of our administrative managers to feel like they are about to be demoted. A manager is a person who controls or directs resources. The term "associate" is closely tied to cashiers and department store personnel who are often called "sales associates". The overall response for our department is that the term "associate" does not reflect the professional level of the work that the administrative managers perform.
- The use of a correct title is also important in what it portrays to those outside of state government. A job title says a lot about a person's duties and level of responsibility. Reporting on your resume that you are an Administrative Manager has an entirely different connotation than reporting that you are an Administrative Associate. The semantics are important, and the title should be the one best title that suits and describes the position. Hopefully you can find a way in your system to do this and still run the old and new series concurrently. Maybe you can use a temporary title of Administrative Manager 07, for example, to indicate the new series until the other is phased out. Keep in mind that if this were the Accounting series, there is probably not another good term for Accountant.
- Proposed job title: Administrative Operations Manager I, II, III, IV, V

- The new titles for Admin Technician and Admin Associate are good within the context of the proposed new classification layout. I am not so keen on the use of the Administrative Executive title. The existing Administrative Services Manager title is a very good one and I think should be kept but altered for the three proposed levels. Rather than come up with a title different from existing, maybe HR should consider temporarily renaming the existing titles so they can be retained long term. For example, use AM V and AM VI for the current range 22 and 23 positions temporarily in order to keep the ASM moniker.
- I can live with the titles am I crazy about them? No, as I feel that administrative assistants/managers/or the even older title of Administrative officers better explain the roles than the new proposed titles.
- It would help if the new identities could be tagged to the old identities.

Proposed Structure of the New Class Series and Job Classes

Administrative Technician:

- Two levels will work well and provide a ladder into the higher level administrative jobs. There are no concerns with the structure, definition or distinguishing characteristics.
- The differentiation with Admin Tech series looks good.

Administrative Associate:

- There should be a third level for the Associate class. Although at this moment we do not have a PCN readily available to show you within that class, you have:
 - I "Perform and coordinate professional level administrative support work..."
 - II "Perform and coordinate professional level administrative support work for an organization whose administrative functions are complicated...."
 - III For a third category we believe what would be appropriate is: "Perform and coordinate professional level administrative support and "programmatic or institutional" work for an organization whose administrative functions are complicated...". This would combine the attributes for the I and II in this new level, allowing for the most complicated work.
- The new mid level job classes, although there appears to be good class coverage at the lower and higher levels (Technician and Executive). The concern is over the middle job class (Associate) moving three or four Admin Manager job classes into two levels.
- There are currently four levels of the Administrative Manager series, with the AM-IV level "appearing" to now fit the AE-I level. That leaves two levels to absorb the remaining AM-I through III levels.

Administrative Executive:

- Here is my response on the proposed Administrative Executive (professional level) definitions for the study. I would not like to see administrative managers in line division career path stop at the Administrative Executive I. It makes no sense to me that a one

seeking a career with the state and working in a line division needs to leave the division and move to a central administration support organization for a promotion. Individuals working in line division spend many years understanding (learning) specific program requirements and leaving the division for a promotion is not attractive. It also leaves the line division with a substantial loss.

- Also, I believe from our discussion yesterday that the Administrative managers provided justification in the need to have a higher level Administrative Executive position in line division that don't have deputy or assistant directors." It should be noted that this view point is shared by the other senior Administrative Managers within our agency. The emphasis I (personally) would convey is having a recruiting and retention draw for in-line divisions by not limiting the potential career growth of the administrative staff, that in reality, provide for much of the infrastructure of that division particularly when changes at the Director level occur. Of course, placement into the Executive II / III level would be contingent upon the actual scope of responsibility and authority of that specific position.
- One employee liked the differentiation with an Admin Executive as managing at the senior division level.

General Structure Comments:

- Overall, the reaction was that this structure is not working well for our department. The specs do not seem to capture correctly or definitively the distinction between levels. The complexity or level of a position is most closely related to the number of disciplines in which the position is required to be proficient. The types of disciplines that a position may be responsible for our department include procurement, facilities management, accounts receivable, accounts payable, revenue accounting, billing, grants management, program administration, budgeting, information technology, specialized or complex software system, travel, risk management, records management, and specialized functions such as volunteer coordination and administrative tasks associated with division specific operations. Using number of disciplines as criteria, a lower level would, for example, require proficiency in only one or two disciplines; a mid-level three to five disciplines; and a top level six or more. Our staff and managers felt that a definition like this would be more concrete and allow objective decisions with regard to placement.
- We also find that the number and type of funding sources can add layers of complexity to a position in the administrative class series, and recommend that this be taken into consideration in your next draft.
- It was also noted that the administrative series does not relate to the accounting technician series. Administrative jobs require more diversity than structured and defined accounting procedures, projects and tasks.
- Proposed structure: Administrative Operations Manager I, II, III, IV, V
 - Administrative Operations Manager I: As an administrative entry level position.
 - Administrative Operations Manager II: As an administrative support position that is expected to perform professional level tasks.

- Administrative Operations Manager III: As a professional level with supervisory responsibilities.
- Administrative Operations Manager IV: As a management position with broad and substantial responsibility at a division level or specific functional areas at a departmental level.
- Administrative Operations Manager V: As deputy director at department level with broad and substantial authority and responsibility for all administrative functions.

The above job class will provide opportunity for employees get into the administrative job class series and allow them to gain experience and move up into higher levels. This concept will allow creating depth and stability in the administrative organization structure of an agency. As an example, the Administrative Operations Manger IV can become a trained back up and strong support to the Administrative Operations Manager V at a department level and a level III can become a back up and strong support at a division level. This same concept can go down to lower organization structure of a department.

- I am sure you and the department specific group share my concern on the impact of these level specifications for a smaller state agency. The classification scheme, if implemented, will cause organizations to centralize the administrative function at least at the Divisional level and probably at the central administrative level. Smaller agencies will become the training ground for larger agencies, where the career advancement exists. Volume has some relationship to complexity and scope of responsibility but, given good process management and the appropriate staffing level, it becomes less of a scoping factor than other elements of the job. I contend that the scope and complexity of responsibility for senior level administrative positions in all state agencies regardless of size is more similar than dissimilar. It might be reasonable to define an Administrative Executive III level as a function of size and/or being the lead in a central administrative organization at the agency level but not to scope both senior level administrative positions in this fashion.
- The executive level series should have the ability to be located in a division other than the department's central administrative support organization. Our department organization is unique and if an executive level position works for a director or executive and accomplishes similar work, the classification should be available for that position.
- The proposed class may not allow creating depth in the administrative structure of an organization or career ladder. Creating three different job classes essentially for the same type or field of work may create confusion and could result in difficulty attracting people to this job class. The following is an alternate approach.

DEFINITIONS & DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS

Administrative Technician:

- The primary problem with the drafts is that there are several instances where there are no specific identified elements in the Comparison of Levels (COLs) that distinguish one

level of work from another. The COLs are merely a repeat of the definition. This is a big hindrance in providing feedback to study classifier, and will be in allocating positions. (e.g. the AT I comparison of ADC III and AT I levels just repeats the definition of ADC III and gives no actual COLs between the two, no examples. This is a concern as the AT I represents the cut between the clerical and technical series, and is especially problematic since this area is one where frequent requests are received from ADC III incumbents to be reclassified into the higher series because they (and their supervisors) can't tell the difference. The same occurs between AA I and AT II, again representing the cut between the technical and the professional levels.

- Finally, it does not seem the shape this new class series is taking, addresses the classification deficiencies that exist in the current class series nor does it sufficiently address the majority of affected positions. For example, we have "specialists" among our line positions that currently cannot be classified as specialists because they are in line divisions that likewise cannot be classified as generalists according to these drafts.
- The basic definition is good, but the term 'within a specified scope' should be better defined. The Admin Tech I mentions 'within a specified scope'. So the Admin Tech II should mention within a broader scope or similar. Since the levels are delineated by the knowledge levels required, it should be included in the definition of the two levels. The Admin Tech I requires practical knowledge, but the Tech II requires extensive practical knowledge. The knowledge requirement should also be part of the definition. One employee suggested the AT II knowledge be more than practical. The suggestion was it be required to have a complete conceptual understanding of all phases of technical work involved, or similar.
- The Scope is also a little muddy. Does a specified scope mean a scope of duties for the incumbent? All organizations and positions have specified scopes. The class spec contrasts Admin Tech II's performing work with more complexity and variety. If that's the delineation use greater/lesser complexity/variety, and not 'scope'.
- Under Admin Tech II comparison with other job classes – “Professional level administrative work” – What is that and how is that different from the Admin Tech I administrative work?
- One comment/concern is with the "Specific to Level" paragraph. As an Administrative Assistant in the Supervisory Bargaining Unit, the individual would like to see clarification to the two levels supervisory designation.
- The Admin Tech I level says "Supervision of other employees, if present, is typically limited to clerical staff". What does “typically” mean? What other job classes could be supervised? Given the variety of tasks involved in both Admin Tech levels, could an Admin Tech I supervise an Accounting Clerk II, for example? The Admin Tech II level already includes “Supervision of other employees...., is typically limited to clerical and/or paraprofessional staff working in administrative functions”.

- In the “Specific to Level” section of the Admin Tech II, a statement regarding “technical supervision or oversight” to other administrative or professional level staff” should be added. This section talks about the coordination of processes, assessment and evaluation to modify processes to meet the needs of the organization, and judgment in implementing decisions. In our department, some divisions assign their Administrative Assistants the authority and responsibility to provide training to other staff members. This training is conducted both in the office and at the field offices, and also at staff meetings where project leaders are present. They are provided overviews and training in recruiting, payroll, OPD, purchasing, etc.
- Incumbents are performing similar work to other techs in the typical administrative functional areas, such as accounting and procurement, so this reference was helpful to identify what the work would look like. Thought about what was being performed at the technician level by comparing to these job classes.
- Specify what is meant by broad variety of duties.

Administrative Associate:

- The definition of Admin Associate II refers to supervision of professional level staff, but it’s unclear what type of positions this would include. Defining the AA II as supervising only professional staff would make this level overly exclusive.
- Defining characteristics don’t address programmatic work that might be performed in addition to administrative work (where the administrative duties make up the higher percentage of time).
- In addition to size of organization, the scope of independent decision making authority should also be considered as indicative of the level.
- Currently, the draft reads ...The complexity of work and organizational scope of control are characterized by: 1) the substantial differences in operations and variety of occupations supported; and typically 2) by the size of the organization and supervision or technical oversight of subordinate professional level administrative staff...
- Many more factors influence complexity of work and organizational scope of control. While study stakeholders don’t expect human resource classifiers to be experts on every aspect of administrative work, forthcoming descriptions of “examples of work” will help to clarify distinguishing characteristics. Also, examples of work should be used in comparing levels and allocating positions, not the two phrases set out above as they are too vague and open to interpretation.
- The last sentence in the Admin Tech and the Admin Associate drafts are awkward and hard to understand. The words "functional area" are listed four times and this is in only one sentence. The phrase may be located on page 3, the last paragraph, in both columns.

- The draft class gives a more accurate job description of what some mid-level administrative staff do.
- We wonder then why the draft Admin Assoc II Specific to Level section, #2 says “The complexity of work...are characterized by...2) by the size of the organization and supervision or technical oversight...” Please ensure this is clarified and easily interpreted if this comment remains in these specifications.
- The basic Definition of performing professional level administrative support work is good. What though is a substantially similar and cohesive function? The Admin Assoc II definition refers to substantial differences in the operations and variety of occupations supported. We are not sure what is so class controlling in variety of occupations. Does this mean occupations of other division members, customers, or something else? In the employee’s mind substantial differences in operations translates into greater budgetary, accounting, HR and logistical/programmatic complexity. That seems more on the mark than talking about a variety of occupations. What is meant by that?
- Defining characteristics: The last sentence under ‘Same for all levels in Series’ talks about levels being distinguished by complexity of work and organizational scope of control. This sounds better than talk of cohesion or occupations mentioned in the definition. But we wonder if also levels should be differentiated by impact of their decisions on the public and the agency?
- Specific to Level Admin Assoc I: Again back to what constitutes substantially similar and cohesive. If operations are geographically dispersed are they cohesive? There is no mention of multiple bargaining units, funding types or revenue streams. The differentiation should mention some of these things.
- The organizational structure separates the Associate I from the Associate II level it is an indicator of complexity of work when supervising staff at either the professional level or the technical level.
- Cohesive size is subjective knowledge of division to effectively measure where to place position.
- Although professional work and variety of job classes is mentioned, still don’t see research, planning, etc., mentioned in class specs at the Administrative Associate level. Incorporate type in definition.
- In general, the Admin Associate definitions and defining characteristics are the least clear when trying to understand where existing positions would fit.
- The differentiation between Admin Assoc I and Admin Assoc II hinges on cohesion, occupations and level of subordinate staff. We think the level of subordinate staff can be a factor, but not the only one and not a “must have”. The Admin Assoc II mentions size as a factor, so the Admin Assoc I spec should too.

- Specific to Level Admin Assoc II: Ditto my comments on the Admin Assoc I. Not sure about the whole occupations test. Size of the organization makes sense. You should also add 'typically' to the supervision or technical oversight of subordinate professional level administrative staff. Its one factor but not the only one.

Administrative Executive:

- The definitions and characteristics for the Admin Executives are very good, and describe clear differences between the levels within the Executive series.
- As administrative managers rise through this series they typically become part of the department's executive team and the management decision making process. Please make an effort not to diminish their importance, but to escalate them to the value they serve and perform.
- Our department also wants to go on the record to say, if all departments move to a more centralized administrative services, then our department will be in the same position we are now in inequitable pay for like work. For example, some of our Divisions are the size of small departments with a high level of complexity in funding sources, programmatic functions and issues being addressed on a daily basis. We are not sure that it would be fair to allow the other departments to gain this status just by centralizing. They are not as complex nor do they do the amount of work that is output by ours. So within the Administrative Executive II, it is too narrow, need to expand to provide for a administrative position; dual reporting, to a highly complex and large line division when AE II functions as a assistant director.
- Here is my response on the proposed Administrative Executive (professional level) definitions for the study. I would not like to see administrative managers in line division career path stop at the Administrative Executive I. It makes no sense to me that a one seeking a career with the state and working in a line division needs to leave the division and move to a central administration support organization for a promotion. Individuals working in line division spend many years understanding (learning) specific program requirements and leaving the division for a promotion is not attractive. It also leaves the line division with a substantial loss.
- The Admin Executive I-III series begins with the entry level being assigned to a line division. The other two higher levels are for use only in agency administrative services divisions. To some people, it implies that line division work isn't as important or difficult as the central admin division work. In the opinion of an admin manager, having the current Admin Services Manager classifications separate from the Admin Manager class levels was and is still appropriate.
- In an opinion of another admin manager, within the State system it seems that line divisions are not seen as warranting higher administrative managerial positions. It seems like the upper level administrative positions are allocated to the Dept. of Administration or the Divisions of Administrative Services. The definitions used for the Admin Exec I and Admin Exec II seem like splitting hairs and that they were created specifically with

the Division of Administrative Services in mind with no thought to a line division. In the opinion of this admin manager, a line division should have these same classification options (Admin Exec I and II) available but as separate job classes.

- In the opinion from one admin manager, they thought there should be 4 levels of Admin Executive, two in line divisions and two in central admin services division. There needs to be an allowance for being the admin lead in a smaller line division vs. a larger line division. One example is an Admin Manager III in another department. The complexity, size, etc of this division doesn't warrant an Admin Manager IV, so an AMIII is appropriate. The manager doesn't see how the current Admin Exec series would address this situation. Even though you must have a certain amount of base admin knowledge to manage a division, we shouldn't discount the added complexity and consequences of managing a large, and multi funded division.
- The distinction though between an Admin Exec II and Admin Exec III hinges on being a deputy director versus an assistant director. To one person, those definitions seem like putting too fine of a point on things. To some people the two seem the same.
- Admin Executive function areas should include Facility, Personnel and Procurement Management, similar to the Administrative Technician. Also, adding Information Technology as a functional area would be helpful to some state agencies.
- It would be helpful to compare these job classes to outside job classes – i.e. Accountant, Procurement Specialist, Assistant Director or Deputy Director, similar to the Administrative Technician series. We don't think there is an Associate Director job class, although it was defined in the cover memo.
- Explain how to define Assistant, Associate, and Deputy Directors for Administrative duties.
- Department Centralized Administrative Services, Division of Administrative Services need to be better defined because this language is confusing.
- Supervisory or Technical oversight question and oversight can be argued at all levels.
- How do we handle regions, field offices, boards, etc. ? Organizational structure varies across agencies.
- Define the difference between Associate, Assistant, Deputy Director terms. Please be careful with identifying positions with these titles.
- Class Specs has four repetitious Assistant Director statements rather than explain or categorize. Work on bringing the class specs to a level where more people can identify with it. Opposed to using the executive title, believes it's misleading and the term Manager should be used.

- The Administrative Executive is confusing to me. They appear to be extremely close as they all are in some way in the position of assisting the Director of the agency. As I read it, I think it would be difficult to make a decision between the two and three levels should someone protest the decision. I suggest making no more than two levels, combining the II & III and keeping the I.

General Definition and Distinguishing Characteristics Comments:

- We were asked to think about, as we go about our work, “what do I see as a defining factor for complexity?” In the case with two divisions within our department, the many different funding sources and size of the division make the Admin Manager job extremely complex. Size plays a huge factor in complexity, including the budget comprised of six components and funding sources with revenue coming from dozens of granting agencies. We have been told for years that size and complexity doesn’t play a part in classification when the reality is size does matter. Additionally, the complexity of a large seasonal workforce should be considered.
- One recurring phrase in the draft is “...primary duty and preponderance of work is in a single administrative functional area, whose work in other administrative functional areas is a marginal duty...” This is not realistic in that in so many state agencies, administrative work evolves as the agency evolves. When agencies experience program expansion, administrative staff often become employee acquisition and procurement experts. As antiquated systems are overhauled and replaced with newer automated systems, administrative staff may develop expertise in records management, their knowledge of imaging technology contracts, or assist with regulatory overhaul and development of standard operating policies and procedures for intake and processing.
- In short, primary and marginal duties constantly evolve and may be temporary assignments. While a position description is supposed to represent a point in time, preponderance of duties in a specific administrative area may prove too limiting to equitably allocate positions to levels within a series. Finally, as incoming exempt appointees sometimes turn over every four years or even more frequently, and have the ability to expand or limit delegations and scope of authority, an administrative assistant/manager who has independence in a functional area on the date a PD is submitted may have to clear everything with a supervisor three months later. Again, understanding this dynamic and how it affects equitably allocating positions to various levels should be better-defined in the draft class specification’s use of the word “typically.”
- There is inadequate description of positions in existing administrative series serving as teachers/trainers as a regular part of their duties—not just instructing subordinate staff, but educating (particularly new) program staff at all levels on how to conduct business within the framework of centralized administration in a government setting.
- Overall, the response I received was that the terms, characteristics and definitions were not clear. We would like to emphasize the importance of eliminating vague language. Descriptive terms such as “broader variety”, “greater complexity”, “preponderant”, “substantial differences in operations”, and “variety of occupations” are too ambiguous and left people unclear as to how they would or could categorizes current positions.

- Along with clarifying the terminology, it is recommended that the specifications clearly define the first level as a paraprofessional level, the middle level is a professional level, and the top level as executive. The stakeholders felt that the level of professionalism required in the “Administrative Associate” classification was not made clear.
- My biggest concern is that once again these classifications will be based, and applied, on organizational size rather than organizational complexity.
- We must get away from using size as a distinguishing characteristic. All size does is indicate the amount of work a position may have not the complexity of that work. DOP has always contended that how much work a position has is irrelevant when determining the classification of a position. Using size as an indicator flies in the face of this belief.
- The information is too broad and vague to even respond. It is noted in the draft "lesser complexity and greater complexity" What work is considered lesser? What work is considered greater? Is there a grid to show the difference?
- A question that has come up repeatedly is how do you progress through the series? Can an Admin Tech I advance to the level of Admin Exec? Should the Admin Tech I be able to advance to that level? How about the Admin Associate?
- It appears that facility management is being placed on the lower end of the administrative series. Facility management can be and most of the time is an extremely difficult task to manage well. Trying to juggle dealing with upset employees, building management, contractors, upper management on space allocations or General Services can be very trying to say the least. These positions must have sufficient authority to ensure a smooth operation. Please keep in mind we are not talking about changing a light bulb but the management of a facility whether it is a normal office building or a specialized laboratory, both have very unique challenges.
- Wording is so general it is hard to tell what is meant. When the examples of duties are added, it might be easier to go back and understand more what was originally meant.
- The "word use" seems to be redundant and somewhat generic throughout all the classes. It would be helpful to see more specific differences between each class.
- Administrative function areas should include facility management, similar to the Administrative Technician.
- “Line agency” should be defined somewhere.
- It would be helpful to compare these job classes to outside job classes – i.e. Accountant or Procurement Specialist, which is done in the Admin Tech series.

- As we discussed yesterday, we won't have a lot of feedback for your team at this stage of the study, predominately because we believe that we will have a better understanding of the scope of the various class levels once DOP has provided examples of duties for each level in the three series in draft form. The subtle differences in the language used to differentiate the draft levels may allow for greater objectivity, but also seem to make it difficult to discern the work actually being performed. Additionally, if we could obtain specific quantifiers as related to levels of complexity we should have a better sense of which level is appropriate for given tasks or functional areas. At that point I expect we could offer more input.
- One comment was they liked the levels and distinguishing characteristics between each job class; but they do not think that any more levels with in each job class would be beneficial.
- We are encouraged to see: The concept of balancing the administrative duties across the state and agencies more equally and consistently. The HR statement that requiring a degree could be considered discriminatory and that HR is looking at "experience" as a valuable qualification.
- It is still not clear where one level begins and another one ends. I would expect that it will be clearer when you assign examples of duties to the job classes and align specific tasks with the distinguishing characteristics. Clearer definitions were previously needed and continue to be needed in this rewrite.
- The size of the organization should not be the only determining factor for the classification level, but should also consider the breadth, depth and complexity of the organization. This has been an issue and disagreement for years.
- The current AM-I through IV levels have an addendum that is meant to help fit a position into a level. Our understanding is this addendum doesn't work well and is misleading.
- What is a Line Division?
- Distinguishing characteristics are wordy, vague and hard to draw a line.
- The Administrative series has become a catch-all type of position. The lines are not clear where one level begins and another one ends. The specs manage to detract from the professionalism of these positions. Using terms such as "variety" and preponderant" make these specifications more ambiguous than before. There should be clear cut definitions where one job class ends and the other begins. Previously the hidden criteria had been the dollar amounts of the budgets or he number of employees in the division. These are not valid measurements as they do not take into consideration the complexity of the job. Fore example, a budget that consists of two fund sources for \$150 million may not be as complex as five funding sources for a budget of \$2 million. In addition, the class specs presented do not reflect the depth or breadth of proficiencies required to be successful in this class. The criteria of progression through the series needs to be clearly outlines.

- The higher levels should be based on the number of business disciplines that are required for the position. For example the lowest level would require proficiency in two or three disciplines while the highest level may require proficiency in eight or more. The middle ranges should require about half. We can state that without naming exactly what specific disciplines are needed for each individual job as the disciplines should be outlined in the overall class specs.
- The highest level should only have two levels.
- The size of the organization does not determine the workload or requirements for this job class. As a matter of fact, the larger agencies do not require their higher level Administrative Managers to be proficient in as many areas as smaller agencies do because they simply have more staff and have the luxury of being able to have them specialized.
- There are many inconsistencies within these specifications. For example, these specifications do not take into consideration if the manager is a member of the division senior management team. That should be an option at the Administrative Executive I and II level. These inconsistencies need to be addressed to create a clear career progression.
- In addition, terms must be clearly defined. An example would be specifically stating what is meant by “complex division” versus “division”, “complex budget” versus “budget”, “broad variety” versus “variety” and get rid of the ambiguous terms such as “preponderance”

ADDITIONAL STUDY COMMENTS

Flexible Staffing

- For staff retention and staff development to succeed in this series, there needs to be a way to examine and reward progressively responsible assigned work and increasing knowledge and skill development with a flex promotion rather than an attempt at reclassification and the risk of the title and salary range remaining the same or even possibly going down as is the case currently. Flexible staffing has had some success in the program budget analyst and contracting officer series. It would be worthwhile to make flexible staffing available in this new series, especially considering how complex administrative work has become in government.
- We are very interested in promotional abilities within our organization and the use of flex positions where ever possible.
- Flex the Administrative Technician I/II- start out as a one and flex to a two according to ability shown, or time spent on the job, or a combination of both. Let the flexing of the position be a way of keeping a person in the same job. Let the time spent in the job class be used towards the next level in the series.

- Flex the Administrative Associate I/II- Begin at the one level and move to the two upon evidence of ability to take on a greater level of responsibility, or time spent on the job (or a combination of both) based on an evaluation by the direct supervisor. Forget about the multiple locations stipulations. Let the flex levels be a way of keeping a person in a job. Also allowing for the time spent in the position to be used towards the Administrative Executive position.

Recruitment and Retention

- The majority of our current department administrative leads fall into the category of employees that can retire now or will sometime in the next five years. Will this classification scheme help those that follow us in making that transition? Unfortunately, I don't think it will. As we are currently configured, we will become a training ground for DHSS, DOT, and the other heavyweight agencies. They too have people who will retire over the next five years creating a large void, which will most likely be filled from the smaller agencies. From a career path perspective given the opportunity, a smart person would lateral to a larger agency because of the upside potential!! Further draining talent from the smaller agencies.
- If the State is interested in recruiting and retaining qualified applicants how does limiting the Administrative Executive levels in line divisions promote stable employment.

Salary

- Our department has concerns about salary comparisons. We believe that sometimes using a single category to compare limits its usefulness. The AM class has a multitude of functions that go across the grain and the duties performed that do not always compare to single classes (i.e., where a professional accountant has black and white rules to perform their duties; the AM must go to the grey areas formulating solutions to fit into black and white rules.)
- We are concerned about the potential ranges that will be assigned to the new class specs, but it appears that the Admin Tech class specs are being compared to other job classes with EVEN number ranges (Accounting Tech, etc) and we support that synchronization with other state job classes.

Minimum Qualifications

- Our department believes with the new class specifications seem to be more limiting. We are curious what the minimum qualifications will entail. One of the major concerns and problems with the old classifications were the minimum qualifications. They were too restrictive.
- Our understanding is this new series takes the place of the current Administrative Assistant and provides an entry level or “bridge” between the Administrative Clerk III and the Administrative Assistant. DOP’s comments have been that there is too much of a leap between these two current levels. We’d like to point out, however, that certain aspects of the work performed at the proposed Admin Tech II level mirrors work

performed at the Human Resource Technician II level. The current HRT-II minimum qualifications allow someone who has just one year at the Administrative Clerk III level to qualify. This is a four-range increase to a job class that is specialized without having to serve at the entry level HRT-I. This begs the question then; will the Admin Tech II level MQs allow someone to jump from an Admin Clerk III to an Admin Tech II without having served at the Admin Tech I level?