

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska
Department of Administration
Division of Personnel

To: Nicki Neal
Director

Date: February 1, 2009

Thru: Cindy Gouveia
Class Studies Supervisor

Phone: 465-4075
Fax: 465-1029
Email: cindy.gouveia@alaska.gov

From: Diane Larocque
Human Resources Specialist

Phone: 465-3837
Fax: 465-1029
Email: diane.larocque@alaska.gov

Subject: Program Coordinator Study

Preamble:

The Program Coordinator Study was a Division of Personnel (DOP) requested study. DOP initiated contact with all state Administrative Service Directors (ASDs) to explain the need for this study and received concurrence that the study was warranted and long overdue. The objectives of the study were to: 1) design generalist job classes that could be utilized by all state agencies while maintaining the integrity of the classification system, 2) study the work, determine the levels and revise the class specifications, 3) conduct an internal alignment analysis, and 4) allocate positions to the appropriate job class.

Study Scope:

The study included the review of all permanent full time and non-permanent Program Coordinator, Project Coordinator, Associate Coordinator, and Project Assistant positions which included approximately 158 positions that spanned across 12 departments. Early on in the process, the decision was made to include these four job classes only and exclude the more specialized coordinator or managerial job classes that are agency specific and as such require specific qualifications. The purpose of this was to limit the scope of an already large and complex study project that would require extensive time and effort. At the same time it was recognized that while the goal was to create a more generalist series for broad agency use, it was equally importance to retain those existing agency specific job classes for individual agency use.

Because of its complexity, it was decided that this study would be conducted in three phases. The initial phase included all positions that were analyzed as appropriate for allocation to the newly revised Project Assistant, Program Coordinator I and II job classes, or reallocation to another existing and more appropriate job class. The second phase of the study will focus on creating a separate class series for positions managing large system projects. The third phase of the study will focus on positions included in the study for which no appropriate job class exists and examine how to best address and correct this situation.

All departments were solicited for their input regarding whether or not the need existed to expand the newly revised series by creating an additional higher level Program Manager. Few agencies responded to this question, and the three agencies that provided feedback indicated that such a need did not exist at this time.

Study Method:

Consistent with the classification study process and procedures, the study Analyst prepared pre-study presentation material; developed and distributed a study plan and general study process information to the ASDs; distributed a position description writing guide and a project/program characteristics questionnaire to supplement the information received in the position descriptions; and identified departmental contacts to use as the primary communication liaison for the study. In addition a working study group was established to participate in developing the class specification. This working group consisted of staff representing the three largest agency users of the study classes who assisted in identifying issues and provided valuable input from a departmental perspective.

In-person desk audits were conducted in Anchorage and Juneau, and telephonic audits were conducted with incumbents based in other locations. A total of 54 desk audits were conducted out of 158 positions. The information obtained through the audits as well as the information provided by the working group was used in the development of the class specifications. Class specifications were drafted and provided to the agencies for review and comment. In addition, an addendum was developed with agency assistance to serve as a guide for both DOP and the agencies. It was intended that this addendum would help to more clearly distinguish the levels of work and authority between the various classes. The guide is posted on the Classification website and readily available. Both the class specifications and the addendum were used by classifiers in a test allocation session. After minor revisions, study positions were allocated using the new class specifications and addendum, and a draft allocation spreadsheet was submitted to each agency for review and comment. In total seven requests for reconsideration were received and again reviewed by the Allocator with the results forwarded to the agency ASD. The job classes were analyzed for internal alignment and the draft results were provided to the agency.

History of Job Class:

Both the Program and Project Coordinator job classes were established in February 1970 in response to the federally sponsored "Great Society" programs, specifically to coordinate the Work Incentive Program jointly operated by the Departments of Health & Social Service and Labor. The Associate Coordinator job class was established in October 1970 to provide staff support for the Coordinator, Office of Aging. In December 1976, the Project Assistant was created at the request of the former Department of Community & Regional Affairs to plan limited projects centered upon public assistance community projects, programs, and needs such as alcoholism, nutrition, community and rural development, relief assistance, and other health and social services.

The original definitions of all four job classes focused on research, analysis, planning, and coordinative duties, with the varying levels of program or project related work and responsibilities described but not clearly distinguished in the class specifications. All required a college education or graduation and/or experience. Since the class specifications were originally

established, numerous revisions have been made to the distinguishing characteristics and minimum qualifications, rendering them somewhat confusing.

Class Analysis:

The existing job classes were initially intended primarily for those agencies whose mission and focus was the delivery of community services, employment, health, and social services related programs and projects. Due to the growing number of initiatives, programs, and projects affecting all agencies, and the lack of appropriate job classes in which to classify positions performing coordinative work outside these specific areas, allocating positions became increasingly problematic. The result was that it became common practice to request and allocate more positions into the Program/Project Coordinator job classes as a “best fit”. Clearly the need to revise the classes to accommodate the needs of all agencies existed and was long overdue.

One of the driving forces behind this study was to clarify the class specifications as well as broaden their availability for use. Because of this, a primary focus was to define and distinguish between a project and a program, and to determine whether or not the work is the same.

Program vs. Project:

A program is different from a project. Programs are on-going, larger in scope than projects, and entail the responsibility for broad range management as well as broad scale and cross functional coordination of all major activities, operational components, and administrative responsibilities associated with the program. The focus of a program is strategic in nature, and the purpose is generally to provide products or services to the public, agency, industry, etc. Most programs have an impact or effect which is external to the administering agency.

Projects are temporary and comprised of a number of activities that must be completed in some specific order. They entail the responsibility for assessment and evaluation, planning and development, implementation, operation, problem identification and resolution, analysis, reporting, and administration directed toward an explicit objective. Projects generally have a single goal and the purpose is to attain the objective and then terminate. Generally speaking, projects are undertaken to create, modify, or enhance a product, service, or system. Projects contribute to and support the goals of an organization’s program, are typically governed by a simple management structure and limited to teams within the functions of a program. The focus is on the tactics of planning and execution of work output.

Although there are many common elements that overlap in the responsibilities associated with either program or project coordination, the overall nature of the work and differing organizational structures, strategies, processes, and skill sets needed to perform the work indicate that they are related but separate disciplines and support separate job classes for each discipline.

Position Grouping and new job classes

DOP’s policy in grouping positions is that they are grouped together when they are sufficiently similar with respect to duties and responsibilities, degree of supervision exercised and received, and entrance requirements so that: 1) the same title can be used to clearly identify each position; 2) the same minimum qualifications for initial appointment can be established for all positions; 3) the same rate of basic pay can be fairly applied to all positions; and 4) employees in a

particular class are considered an appropriate group for purposes of layoff and recall. Job classes should be constructed as broadly as is feasible as long as the tests of similarity are met. In the case of the Associate Coordinator, it was difficult to distinguish between the original Project Coordinator and the Associate Coordinator job classes while working on revising the class specifications. Specifically the examples of duties and KSAs were essentially the same, and the minimum qualifications were almost identical. In addition the salary ranges for these two job classes have been the same since they were established. It was determined that all these factors combined met DOP's grouping criteria and as a result, the Associate Coordinator job class was abolished and the work was incorporated in the newly established Program Coordinator I (revised Project Coordinator).

Type of work

- Professional – DOP's standard operating procedures define professional work as creative, analytical, evaluative, interpretive, and requiring a range and depth of specialized and theoretical knowledge in a field of science or learning characteristically acquired through education or training equivalent to a bachelor's degree or higher. The work requires the exercise of discretion, judgment, and personal responsibility for the application of an organized body of knowledge that is constantly studied to make new discoveries and interpretations, and to improve data, materials, and methods.
- Technical/Paraprofessional – DOP's standard operating procedures define technical/paraprofessional work as typically associated with and supportive of a professional or administrative field. It involves extensive practical knowledge gained through experience and/or specific training. Work in these occupations may involve substantial elements of the work of the professional and/or administrative field, but requires less than full knowledge of the field involved. Employees carry out tasks, methods, procedures, and computations that are covered by established precedents or guidelines and often require a high degree of skill, care, and precision.

Level of work

Division of Personnel Standard Operating Procedures identifies eight levels of work: entry, trainee, developmental, journey, advanced, lead, supervisory, and managerial:

- Entry level is defined by work assignments that consist of basic or elementary tasks and duties.
- Training and/or developmental levels involve the completion of a training plan and completion of well defined projects or portions of the work for the purpose of advancing the incumbent's training.
- Journey level work is the full working level whereby incumbents perform the full range of assignments, without close supervision.
- Advanced level work consists of unusual, difficult, or exceptional assignments that most often require modifying methods or techniques to complete.
- Lead level work includes responsibility over employees while performing the same work. Lead responsibilities are not at the level of full supervisory authority.
- Supervisory level work includes those positions which have full supervisory authority.
- Managerial level applies to those positions that are responsible for a major program which includes planning, organizing, and resource management.

Project Assistants perform professional work at the journey level. The Project Assistant was originally established as a journey level position to provide professional support to public assistance, rural development, substance abuse and alcoholism, aging, or employment programs or project. The work includes research, data gathering and analysis, report writing, implementing and evaluating programs and procedures, and providing significant outreach to stakeholders. The study indicated that the nature of Project Assistant work remains the same as does the type and level of the work. The intent of this job class is that it is a “generalist” job class. However, those positions whose work is focused primarily in a specific functional area are precluded from allocation to the Project Assistant job class.

Program Coordinators

The Program Coordinator series was broadened to allow use by all agencies. The type of work is professional and the level of work for both the Program Coordinator I and II remains the same. Program Coordinators are responsible for planning, developing and coordinating program activities, functions and major components of a program to achieve long-term program goals and objectives, and ensure delivery of the program and program services.

The Program Coordinator I performs advanced level work to coordinate a program or multiple program components. There are three options within this job class: 1) responsibility for a small, less complex program, or 2) regional authority for a large statewide program, or 3) multiple significant components of a large statewide program. This third option defines the work that was previously performed by Associate Coordinators.

The Program Coordinator II performs at the advanced and managerial level and the scope of responsibility and authority is greater than that which is found at the Program Coordinator I level. Program Coordinators II are responsible for long-term program development, planning, coordination, evaluation, and oversight of either 1) a large complex statewide program or 2) multiple small programs. The scope of responsibility includes related sub-programs, projects, and services.

Class Title:

The class title should be the best descriptive title for the work. It should concisely and accurately convey the kind and level of work performed, be as brief as possible and easily recognized, and must be gender neutral and understood by potential applicants.

The title Project Assistant best describes the work performed by incumbents who provide essential professional support and assistance to either program and project managers for administering, promoting, evaluating, and delivering project or program services.

The title Program Coordinator best describes the work performed by incumbents who are responsible for planning, developing, coordinating, and overseeing the activities, functions, and major components of a program.

Minimum Qualifications:

The Project Assistant is a professional job class that requires the application of analytical, evaluative, and interpretive skills. Incumbents utilize these skills to perform and implement program functions and services. The general bachelor's degree requirement for the Project Assistant has always been in place. The concept is that by meeting the general degree requirement, incumbents are likely to have acquired the basic skills necessary to write, comprehend, and complete a variety of professional assessment and report documents, as well as having developed the skills necessary to accurately analyze and assess information and data both within and outside agency sources. Allowing for an experience substitution provides management with the ability to consider applicants who have gained sufficient and related paraprofessional work experience, and could be reasonably expected to perform at the professional level by the end of the probationary period.

Similarly, the Program Coordinators I and II require a general bachelor's degree with additional and higher level experience. The experience requirement was revised for consistency and flow, and the number of years reduced from its original state. Beginning at the Project Assistant level and progressing up to the Program Coordinator II, the minimum requirements are consistent and the progression of work experience is logical.

Class Code:

The Classification Outline is the hierarchy by which various job classes and class series are sorted into occupational groups and job families. Occupational groups consist of job families that encompass relatively broad occupations, professions, or activities. Job families consist of job classes that are related as to the nature of the work performed. The Project Assistant, Project Coordinator, and Program Coordinator were originally assigned to the PF occupational group which consists of families of classes that are specifically focused on Social, Benefit, and Employment Services programs, work, and services. Because a significant result of this study was that all three job classes were broadened to allow use by all agencies, they are no longer specific to these programs and services and therefore no longer appropriate for this group.

Due to changes in the job classes and because the general nature of the work performed by these three classes broadly include managerial work at some level, the newly revised Project Assistant, Program Coordinator I and II job classes are assigned to the PB Administrative and Office Support Occupational Group, and more specifically the PB99 job family. The PB99 family is reserved for job classes not otherwise described. This family includes classes of positions of an administrative or management nature of general or miscellaneous character which are not specifically classifiable in another family. Initial preparation for employment is typically through progressively responsible professional experience. Because there are no other appropriate occupational groups to place these classes within, Project Assistant, Program Coordinator I and II are assigned to the PB99 job family and assigned the new class codes PB9908, PB9909, and PB9910.

To Be Abolished:

- PF0141 (old - Project Assistant)
- PF0142 (old: -Associate Coordinator)
- PF0546 (old - Project Coordinator)

PF0545 (old - Program Coordinator)

Fair Labor Standards Act

The positions in this study are covered by the minimum wage and maximum hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as Amended (FLSA). While exemption from the provisions of the Act are determined based on the specific circumstances of an individual employee on a work-week basis, there are general aspects of the classes and their influence on the exemptions for employees in bona fide executive, professional, or administrative positions that can be addressed in general.

There are both salary and duty requirements which dictate FLSA exemption status. There are three categories used in analyzing the eligibility for overtime exemptions under the Fair Labor Standards Act: Administrative, Professional, and Executive:

Administrative Exemption Status: in order to qualify an employee must be compensated on a salary or fee basis at a rate of not less than \$455 per week and his or her primary duty must be the performance of office or non-manual work that is directly related to the management or general business operations of the employer that includes the exercise of discretion and independent judgment with respect to matters of significance. Some examples of this type of work include tax, finance, accounting, budgeting, personnel, and procurement related functions. No Project Assistants or Program Coordinators perform office work related to management or business operations as a primary duty and therefore do not meet the FLSA administrative criteria for overtime exemption.

Professional Exemption Status: in order to qualify an employee must be compensated on a salary or fee basis at a rate of not less than \$455 per week and an employee's primary duty must be work requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning, which is customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction; or be work requiring invention, imagination originality or talent in a recognized field of artistic or creative endeavor. While the Project Assistant and Program Coordinator work is professional and requires advanced knowledge, a wide variety of study fields are allowed to meet minimum qualifications. Further a substitution in the minimum qualifications allows for a combination of less than four years of college education and experience to qualify. Project Assistants and Program Coordinators do not meet the FLSA professional criteria for overtime exemption.

Executive Exemption Status: in order to qualify an employee must be compensated on a salary or fee basis at a rate of not less than \$455 per week and the primary duty must be the management of a customarily recognized subdivision of the organization, including the customarily and regularly directing of work of two or more employees; and include authority to hire or fire other employees or make recommendations as to the change of status of other employees that are given particular weight. Some Project Assistants and Program Coordinators have management and supervision as a primary duty. Under FLSA, management is defined as activities such as interviewing, selecting, training and directing employees; maintaining production for use in supervision or control; appraising employee's productivity and efficiency for the purpose of recommending promotions or changes to status; handling complaints, grievances, and discipline; determining techniques, apportioning the work among employees; planning and controlling

budgets and monitoring or implementing legal compliance measures. Only those Project Assistants and Program Coordinators with full supervisory and managerial duties meet the executive criteria for FLSA exemption. Each individual position is being reviewed against the criteria for the Executive exemption to determine FLSA exemption status.

Internal Alignment:

The state's pay plan is governed by the merit principle and includes "integrated salary programs based on the nature of the work performed." The pay plan is based upon the state's classification plan, provided for fair and reasonable compensation for services rendered, and reflects the principle of "like pay for like work." In achieving this principle, internal consistency is the primary consideration when setting the salary range of a job class. In evaluating internal consistency, the difficulty, responsibility, knowledge, skills, and other characteristics of a job class are compared with job classes of a similar nature, kind, and level in the same occupational group or related job families.

Projects Assistant

The primary purpose of the Project Assistant is to extend the capabilities of program managers by performing professional journey level support. Project Assistants perform a variety of duties at this level such as research, data compilation and analysis, writing reports, implementing and evaluating programs and procedures, and providing significant outreach and program assistance to stakeholders. Incumbents are expected to exercise discretion, judgment, and limited authority. The focus of the work is narrow and usually limited to a specific target group. Similar to most journey level professional job classes, the knowledge and skills typically required for the Project Assistant job class can be acquired through a post secondary education degree and some technical experience or the equivalent in knowledge and experience gained on the job.

The PB99 job family consists of miscellaneous job classes that are not specifically classifiable in another family: Claims Administrator (PB9901 SR19), Risk Manager (PB9902 SR22), State Travel Manager (PB9903 SR20), Veterans Affairs Administrator (PB9904 SR21), Administrator Violent Crimes Compensation Board (PB9905 SR20), State Travel Office Assistant (PB9906 SR17), and Cultural Resources Manager & Native Liaison (PB9907 SR19). These job classes range from program managers and administrators to single position job classes where the incumbent is solely responsible for delivering services which affect all agencies statewide. The level of authority and scope of responsibility for these job classes far exceed that which characterizes the Project Assistant, and are therefore not appropriate for purposes of internal alignment.

Because there are no appropriate comparable job classes within the PB99 job family itself, the scope of review was expanded to include the job classes within the same occupational group (PB). The journey level professional job classes in the PB occupational group are:

Administrative Officer I (PB0154 SR17), Accountant II (PB0212 SR16), Payroll Specialist I (PB0233 SR16), Human Resource Specialist I (PB0311 SR 16), Retirement and Benefits Specialist I (PB0341 SR16), Internet Specialist I (PB0491 SR16), Research Analyst II (PB0512 SR16), and Procurement Specialist II (PB0632 SR16).

These are professional journey level job classes whose incumbents perform tasks that are analytical, evaluative, and interpretative in nature and whose primary purpose is to provide professional level support. These job classes share significant similarities in scope of responsibility, authority, and minimum qualifications.

The classification structure and typical classification procedure sets the benchmark salary range for journey level professional job classes at 16. Within the list of journey professional job classes in the PB occupational group, only the Administrative Officer I is above this range, the reason being that the Administrative Officers I have a much broader scope of responsibility and greater level of authority for multiple and varied functional areas, rather than a single functional area.

Because the nature of the Project Assistant's work is to provide professional support to project and program managers, in order to consider this classification factor the analyst searched for other journey professional job classes outside the scope of the PB occupational group that share a similar nature. The Health Program Associate (PG0120 SR16) was the only other professional level job class whose primary purpose is to provide program/project support. The Health Program Associates provide very similar substantive professional level support to Health Program Managers such as on-going analysis, evaluation, compliance monitoring, and service analysis.

In summary, the selected comparable job classes are professional and journey level, have a narrow and limited focus and scope of responsibility and authority, share similar minimum qualifications, and work either directly or indirectly in a supportive capacity. The comparable job classes are assigned salary range 16 which indicates that the Project Assistant is appropriately placed at salary range 16.

Program Coordinators

Program Coordinators are responsible for planning, developing, coordinating, and overseeing the activities, functions, and major components and projects under a program. The Program Coordinators I and II are distinguished by the scope of responsibility, program size and complexity, and level of program authority. The Program Coordinator I exercises a limited scope of responsibility and authority for a small less complex program, or has regional oversight for a large program, or is responsible for significant program components or projects of a large and complex program. The Program Coordinator II has a greater scope of responsibility and full authority for large, complex programs which include all program related projects and sub-programs, or multiple programs.

Both the Program Coordinator I and II were placed in the PB99 job family. This family consists of miscellaneous job classes that are not specifically classifiable in another family: Claims Administrator (PB9901 SR19), Risk Manager (PB9902 SR22), State Travel Manager (PB9903 SR20), Veterans Affairs Administrator (PB9904 SR21), Administrator Violent Crimes Compensation Board (PB9905 SR20), State Travel Office Assistant (PB9906 SR17), and Cultural Resources Manager & Native Liaison (PB9907 SR19). Although the majority of these job classes are primarily managerial and administrative, they consist of single position job classes where the incumbent is solely and fully responsible for managing and delivering statewide services (rather than a program) that affect all state agencies, or others who in addition to

administering the statewide service, serve as consultants to Directors and Commissioners. Simply put, these job classes do not have program coordination as a primary responsibility, rather they are job classes where the incumbent is responsible for ensuring the delivery of statewide services or are program administrators or assistant administrators. The nature and scope of the work does not present a good comparison for internal alignment.

Expanding the scope of comparison to include and analyze job classes within the same occupational group (PB) failed to produce job classes with a similar and primary responsibility for program coordination or management. The PB occupational group consists of specialists who advise on, administer, supervise or perform work involved in administration, management, accounting and related financial management, research and statistics, supply, personnel management, IT and clerical or secretarial work.

The Program Coordinators I and II are broadly written to accommodate the variety of agency programs. The job classes that provided the best comparison were program coordinator or manager type classes that, although they require more specialized expertise in a specific field, still had program coordination as the primary duty. Job classes across several other job families and groups met this criterion and were selected for comparison because the coordinative and managerial work is similar; programmatic responsibilities include projects and components; advanced knowledge and experience at the professional level is required; and duties include the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive programmatic operation. In addition, depending on the level of management, incumbents in these job classes routinely contribute to long-term planning, statewide policy and operational changes, and program budget planning, development, and management. These are class defining features at differing degrees for the Program Coordinators I and II, and for most program manager type job classes as well. With these class controlling duties in mind, the classes reviewed include: Social Services Program Coordinator (PF0171 R20); Health Program Manager I (PG0121 SR17) Health Program Manager II (PG0122 R19), Health Program Manager III (PG0123 SR21); Health Program Manager IV (PG0124 SR23); Unclaimed Property Manager (PC 0570 SR18); Community Rehabilitation Program Specialist (PF0401 R20); Emergency Program Manager I (PD0421 R20); Emergency Program Manager II (PD0422 SR22); School Food Coordinator (PE0130 SR20); Social Services Program Administrator (PF0173 SR23); Children's Services Manager (PF0210 SR21); Program Manager: Occupational Safety and Health (PC0325 SR22); Regional Alcoholism Program Coordinator (PG0570 SR21); and Vocational Rehabilitation Manager (PF0460 SR21).

Comparisons were made by examining, evaluating, and comparing the Program Coordinator I's primary duty, overall programmatic authority, scope of responsibility, nature and level of program complexity and the knowledge and required skills with the comparable job classes. The Program Coordinators I are responsible for a small well-established program, have a limited scope of responsibility and authority level, and are primarily responsible for program implementation and ongoing operations more so than program development. With these characteristics in mind, the Program Coordinator I appears to be a blend of both the Health Program Manager I and II job classes, sharing some similar duties and responsibilities in each and with an authority level that is also in between. All comparable job classes at range 20 and higher are responsible for larger, more complex programs that are multifaceted with multiple

components; serve a large and diverse constituency that have an array of service needs that cross programs and/or agencies, government jurisdictions, and advocacy groups; and require more active and in-depth accountability, initiative, and authority for program and funding development in general. The level of complexity, authority and scope of responsibility of the Program Coordinator I most closely align with the Unclaimed Property Manager.

Likewise the analysis for the Program Coordinator II took into account overall programmatic authority, the scope of responsibility, the nature and level of program complexity, and the knowledge and skills required to effectively perform duties at this level. Comparable job classes at the range 20 level indicates that these generally consist of positions that are responsible for planning, developing, and coordinating large, complex programs that are politically and socially sensitive or otherwise affected by influences and factors which demand on-going analysis and evaluation. As such incumbents provide close and pro-active oversight and management, as well as recommending and implementing adjustments to the comprehensive plans, goals, objectives, operations, and delivery. The fiscal authority and responsibility at this level is also significant. Reviewed job classes in the higher ranges 21, 22, and 23 are typically senior program managers, staff consultants, regional supervisors, or administrators who provide expert advice and guidance to the agency's senior executives, and whose role shifts from coordinating all the activities and elements necessary for developing and running a program to a broader and more fully encompassing managerial and administrator role. At this level incumbents have a larger role in formulating, setting, and approving (program related) policy and procedures, which includes reviewing Program Coordinators' and lower level managers' recommendations. As managers, incumbents must have a broader awareness of the political, social, economic and administrative factors having potential impact on the program, and also have a much greater fiscal authority that spans beyond a single program and its sub-programs. At this higher level, incumbents are also responsible for a large professional staff that may be spread across multiple offices and in several different geographical locations. Senior managers, regional supervisors, and administrators are most likely focused on the overall management and supervision of staff and the effective program delivery which is accomplished through subordinate managers and coordinators. In short, the breadth of responsibility and authority level are much broader for these positions than at the Program Coordinator levels.

The Program Coordinator II's scope and level of responsibility and authority as well as required level of knowledge is most comparable in characteristics to the School Food Coordinator (20), Social Services Program Coordinator (20), Community Rehabilitation Program Specialist (20), and Emergency Program Specialist (20). Similar to the Program Coordinator I it was clear that the Program Coordinator II shared significant similarities with both the Health Program Manager II and III job classes, but fell either above the lower level or just below the higher level in terms of authority level and responsibility. In addition the Health Program Managers require higher minimum qualifications in a Master's degree, the primary reason for the ranges 17, 19, 21, and 23.

Conclusions:

In summary, based on the analysis of the class controlling duties and responsibilities typical of the classes, the comparisons with other job classes, the goals of the pay plan, and the differences in required minimum qualifications, the recommendation is that the Project Assistants remain

assigned to range 16. For the Program Coordinator series, the benchmark Program Coordinator II is assigned to salary range 20. Applying the standard classification practice of providing sufficient range separation between job classes within a series indicates that the Program Coordinator I is appropriately assigned to salary range 18.

The original objectives of the Program Coordinator Study have been met. The Project Assistant, Program Coordinator I, and Program Coordinator II job classes have been revised and established. The initial phase I of this study is effective February 1, 2009. The second phase of the study will be addressed next followed by the third and final phase of the study. Once all phases of the study have concluded, the Project Coordinator and Associate Coordinator job classes will be abolished.