
LGPI – Local Government Personnel Institute

Classification Study for Multnomah County

Study Classifications:

Program Development Specialist, Senior

Program Development Specialist

Program Coordinator

Program Development Technician

Volunteer Coordinator

MCSO Volunteer Program Coordinator

August 25, 2011

Study Team Included:

LGPI - Dana Bennett, Steve Foster, and Jill Armstrong

Multnomah County Class Comp – Joi Doi, Manager; Candace Busby, John Kaneski, Leila Wrathall and Olga Ward

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION 1
 - 1.1 CLASSIFICATION TITLES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY 1
 - 1.2 STUDY BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE 2

- 2 BASIC STUDY METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS 4
 - 2.1 METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS 4

- 3 FINDINGS AND SUMMARY 7
 - 3.1 CLASSIFICATION STRUCTURE CONCLUSIONS 7
 - 3.2 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM SPECIALIST SENIOR 8
 - 3.3 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM SPECIALIST 9
 - 3.4 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR AND THE PRIOR VOLUNTEER COORDINATOR CLASSIFICATIONS 10
 - 3.5 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM TECHNICIAN 11
 - 3.6 CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 12

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 CLASSIFICATION TITLES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

| Job Title | No. Positions | Job Title | No. Positions |
|--|---------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Program Development Specialist, Senior | 44 | Program Development Specialist | 67 |
| Program Development Coordinator | 34 | Program Development Technician | 19 |
| Volunteer Coordinator | 2 | MCSO Volunteer Program Coordinator | 2 |

A total of 169 positions were reviewed and allocated as a result of this study; the two MCSO Volunteer Coordinators were the only Management/Exempt classifications under review. The remaining classifications are part of the AFSCME collective bargaining unit. Additionally one Research & Evaluation Analyst 2 position was included by management request.

1.2 STUDY BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The classifications and work assignments performed by employees in this study have evolved over a 20+ year period with the last study conducted in 2004. As a classification series, the job classes below span a wide variety of work performed throughout the County in almost every department and non-departmental organization. This report summarizes the findings and recommendations of a classification-only study conducted for specified AFSCME and management positions allocated to the classifications of:

- Program Development Specialist, Senior
- Program Development Specialist
- Program Coordinator
- Program Development Technician
- Volunteer Coordinator
- MCSO Volunteer Program Coordinator

The majority of these classifications are found within the Department of County Human Services (over 50%) and in the Health Department (+20%). However, these classifications are found in other departments throughout the County, including: Community Services; Community Justice; the Library; County Management; District Attorney's Office; Sheriff's Office; and Non-Departmental organizations. These broad classifications encompassed functions which have significantly varying work assignments in diverse programs. Assignments range from creating community food/gardening initiatives to developing health equity policies and performing research on various social/contemporary topics. Additionally one Research & Evaluation Analyst 2 position was included in the study, as the work assignments appeared to align with the "PDS" series. This management sponsored study began in mid-February, 2011 and was completed in August 2011.

As a management sponsored study, the objective of the study was three-fold:

1. To determine if the current array of classifications was sufficient and/or appropriate to describe the work being performed
2. To either revise the current classifications with clearer job distinctions and/or create new job classes to better describe the work performed, and
3. To allocate the positions in the study once the new and/or revised job classes were developed.

The study was undertaken using a combined team of outside consultants from LGPI (Local Government Personnel Institute) and the County's Class Comp team.

The two groups worked in unison to conduct the necessary research, explore options, and develop solutions. This study was a classification-only study and did not include a compensation analysis component.

The study included a total of 169 separate positions spanning 6 classifications in 9 separate departments/organizations. The team launched the study by meeting with the employees in the impacted classifications along with their direct managers and Department HR Representatives. The purpose of the study, the general study process and timelines were discussed during those meetings and an opportunity was provided for both employees and managers to ask questions about the study. Emphasis was placed on the importance of accurately completing Position Descriptions (PDs), as they are the primary tool by which allocations are determined. In addition, training on completing the PDs was offered, and key dates were outlined including the goal of allocation completion by August 2011. The effective date for the study's results will be September 1, 2011 which follows the basic tenet that management studies are effective when completed, and there would be no retroactivity, unless previously identified and communicated by Class Comp.

2 *BASIC STUDY METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS*

2.1 METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

- LGPI and Multnomah County Class Comp met as a team in January 2011 to discuss options and parameters of the study, in order to understand the scope, process, and issues.
- Employee, supervisor and management kick-off meetings were held in February 2011 to rollout the process and goals of the study. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the Position Description (PD) document and that it needed to accurately and clearly reflect the duties and responsibilities of the work assigned to each position.
- Employees completed Position Descriptions and submitted them for review by their direct managers. The PDs were due to supervisors at the end of February 2011. The purpose of the PD is to illicit information about core duties and responsibilities; level of decision making within a position; degree of autonomy; contact types, frequency and purpose; any supervisory and/or budgetary responsibilities included within the job; and the incumbent's unique qualifications. Again, these documents are the key element upon which allocation determinations are made.
- Managers reviewed submitted materials, discussed any concerns with employees, revised PDs where appropriate and forwarded final documents to Departmental HR Representatives (due to Department HR by mid-March 2011).
- HR Representatives conducted a final review and forwarded finalized Positions Descriptions to Class Comp by end of March 2011.
- LGPI received and logged the majority of Position Descriptions to be included in the study in mid-April 2011.
- LGPI reviewed the current classification descriptions for each classification included in the study, closely analyzing the distinctions between the classifications to better understand the current structure.
- LGPI then reviewed all of the subsequent Position Descriptions submitted between mid-April and mid-May 2011, developing an analysis table to begin identifying and categorizing the types of work and functions performed within the study classifications.
- During this review, LGPI identified an initial list of potential positions to be audited (i.e. interviewing employees about their work, as well as conducting follow-up discussions with their supervisors if needed to further clarify work functions). The audit recommendations were based upon a particular uniqueness in certain positions, questions that arose out of the review of the documents for other positions and/or those positions appearing to be fairly representative of the current classification.

-
- LGPI met with Class Comp to discuss initial findings, to brainstorm strategy options on how best to proceed and to make final determinations regarding the positions to be audited.
 - The combined team (LGPI and Class Comp) met with managers with direct and indirect responsibility over classifications in the study to identify differences and similarities of work performed by the classifications in different departments. Particular attention was focused on the Program Development Specialist Senior classification.
 - A management panel was formed in mid-May 2011 to serve as a “sounding board” for the Class Comp/LGPI team and to assist in answering more detailed questions about how the classifications were used within departments. The panel also served as a review panel as the process began to take shape. The panel included:
 - Department of County Human Services --
 - Lee Girard
 - Leslie Goodlow
 - Joan Rice
 - Peggy Samolinski
 - Department of Community Services --
 - Kim Peoples
 - Health Department --
 - Sandy Johnson
 - Department of County Management
 - Elisabeth Nunes
 - Department HR representatives who contributed significant content and assistance on this large study included: Melissa Dailey (Health Dept.); Johnette Easter (Library); Jodi Erickson (DA’s Office); Patsy Moushey (Department of County Assets, and Non-Departmental organizations); Elisabeth Nunes (Department of County Management); Shawntia Otero (DCJ); Jennifer Ott (Sheriff’s Office); Jerry Petty (DCS); and Urmila Jhattu and Heather Garrett (DCHS).
 - Analysis tools were developed based upon the work described in the position descriptions (PDs). The information gleaned from the PDs helped the team identify and delineate how the classifications were being used across the County and to distinguish various levels of work. This development was ongoing during May and June 2011. The management panel provided significant assistance in shaping the initial development of functions and served as a review board providing critical input as the study progressed.
 - LGPI and Class Comp completed desk audits on approximately 40% of the positions under review during the months of May and June 2011. Following

completion of audits, the team held debriefing meetings to review outcomes, patterns detected through the audits, and continued to refine their analysis tools in light of their findings, research, and ongoing input from the management panel.

- A quick market review was conducted in early July 2011 to determine how other agencies classified similar bodies of work. Research was conducted by Steve Foster and John Kaneski. They examined classification structures in a number of other agencies to determine if there were comparable, simpler and viable structures that should be considered. Their research revealed other systems are reasonably similar – that is, other agencies are using broad generic classifications to encompass a variety of professional and technical work assignments that are similar to Multnomah County’s “PDS” structure.
- Recommendations were developed regarding the structure of the classifications in mid-July 2011; the team worked jointly on revisions to gain consensus on the new/revised classifications. This included leaving the current structure largely intact, revising the job titles (removing the word “development” as a result of the findings), revising the job class distinctions based on the research/information gathered through the process, and eliminating the Volunteer Coordinator and MCSO Volunteer Coordinator classifications, merging them into the Program Coordinator classification.
- Supplemental information was requested in mid-July. During the course of the desk audits, some employees furnished copies of their written analysis and other work. The Class Comp team wanted to ensure all professional level incumbents in the study had the opportunity to submit similar documents so that adequate information was available for the team to review as part of their allocation recommendations/decisions. Subsequently, employees in all the job classes being studied -- except for the Program Development Technician (PDT) -- were asked to submit samples of their communications or written products. PDTs were not asked to submit materials, since they do not routinely and independently author written reports, formal analyses, presentations, grants, etc.
- The analysis tools were applied along with the new/revised classification specifications to all Position Descriptions in the study to determine allocations (i.e., the appropriate classification for positions under review) in late July and early August.
- The LGPI/Class Comp team reconvened the management panel in late July 2011 to review the key distinctions and differences they found for each job class. In particular, significant discussion and review were focused on the distinctions between the classifications for the full professional level Specialist and the advanced Senior level job classes.
- Final classification specifications were sent out for management review and comment in early August 2011
- Additional reviews for some positions and follow-up conversations with supervisors were conducted to ensure all potentially negatively impacted positions were thoroughly examined before final allocations were determined in late August 2011.
- A draft classification report was prepared with a summary and findings in mid-August 2011.
- The final classification study report and allocation letters were distributed on August 25, 2011.

3 FINDINGS AND SUMMARY

3.1 CLASSIFICATION STRUCTURE CONCLUSIONS

After considerable research and review of employees' Position Descriptions, data and information collected from the desk audits, review of external practices and input from employees, managers and the management panel, the team (LGPI and Class Comp) determined the current classification structure was still viable. Program Development Specialist Senior, Program Development Specialist, Program Coordinator and Program Development Technician classifications were maintained; however, the word "Development" was struck from the titles. It became apparent many employees working in these classifications do little to no actual program development and thus the title was misleading. Additionally, it was determined the Volunteer Coordinator and MCSO Volunteer Program Coordinator should be eliminated and those jobs reclassified to the Program Coordinator classification, as there were no significant differences in the work being performed and the Program Coordinator classification adequately described the work of the incumbents. The changes to the classification structure are summarized in the table below.

| Original Job Class Title | New/Revised Job Class Title | Comments |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Program Development Specialist, Sr. | Program Specialist, Sr. | Title Change to better reflect the work |
| Program Development Specialist | Program Specialist | Title Change to better reflect the work |
| Program Coordinator | Program Coordinator | No Change |
| Program Development Technician | Program Technician | Title Change to better reflect the work |
| Volunteer Coordinator | Program Coordinator | Original Job Classification Eliminated |
| MCSO Volunteer Program Coordinator | Program Coordinator | Original Job Classification Eliminated |

The team next focused on clarifying the distinctions between the classifications to make the difference more apparent and thus the allocation decision-making process clearer. Additionally, the team developed a definition for a "Program," to clear up how it differs from a department, function, project and/or other major assignment.

A program is defined as - a specialized area with distinct but integrated client services, operations and activities that retains its own policies, procedures, goals, objectives, budget, funding and tasks, which distinguish it from the main body of a department or agency. Programs are externally

focused and differ from internal staff functions such as IT, Finance, distribution, purchasing and HR. While they complement core goals and objectives of an agency or department, programs are separate functional areas with distinct goals and objectives. Professional staff and supervisors assigned to a program are required to possess knowledge and expertise within a particular discipline in order to accomplish program goals, meet performance objectives, and deliver required services.

3.2 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM SPECIALIST SENIOR

The Program Specialist Senior classification was a significant focus of this study; a considerable amount of time was spent researching how the Senior classification was used across the County, and how it differed from the full professional level, Program Specialist. As the study progressed, the level of work in key job elements emerged. These elements included:

1. Administering or leading a program
2. Development of written documents, reports, and analysis
3. Strategic role relative to the larger program
4. Level of policy and/or procedure development
5. Cross-jurisdictional coordination
6. Decision-making authority and self-initiated work
7. Job impact
8. Communication/facilitation skills

These key elements distinguished the work of the classification grouping in general. Seniors were separated from the other classifications based on the level of work required within these job elements. As the team worked with the management panel, the elements were further refined with the areas of **Administering/leading a Program**, **Decision-making Authority** and **Job Impact** becoming the most critical components in distinguishing a Senior level job from the other classifications under review. Although a Senior level position would likely have high levels of responsibility in most of the 8 job elements, the significant level of responsibility in one or more of the three critical areas, distinguished Senior level work from the other classifications.

There were numerous positions in the Senior and the Specialist classifications that included managing a portfolio of contracts and/or service providers; duties included preparing/providing training, drafting/revising contracts, ensuring compliance, and other related functions. When looking closely at this set of positions, it became clear the pivot point between the Senior level and the Specialist level was at the level of decision-making authority within jobs. This finding was

consistent with the conclusion reached by the team, in that decision-making is one of the three critical elements that define Seniors.

The Senior level classification is distinguished in the new/revised class specification by positions/incumbents who are considered technically authoritative/knowledge leaders within their program area. These employees/positions are distinguished from other classes within the series by their level of responsibility assumed and their leadership roles. They are the primary “drivers” of assigned grants/contracts. Program Specialist Senior differs from the full journey/professional level Program Specialist in that the latter is responsible for more operational/evaluation assignments and/or implementation. Positions allocated to the Specialist job class are not considered the assigned driving force/authoritative position for the program or grant. The professional level Specialist typically has a more tactical role in ongoing programs that are managed by an exempt supervisor or Program Specialist Senior who provides technical direction, final review and approval regarding financial commitments, program obligations and services. Program Specialist Seniors are further distinguished by the greater consequence of error and breadth of self-initiated work, routinely identifying problems and formulating solutions independently or through consensus with stakeholders.

3.3 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM SPECIALIST

Throughout the process a continued focus was to determine both the differences and similarities of the various classifications under review. The primary job elements noted under section 3.2 for the Senior were used as benchmark factors to measure and compare the other classifications in this study. The distinguishing elements for Program Specialist (the full journey/professional level class within the series) include extensive coordination and collaboration between the program and community organizations, contractors, other County departments, and with other public agencies at both the state and federal level. Employees in this class are distinguished from Program Technician in that the latter provides technical administrative program assistance in the research, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programs, projects, contracts or grants. Program Specialists receive only occasional instruction or assistance as new or complicated situations arise. Employees in this job class are fully aware of the operating procedures and policies of the work unit, division and department. They exercise significant discretion, decision-making and have fairly broad program latitude under limited or infrequent supervisory direction.

The Program Specialist classification is distinguished from Program Coordinator in that Coordinators organize, provide technical direction and are responsible for achieving program results through others as well as through applying their own efforts. Program Coordinators typically oversee established stand-alone, small to medium sized programs and are viewed as the “working manager” for their programs. This class is distinguished from Program Specialist Senior in that the latter is viewed as a subject matter expert/knowledge leader in their area of assignment; is the primary “driver” of assigned grants/contracts; provides lead responsibility for organizational policy, procedure and program analysis, program planning and development efforts; has significant decision-making authority, and work is self-initiated/self-directed. Program Specialist (PS) Senior positions require independent critical thinking and complex problem solving, as PS Senior positions operate in broad policy areas where standards, management direction, and access to best practices are not readily available.

3.4 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR AND THE PRIOR VOLUNTEER COORDINATOR CLASSIFICATIONS

Program Coordinator was reviewed closely and in combination with the Volunteer Coordinator and MCSO Volunteer Program Coordinator, to determine what distinctions existed within the work being performed by these three separate classifications. It was found that the work and level of responsibility was significantly similar and did not warrant separate classifications. Further, it was determined the classification of Program Coordinator appropriately described the work of incumbents in each of the three classifications. It was recommended the two volunteer classifications be eliminated and the incumbents reclassified into the Program Coordinator classification for greater consistency and equity across the County. This action is consistent with the County's preference of using generic classifications whenever possible.

The classification of Program Coordinator is a full professional-level classification which performs lead supervision and program administration as major components in its work assignment. Program Coordinators typically oversee stand-alone, small to medium sized programs and are viewed as the "working manager" of their programs. This job class differs from traditional management/supervisory classifications in that the latter job classes are directly responsible for an assigned staff, and have disciplinary, and other employment related (hiring, promoting, disciplinary, etc.) functions. Program Coordinator performs technical lead duties but does not hire, formally evaluate, discharge staff, or resolve personnel grievances. Program Coordinators also perform professional administrative and operational duties for a small team of professionals, paraprofessionals, and/or volunteers including program planning and evaluation, and community development/outreach activities at the division or department level. Program Coordinators oversee assigned staff and/or a large network of volunteers, contractors, temporary or on-call employees.

Program Coordinator is distinguished from Program Specialist Senior, in that the latter job class is responsible for a larger program with greater community impact, a larger budget and more regular staff assigned to the program. Program Specialist (PS) Senior positions require independent critical thinking and complex problem solving, as PS Senior positions operate in broad policy areas. Program Coordinators differ from Program Specialists, in that Coordinators organize, provide technical direction and are responsible for achieving results through others as well as through their own efforts. In contrast while all jobs require collaboration and teamwork, Program Specialists are typically "implementers" and sole contributors, independently carrying out program objectives or functions.

Below is a summary of key findings that outline some important elements that distinguish the Program Coordinator job classification from Program Specialist.

Program Coordinator

- Is assigned to oversee an established, on-going program
- The program and position provide a tangible outcome or service primarily for external clients (i.e. not internal County employees)
- Major work functions do not result in producing a policy, strategic plan, or initiative
- Work is done primarily through others (for example: working with an assigned staff, gang task force, mentors, volunteers, learning lab staff); and work is not accomplished through commissions or loosely formed policy bodies
- Program Coordinators typically have responsibility for a program budget

Program Specialist

- Are viewed as Subject Matter Experts (SME), implementers, and people who help drive initiatives
- Positions are not typically viewed as Person in Charge (PIC)
- Positions at this level, require strong policy, contract compliance, and analysis/formal evaluation skills
- Emphasis is on facilitation and implementation versus coordinating the work of others

3.5 CLASSIFICATION DETAILS FOR PROGRAM TECHNICIAN

During the study, it was determined Program Technician classification was relatively solid -- both in terms of the classification description and in the general application and use of the job class.

The Program Technician classification is distinguished by providing technical administrative support to professional, supervisory and managerial staff in an assigned program(s). Projects and work assignments are performed within established program policies and procedures. This class differs from the Program Specialist class by the latter having responsibility for performing the full range of professional level program duties, including the research, design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of programs, projects, contracts or grants. This class differs from Data Technician in that Data Technician assignments are narrower in scope and are primarily focused on data collection, validation, updating, editing and reporting. This class is further distinguished from Office Assistant classifications by the latter having broader work assignments which are predominantly administrative in nature; the Program Technician class provides technical assistance to program staff, with limited administrative support duties. Program Technician work functions/assignments typically include performing on-site, simple reviews of sub-contracted services; assisting program staff in monitoring/evaluating programs or contracts; and helping design/implement programs, ensuring compliance with regulations/statutes/contact terms, preparing program budgets, etc.

3.6 CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

By applying the distinguishing elements to all positions in the study, the team determined a number of Program Coordinators better fit the updated Program Specialist classification; conversely, a number of Program Specialists now met the definition for Program Coordinator. The Research & Evaluation Analyst 2 position that was included in the study, also better aligned with Program Specialist. The table below shows the resulting distribution for the 2011 “PDS” study.

| Class Title | JCN | Pre Study | Post Study |
|---------------------------------------|------|-----------|------------|
| Program Specialist Senior | 6088 | 44 | 44 |
| Program Specialist | 6021 | 67 | 83 |
| Program Coordinator | 6022 | 34 | 21 |
| Program Technician | 6020 | 19 | 14 |
| Volunteer Coordinator | 6263 | 2 | 0 |
| MCSO Volunteer Program Coordinator | 9640 | 2 | 0 |
| Research & Evaluation Analyst 2 | 6086 | 1 | 0 |
| Administrative Specialist | 6005 | 0 | 1 |
| Contract Specialist | 6011 | 0 | 2 |
| Data Analyst | 6073 | 0 | 1 |
| Finance Specialist 1 | 6029 | 0 | 1 |
| Fleet and Support Services Specialist | 6184 | 0 | 1 |
| Office Assistant 2 | 6001 | 0 | 1 |

Allocations (the classification of positions) are based on the jobs’ levels of: knowledge/skills; supervision received/exercised; complexity of work; major responsibilities and accountability assigned to a position; scope/impact; and qualifications needed to perform the work. The general allocation decision guidelines used were:

- Administrative Specialist (6005) – Positions were allocated to this classification when work assignments involved a variety of highly responsible complex administrative, discreet secretarial, and program duties to support a County department or division director/executive manager. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to completion of the twelfth grade and three years of responsible administrative, secretarial and/or office management experience. An Associate’s degree in office management, business, communications or related discipline is desirable.
- Contracts Specialist (6015) – Positions were allocated to this classification when responsibilities focus on procurement, contract development and

tracking rather than program development and management. Work assignments involve contract management coordination between various operating programs to ensure the proper processing, procurement and tracking of contracts for services and supplies; and to ensure contracts meet all requirements for County standards. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to a Bachelor's degree with major coursework in human/social services, business or related field, and two years of increasingly responsible social service or business experience dealing with contract administration.

- Data Analyst (6073) -- Positions were allocated to this classification when assignments were to create, manage and oversee stand-alone systems developed from various data systems and sources. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to a Bachelor's degree with major coursework in math, computer science, business, or a related field, and two years of work experience in statistics, operational analysis or a related field where performing analysis, statistical evaluation or database design, maintenance, administration, and reporting were required.
- Finance Specialist 1 (6029) – Positions were allocated to this classification when work assignments were responsible for performing standard accounting and fiscal management functions that require formal training or knowledge of accounting. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to an Associate's degree in accounting or finance, and two years of progressively responsible technical accounting support experience.
- Fleet and Support Services Specialist (6184) – This unique classification is responsible for day-to-day oversight of County motor pool services including the circulating motor pool, the fuel program, assigned parking lots, and coordination of vehicle maintenance and repair. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to three years of increasingly responsible administrative support experience in a fleet and/or support services organization.
- Office Assistant 2 (6001) -- Positions were allocated to this job class when work assignments were responsible for moderately complex general administrative and secretarial/clerical support functions. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to completion of the twelfth grade and two years of general clerical experience, including experience working with clients and /or the public. One additional year of specialized clerical or business/vocational related training is highly desirable.
- Program Coordinator (6022) – Positions were allocated to this job class when work assignments were responsible to accomplish program work primarily through others (i.e., assigned staff, volunteers, gang task force, mentors, learning lab staff, etc.). Work is not usually accomplished through commissions or loosely-formed policy bodies. Programs are established/ongoing and provide a tangible externally focused outcome or service, major work functions do not result primarily in a producing a policy, strategic plan or initiative, and incumbents often have responsibility for a program budget. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to a Bachelor's degree with major coursework in public administration, social work or a related field, and two years of responsible program coordination, and/or outreach experience.
- Program Specialist (6021) – Positions were allocated to this job class when viewed as Subject Matter Experts (SME), implementers, and people who help drive initiatives, as opposed to being viewed as the Person in Charge (PIC); Specialists are much stronger on policy and program analysis/evaluation and contract compliance, and their job emphasis is on facilitation and implementation versus coordinating the work of others.

Minimum qualifications are equivalent to a Bachelor's degree with major coursework in social work, sociology, public health, English, journalism, business administration or public administration or a related field, and two years of responsible program planning, development, research assistance or evaluation experience.

- Program Specialist Senior (6088) – Positions were allocated to this classification when work assignments provide leadership for internal and/or external programs that are significant, extremely complex in nature, and require astute, often sensitive/delicate execution of interdivisional and interagency agreements, contracts and/or grants. Incumbents are highly skilled collaborators often working with other non-County leaders who are also experts in their fields in order to meet complex goals and develop new programs and/or strategies. The scope and impact of recommendations, decisions and commitments typically have significant impact on other activities or programs in the County and/or other jurisdictions. Incumbents are considered technically authoritative/knowledge leaders within their program area and are distinguished from other classes within the series by the level of responsibility assumed, self-initiated work, leadership role, and are seen as the primary “drivers” of assigned grants/contracts. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to a Bachelor's degree with major coursework in public administration, business, statistics/math or a related field, and five (5) years of increasingly responsible and major program development, policy analysis, or program compliance/monitoring and evaluation experience.
- Program Technician (6020) – Positions were allocated to this classification when responsibilities were to provide technical administrative program assistance in the research, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programs, projects, contracts or grants. Work assignments are performed within established program policies and procedures and typically include conducting on-site reviews of subcontracted services, and assisting program staff in monitoring/evaluating programs/contracts, designing/implementing programs, ensuring compliance with regulations/statutes/contract terms, preparing program budgets etc. Minimum qualifications are equivalent to completion of the twelfth grade and three years of specialized, increasingly responsible clerical/administrative experience in the area of assignment. Additional coursework in social services, social science, business or public administration, statistics, computer science, or related field is desirable.

Following Class Comp's standard practice, copies of the study and allocation notices were sent to employees and Department HR staff explaining the effective dates, implications of any reclassification action, and the employees' appeal rights. Of 169 positions studied, 3.5% changed to job classes with higher pay grades; 3.5% of positions were allocated to classifications with lower pay grades; and 93%, the vast majority, remained unchanged with regards to pay grade.

LGPI and Class Comp would like to thank the management panel for their many hours of contributing thoughtful, sometimes difficult input and for their system-wide approach. The team also thanks the managers and affected employees of the study for their professionalism, and whose vast array of skills, program services and dedication to their clients are simply amazing. Lastly, the Department HR teams are acknowledged for their continuing valuable assistance often with difficult and/or tedious details that make a study successful, as well as their input and support throughout this process. The amount of assistance, time, and expertise were invaluable as the team worked through this study!

Given the updates to the job classes, these classifications should serve the County, its employees, managers and clients well for a number of years. Again, this large study was accomplished with the significant assistance and effort of many people -- LGPI and Class Comp sincerely express our thanks to all who were involved.

Position descriptions and copies of interview notes and all allocation notices are on file in Central HR and available upon request.