

**Administrative Management Study FY07  
Follow-up Summary re:  
1/16/07 Preliminary Findings Report**

Thank you! to the following departments for their feedback on the preliminary findings: Administration, Commerce, Corrections, Education, Environmental Conservation, Fish & Game, Health & Social Services, Labor & Workforce Development, Natural Resources, Revenue, and Transportation & Public Facilities. We appreciate your thoughtful and constructive comments and suggestions.

We've recorded the comments, questions and suggestions we received in response to the preliminary findings report in this summary. We also felt it was important to follow-up on the feedback and so, wherever possible, we've tried to: indicate when feedback was or will be incorporated into the study; answer specific questions; provide additional information about the class study and/or classification process; and address any concerns expressed through the comments and suggestions. Please note we are using the working titles of Administrative Technician, Administrative Associate, and Administrative Executive throughout this summary document. These titles have not been finalized.

**Recap:**

- 1/16/07: Preliminary Findings report distributed to agencies.  
Report focus – initial proposed class structure and naming
- 1/29/07 - : Agency comments received and summarized for report to  
2/15/07 agencies via Admin Study web site

This summary is divided into five categories:

- Proposed structure of the new class series and job classes
- Considerations when writing the class specifications
- Secretary job class in this study
- Proposed job class titles
- Other comments

**Comments for the proposed structure identifying Job Classes and Series:**

“When these classifications are established they should be positions in which the ability to flex is allowed. We have got to find a way to recognize that employees become more valuable as they learn more and assume additional duties within the agency. Flex positioning would allow us to do this.” **Most agencies have requested the option for flexibly staffing. The draft class specs at the Technical level are written to provide those agencies who would like to utilize this management tool with the ability to do so.**

“There is concern that the technician/specialist/manager template doesn't recognize the generalist nature of administrative work; most admin managers perform a wide variety of administrative

type work, which I think is one of the difficulties in classifying these types of positions. Need to clarify types and levels.” We’re committed to addressing the difficulty in allocating positions performing a variety of types of work. With this goal in mind, the draft class specs identify the work that will be the same across the series. In addition, based upon the information shared by the departments and gathered from those interviewed, we tried to clarify the differences between the levels within the three series. In the cover memo provided with the draft specs we have asked for your assistance with providing specific feedback to clarify the draft specs. This is where your feedback is very important.

“I’ll preface this response with the comment that I find it difficult to provide input on the proposal without a better understanding of what differentiates one series level from another as related to the characteristics and boundaries of work, since those have yet to be defined. Hopefully, this round of response won’t be considered firm until such time as that review can take place.” We recognize the information provided in the preliminary findings report was brief. The draft definition and distinguishing characteristics have just been distributed and we hope for a lot of feedback from the agencies to better define the work at the various levels. We look forward to your feedback so we can accurately describe the work.

“I can share that the overall observation made by top Administrative Managers in our agency is that the proposed job classes appear to reduce overall flexibility in position placement by having stringent interpretations of the type of work being performed and which job series best applies. The point I try to emphasize here is that the specifications would need to overlap to allow for broader application during position placement across these series.” Our goal is to provide a clear career path for state employees who choose a career focused on the Administrative job classes. We have attempted to clarify the levels. Your feedback regarding the definitions and distinguishing characteristics will be critical for ensuring the new job class structure will meet business needs.

“Regarding the question for how many series (classes) of managers are necessary, I would suggest no less than three and possibly as many as four. Again, it’s difficult to say for certain without better understanding what characteristics and boundaries are developed. In my opinion, there is a greater need for a broad series in the manager arena than in the others identified... take the AA in the field office in comparison to the current AM IV in the central office as a consideration.” With the draft class specs, we are proposing three managerial levels. We hope for your feedback on the definition and distinguishing characteristics.

“In the Specialist category, it will be important to make distinctions based on variety and complexity of tasks, as well as the level of communication skill required to be effective in a position (i.e., number and types of contacts on a regular basis).” The draft Administrative Associate (professional) series identifies complexity by the work and organizational scope assigned to positions.

“I’ve seen this and have heard that many of the folks involved with the study believe that HR is taking this in the wrong direction by finding too many ways to break up the duties based on technical classification issues. There was a general consensus that this job class series needed to be broad enough to capture the wide range of duties and shouldn’t contain all of these “levels” of

work described in the preliminary finding document.” The information obtained from the agencies confirmed the Administrative staff perform a wide range of duties and guided us to define two technical levels, two professional levels and three managerial levels. Your specific feedback on the levels proposed will help us refine the structure.

“After reading the preliminary findings report sent on January 16, 2007, it was hard to find how current positions would fit into only one category specified in the report. Many of our current positions seem to overlap each of the areas outlined. More clarification is needed for the three categories: technical, specialist, and managerial. Further in the report there are two titles that are listed: Business Operations Tech/spec/Mgr and Business Administration Tech/Spec/Mgr. In order to provide better feedback, the description of each of these titles should be better defined. In addition, providing further clarification for the three categories (Tech/Spec/Mgr) would be beneficial.” / “Until we see the meat and potatoes or the classes it is hard for us to comment so we will take that information as an FYI.”

We’ve noted this for our Lessons Learned –we could have done a better job with defining the purpose of the Preliminary Findings Report and the information to be included in it.

“If/when DOP establishes "benchmark" positions; it should be based on the job complexity not just size, number of employees, or dollar amount of the agency's budget. **(NOTE: I received several comments on the issue of position evaluations based on size. We have one of the most complex operating budgets, an extensive capital budget (construction projects) and very unique building management functions that don't seem to be recognized in the current classification structure.)**” We have striven to draft the definitions and distinguishing characteristics with a focus on complexity. We look forward to your comments.

### **Comments and questions proposed for consideration with writing the Class Specs for this study:**

“How will someone performing an *equal* portion of technical, specialist, and managerial duties be rated?” In whole job classification, each position is analyzed to determine the class controlling work. In this analysis, we examine the principle purpose for the position, why the position exists, and other elements of the work.

“Several of the administrative positions have duties which are a mix of Technical and Specialist (using the definitions in the preliminary findings report). How will these be classified?” Please see above.

“It will be important to recognize both direct and indirect supervision when evaluating individual positions.” Both are considered in the drafts.

“Facility management doesn't seem to be addressed in any of the groups. For several of our positions this can be a major body of very complex work. How would this be incorporated?” Facility management will be covered in the examples of duties portion of the class specs, which will be drafted later in the study.

“We have people in the administrative series that plan, organize, direct and control resources as a major part of their job, but whose primary assignment is not managerial and/or are not responsible for a major program or programs. Overall, we feel there is no category for this type of person. There appears to be a big gap between Specialist and Managerial, which also makes career development and advancement difficult. Perhaps we need a definition of “major program”.” *We hope this issue has been addressed with the Administrative Associate and Administrative Executive class specs. If you feel the gap still remains, please let us know in your agency feedback on the draft definitions and distinguishing characteristics.*

“There were no preliminary findings provided on pay. We have a comment. It was recommended by staff that the higher or highest level position in this series be at least a range 23. Our higher level Admin Managers work with and provide daily direction to Project Managers and Engineers in ranges 23-25. These are their peers.” *During this phase of the Study process, we are focused on accurately defining the work. Range assignment is addressed later in the study process, after the class specs have been finalized.*

### **Comments provided for the secretary job class:**

“DOP should take up the secretary classification either as part of this study or as a separate study. In many organizations this position performs administrative duties in addition to supporting Directors or other senior managers. Additionally it is an issue only having a single classification for the duties rather than having at least two if not three levels for the classification.”

“I think the Secretary job class fits most closely with the Admin Clerk III and those positions were NOT included in the class study.”

“Yes, include secretaries in the study. If you can find a fit for them for future upward mobility and advancement, it is desired.”

*Secretary positions are being examined in this study because some agencies utilize secretaries in a general administrative role. At this time, we do not plan to re-write the Secretary job class specs, but the draft class specs should allow for movement into the Administrative series if the duties warrant.*

### **A list of the Proposed Job Class Titles and comments for the three series:**

“The Business Operations/Business Administration titles seem appropriate but I'm not sure it really covers the manager series nor recognizes the programmatic work often involved with the higher level manager. Some suggestions are: Program/Division/Department Administrator; Senior Administrator; or Executive Administrator.”

“Suggested titles for the other classes included: Administrative Technician; Administrative Specialist; Administrative Coordinator or Administrative Associate.”

“We feel that the name should reflect Administration in some way, so of the two choices presented, Business Administration (Tech/Spec/Mgr) was preferred.”

“We prefer to keep the same name for the classes. Perhaps DOA can make it work somehow even though you told me that it could not.”

“The vote for titles is in favor of Business Administration Tech/Spec/Mgr as opposed to Business Operations. Keeping the word ‘administration’ or ‘administrative’ seems to best describe positions that oversee or are associated with the type of work in this class.”

“As for the naming convention for the new series, one thought was to see how other states categorize these types of positions to work toward uniformity. If that doesn't fit our needs, I'd recommend going with the Business Administration convention over the Business Operations convention. It seems to me that the former lends itself more to administrative work, is more consistent with what post-secondary institutions use for verbiage, and would hopefully be more intuitive to potential applicants.”

“Suggestions for naming the new categories (we like the word “Administrative”):  
Administrative Technician, Administrative Specialist, Administrative Operations Manager”

“I don't like the class titles you folks developed and I prefer the class titles I previously sent via e-mail which are: **First Choice:** Administrator I, II, III, IV (Manager Series), Administrative Specialist I, II, III, Administrative Technician I, II, III; **Second Choice:** General Administrator I, II, III, IV (Manager Series), General Administrative Specialist I, II, III, General Administrative Technician I, II, III (I hate to see Administration or a derivative taken out of our title. I think Administration is a widely recognized title in various levels of government and business and wonder how our new titles will transfer (as experience) if we seek other employment. I can't see a good reason for choosing a new name.) If we must, maybe something like: **Third Choice:** General Manager I, II, III, & IV, General Management Specialist I, II, III, General Management Technician I, II, III”

“The titles suggested were thought to be long and bureaucratic sounding, and we would discourage the use of the word “operations”. In this department (and probably others) we use the term to refer to the programmatic work, not the administrative work. An alternate suggestion is Administrative Technician/Specialist, and Administrator.”

Based on the number of requests to keep the word Administrative in the title, we propose the working titles of Administrative Technician, Administrative Associate, and Administrative Executive. We appreciate any further ideas you have for naming the series.

### **Other comments:**

“The proposed structure is reasonable.”

“I think your plan so far sounds fine.”

“Generally it was felt that there wasn't enough information yet to really comment on.”

“The technical series should have two levels – one for entry and one for journey level. It is not felt that you need a third level.”

“There was a consensus that two levels is sufficient for the technical level.”

“Generally it was felt that there wasn't enough information yet to really comment on.”

“In one of our divisions, many of the administrative assistants run volunteer programs for their regions. Please keep this task in mind when developing class specs.”

In closing, we appreciate your active participation and look forward to your feedback and comments in the next stage of the study.