



County of Sonoma Agenda Item Summary Report

Clerk of the Board
575 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Agenda Item Number: 49
(This Section for use by Clerk of the Board Only.)

To: Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County, the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Water Agency, the Board of Commissioners of the Community Development Commission, the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, the Board of Directors of the Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District

Board Agenda Date: June 4, 2013

Vote Requirement: Majority

Department or Agency Name(s): County Administrator and Human Resources

Staff Name and Phone Number:

Christina Cramer, 707-565-2988
Chris Thomas, 707-565-3781

Supervisory District(s):

All

Title: Workforce Structure Review

Recommended Actions:

Receive report on workforce structure and approve recommended actions.

Executive Summary:

In recent years, unions have communicated concerns that the County of Sonoma has too many managers and has advocated that fiscal challenges can be mitigated by reducing the number of management positions. In response to this, the County Administrator's Office and Human Resources Department undertook a review of the County's workforce structure to provide information that would inform this perspective. The ultimate goal of the review was to inform the County of any possible actions that would improve service delivery, ensure a high performing organization and support strategic planning objectives. The review was conducted based on the actual workforce as of January 30, 2013. The full report, analysis and data are included in Attachment A and Exhibits A-G.

How the County conducts its day-to-day work and delivers services has significantly evolved in the last decade, which has led to a changed workforce. Business automation, software systems and programs and document management systems have significantly altered staffing needs. Work that was formerly conducted manually was labor intensive and required more support and technical staff, the majority of which has now been automated. Compelling opportunities to use community based programs to maintain critical services have presented themselves.

Staff researched similar efforts in other public agencies in which workforce structure was analyzed, and reviewed management literature. Efforts in other public agencies are based on the concept of span of control. In reviewing management literature, span of control and management layers, or the hierarchy, are identified as the critical benchmarks to achieve organizational effectiveness. This information suggests that analyzing the workforce based on percentages or ratio of management positions is not as meaningful as span of control. Therefore, this review goes beyond looking solely at management allocated full-time equivalents (FTE) to non-management FTE, or what has been referred to as "management to line". Span of control is the number of employees directly

reporting to a manager or supervisor. Union representation is not considered. Management layers are the number of people through which a line staff employee must report in order to reach the department head.

Research strongly indicated there is no “one size fits all” approach to these two concepts, and does not suggest any specific ratios or percentages. The common theme found in this research is numerous factors must be considered to achieve optimal staffing models.

How a position is designated as a management position impacts the makeup of the County’s workforce. Each job classification must be assigned to a bargaining unit pursuant to the County’s Employee Relations Policy. The County’s Employee Relations Policy defines management very broadly. Over 200 classifications are designated as management.

Some findings in the review are as follows:

- Management allocations have been in the 15-16% of total allocation for the last seven years; currently the percentage of management allocations is 15%, which is a ratio of 1:5.7
- The number of “management” as compared to “line” positions has followed a similar trajectory over the last several years
- By adjusting the number of management employees extracting out certain job classifications such as analysts and Deputy County Counsel, the workforce is comprised of 10% managers or a ratio of 1:9
- 230 management positions were surveyed and demonstrated they have multiple “management” level responsibilities and approximately 80% perform regular, day-to-day internal or external services
- The County’s aggregate span of control is 1:5.7 – 3,765 employees are direct reports to 666 employees. (Employees may be counted more than once in this evaluation because they may be employees in one reporting relationship and a supervisor in another relationship.)
- Generally, larger departments have 2-6 management layers, mid-sized departments have 2-4 management layers, and smaller departments have 2-3 management layers

The results of this review and research has confirmed that there is no “one size fits all” approach to management staffing percentages, span of control or organizational structure, and numerous factors must be taken into consideration when optimizing staffing models. The proportion of management employees has been consistent over the years, and management layers are proportionate to department size. There are many success stories with the County’s current workforce and staffing models.

There is no compelling data that suggests immediate or aggressive actions to change management percentages or span of control is necessary. There are some areas which should be further evaluated. Given the wide array of organizational structures and services in County departments, the data found from this analysis should be recognized as a starting point, or benchmark, for learning and determining where opportunities exist in which widening (or narrowing) span of control will result in service and performance improvement.

The following are recommended next steps to maximize responsibility and accountability to this effort:

1. Ensure all actions result in improved and/or positive impacts on service delivery, lead to a professionally managed organization and support the goals of the County Strategic Plan and its strategic organizational vision. Performance indicators that are identified and tracked pursuant to the strategic plan should provide the mechanism for measurement.
2. Consistent with number one above, staff recommends using the day-to-day opportunities to analyze positions as they arise such as:
 - a. when filling vacancies, evaluate the position;
 - b. when requesting new positions (management and supervisory), continue the requirement for

- business case justification and classification review;
 - c. when planning reorganizations; and
 - d. when studying positions during formal classification studies.
3. Direct departments to analyze span of control when creating or filling positions with the goal of achieving optimal service delivery and keeping in mind strategic objectives
 - a. HR, CAO, and Departments evaluate and provide guidance on optimal span of control
 - b. Include as a measurement for department head evaluations effective use of organizational structure and span of control concepts.
 4. Direct Human Resources to evaluate the Employee Relations Policy, definitions and bargaining unit designations for management classifications and pursue actions where needed to delineate bargaining units.
 5. Direct staff to meet with unions to explore potential and appropriate collaborative opportunities related to span of control.
 6. Continue the practice of management reviews of departments and include organizational structure and span of control in the analysis.
 7. Direct staff to develop an organizational leadership philosophy that demonstrates the commitment to being a high performing organization that values all employees.

Prior Board Actions:

None.

Strategic Plan Alignment Goal 3: Invest in the Future

Fiscal Summary - FY 12-13

Expenditures		Funding Source(s)	
Budgeted Amount	\$		\$
Add Appropriations Req'd.	\$	State/Federal	\$
	\$	Fees/Other	\$
	\$	Use of Fund Balance	\$
	\$	Contingencies	\$
	\$		\$
Total Expenditure	\$	Total Sources	\$

Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

There are no fiscal impacts.

Staffing Impacts			
Position Title (Payroll Classification)	Monthly Salary Range (A – I Step)	Additions (Number)	Deletions (Number)
Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):			
There are no staffing impacts.			
Attachments:			
Attachment A - Workforce Review Report with Exhibits A-G			
Related Items "On File" with the Clerk of the Board:			
Departmental Organization Charts; Departmental Management Review Charts (5)			

County of Sonoma

Workforce Structure Review

June 4, 2013

Opportunity. Diversity. Service.



COUNTY OF SONOMA

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A review was conducted based on the actual workforce as of January 30, 2013. Major objectives of this review included: better understanding the workforce and organizational structure, understanding “lessons learned” from other agency reviews and legislation; and researching prevalent management principles related to organizational structure. The ultimate goal of the review was to inform the County of any possible actions that would improve service delivery, ensure a high performing organization and support strategic planning objectives.

How the County conducts its day-to-day work and delivers services has significantly evolved in the last decade, which has led to a changed workforce. Business automation, software systems and programs and document management systems have significantly altered staffing needs. Work that was formerly conducted manually was labor intensive and required more support and technical staff, the majority of which has now been automated. Compelling opportunities to use community based programs to maintain critical services have presented themselves.

Staff researched similar efforts in other public agencies in which workforce structure was analyzed, and reviewed management literature. Efforts in other public agencies are based on the concept of span of control. In reviewing management literature, span of control and management layers, or the hierarchy, are identified as the critical benchmarks to achieve organizational effectiveness. This information suggests that analyzing the workforce based on percentages or ratio of management positions is not as meaningful as span of control. Therefore, this review goes beyond looking solely at management allocated full-time equivalents (FTE) to non-management FTE, or what has been referred to as “management to line”. Span of control is the number of employees directly reporting to a manager or supervisor. Union representation is not considered. Management layers are the number of people through which a line staff employee must report in order to reach the department head.

Research strongly indicated there is no “one size fits all” approach to these two concepts, and does not suggest any specific ratios or percentages. The common theme found in this research is numerous factors must be considered to achieve optimal staffing models.

How a position is designated as a management position impacts the makeup of the County’s workforce. Each job classification must be assigned to a bargaining unit pursuant to the County’s Employee Relations Policy. The County’s Employee Relations Policy defines management very broadly. Over 200 classifications are designated as management.

Some findings in the review are as follows:

- Management allocations have been in the 15-16% of total allocation for the last seven years; currently the percentage of management allocations is 15%, which is a ratio of 1:5.7
- The number of “management” as compared to “line” positions has followed a similar trajectory over the last several years
- By adjusting the number of management employees extracting out certain job classifications such as analysts and Deputy County Counsel, the workforce is comprised of 10% managers or a ratio of 1:9

- 230 management positions were surveyed and demonstrated they have multiple “management” level responsibilities and approximately 80% perform regular, day-to-day internal or external services
- The County’s aggregate span of control is 1:5.7 – 3,765 employees are direct reports to 666 employees. (Employees may be counted more than once in this evaluation because they may be employees in one reporting relationship and a supervisor in another relationship.)
- Generally, larger departments have 2-6 management layers, mid-sized departments have 2-4 management layers, and smaller departments have 2-3 management layers

The results of this review and research has confirmed that there is no “one size fits all” approach to management staffing percentages, span of control or organizational structure, and numerous factors must be taken into consideration when optimizing staffing models. The proportion of management employees has been consistent over the years, and management layers are proportionate to department size. There are many success stories with the County’s current workforce and staffing models.

There is no compelling data that suggests immediate or aggressive actions to change management percentages or span of control is necessary. There are some areas which should be further evaluated. Given the wide array of organizational structures and services in County departments, the data found from this analysis should be recognized as a starting point, or benchmark, for learning and determining where opportunities exist in which widening (or narrowing) span of control will result in service and performance improvement.

The following are recommended next steps to maximize responsibility and accountability to this effort:

1. Ensure all actions result in improved and/or positive impacts on service delivery, lead to a professionally managed organization and support the goals of the County Strategic Plan and its strategic organizational vision. Performance indicators that are identified and tracked pursuant to the strategic plan should provide the mechanism for measurement.
2. Consistent with number one above, staff recommends using the day-to-day opportunities to analyze positions as they arise such as:
 - a. when filling vacancies, evaluate the position;
 - b. when requesting new positions (management and supervisory), continue the requirement for business case justification and classification review;
 - c. when planning reorganizations; and
 - d. when studying positions during formal classification studies.
3. Direct departments to analyze span of control when creating or filling positions with the goal of achieving optimal service delivery and keeping in mind strategic objectives
 - a. HR, CAO, and Departments evaluate and provide guidance on optimal span of control
 - b. Include as a measurement for department head evaluations effective use of organizational structure and span of control concepts.
4. Direct Human Resources to evaluate the Employee Relations Policy, definitions and bargaining unit designations for management classifications and pursue actions where needed to delineate bargaining units.
5. Direct staff to meet with unions to explore potential and appropriate collaborative opportunities related to span of control.
6. Continue the practice of management reviews of departments and include organizational structure and span of control in the analysis.

7. Direct staff to develop an organizational leadership philosophy that demonstrates the commitment to being a high performing organization that values all employees.

BACKGROUND

Service Employees International Union, Local 1021 (SEIU) has communicated concerns that the County of Sonoma has too many managers and has advocated that long-term fiscal challenges can be mitigated by reducing the number of management positions. In response to this, the County Administrator's Office and Human Resources Department undertook a review of the County's workforce structure to provide information that would inform this perspective.

Some public agencies have conducted similar studies or passed legislation related to management positions. Span of control management principles were studied, several government reviews/audits were reviewed in which span of control was the topic, and span of control legislation from several states was reviewed. The Employee Relations Policy and the Fair Labor Standards Act were reviewed for required definitions and designation of positions/job classifications as management and/or overtime exempt. To conduct this study, a series of objectives were identified, research was conducted and data was gathered and analyzed. Findings have been made and recommendations developed. The definitions used in this review and that guide the understanding of important terms are included in Exhibit A.

The review was designed to answer the following questions:

- What is the current management to non-management position ratio, within each department and as an aggregate?
- What is the current span of control, within each department and as an aggregate?
- How many management layers does the County have within each department?
- What factors should be considered in looking at organizational structure?
- Are there areas where the number of management positions and/or span of control may be further evaluated and improved?
- Should the County take any specific actions to adjust organizational structure?

Previous Monitoring of Management to Non Management Position Ratios

Staff has looked at management to non-management percentages and ratio over the last two years and has presented the data in the annual budget process. The data from FY 05/06 through FY 12/13, shows that management percentages and ratios have been consistently between 15-16% (rounded) and the average ratio over this period is 1:5.4. Exhibit B shows the position allocation history.

A soft hiring freeze has been in place since 2010 in which departments have had to submit exemption requests to fill management vacancies to the County Administrator's Office; the exemption approval process is still in place for management positions. New/additional position requests have been and continue to be reviewed by Human Resources for appropriate classification designation, and the County Administrator's Office also reviews and approves requests for new positions.

How Are Management Positions Designated?

Several factors are taken into account when a job classification is designated as management or non-management. Generally, classes are designated to bargaining units in which there is a “community of interest”. This is the County’s Employee Relations Policy general guidance, and this policy also defines management, supervisory and professional employees. Management is broadly defined and essentially includes any job class that is exempt from overtime per the Fair Labor Standards Act. (See Exhibit A for definitions.)

Management classifications at the County of Sonoma are in the Salary Resolution and Sonoma County Law Enforcement Management Associations and Deputy Sheriff Management Association. The management designated classifications in the Salary Resolution are in Bargaining Unit 52 (Department Heads) and all other management designated classifications are in Bargaining Unit 50. Bargaining Unit 50 has a wide variety of job classifications without distinction from one another. For example, there are professionals such as staff attorneys in the County Counsel’s Office, management classifications that are intended to manage units or functional areas and associated staff, and administrative management and analyst classes. Within this latter “group” of classes, their primary responsibilities are to perform professional level staff work related to budget, finance, data analyses, human resources, risk, general administration, planning, and/or coordinating programs and services. This latter group of management classifications’ primary purpose is not supervising staff, if at all.

A related practice in the County has been departmental management reviews in which department operations have been reviewed by outside consultants. For example, in the last few years, Information Services, Regional Parks and Public Defender have been reviewed. To some extent, these reviews have included a review of staffing.

LOOKING EXTERNALLY: DATA FROM OTHER AGENCIES

Staff researched relevant and related legislation, studies and efforts. Consolidation, process reengineering, optimizing technology and organizational reviews have been a concerted effort in government agencies primarily beginning in the early 1990s, particularly after the Clinton administration released its National Performance Review. The need to find ways to reduce budget has resulted in several government agencies conducting span of control reviews and a few states passing legislation mandating specific span of control ratios. Some of these efforts have been influenced from union activity.

The prevalent approach in these efforts is a span of control analysis. Oregon and Texas have a legislated 1:11 span of control ratio. Their definitions of span of control are consistent with the definitions listed in Exhibit C. In Oregon and Texas, there was a phased process in which they were required to achieve the required ratio, and each state has some exemption processes and exempted departments.

What is Span of Control?

Span of control is defined as the number of subordinates reporting directly to one manager or supervisor. For example, a supervisor who has seven direct reports would have a ratio of 1:7, and a department that has five total managers/supervisors and 25 total non-managers/supervisors reporting to the five would have a ratio of 1:5. Span of control is a tool used to determine how relationships and

direct reporting structures are established. Span of control is important because it directly affects supervision and control, efficiency, communication channels, workload balance, performance, morale and labor costs. The organizational structure should be a means to a high performing organization and should support the organization’s objectives and services. Span of control is referred to as being “narrow” or “wide”. A narrow span of control indicates that one manager/supervisor directly supervises few subordinates and inversely for a wide span of control.

The literature does not identify a single ratio that is the ideal or recommended ratio for optimal span of control. Rather, research indicates the appropriate ratio depends on a variety of factors, and organizations are charged with taking these factors into consideration when evaluating and determining appropriate organizational structures depending on services, products, business models, business processes, technology, etc. Organizations with narrow spans and many management layers can suffer from poor communication and slow decision making; spans that are too wide also create problems such as inconsistent employee performance, inadequate supervision, and slow decision making/responsiveness by leadership due to having too broad of a scope of responsibility.

The following, and similar illustrations, was commonly found in literature:

←	Narrow Spans	Wide Spans	→
Complex	Nature of the Work		Not Complex
Different	Similarity of activities performed		Similar
Not Clear	Clarity of organizational objectives		Clear
Fuzzy	Degree of task certainty		Definite Rules
High	Degree of risk in the work for the organization		Low
High	Degree of public scrutiny		Low
Weak	Supervisor’s qualifications and experience		Strong
Heavy	Burden of non-supervisory duties		Light
High	Degree of coordination required		Low
None	Availability of staff assistance		Abundant
Weak	Qualifications and experience of subordinates		Strong
Dispersed	Geographic location of subordinates		Together
←	More Supervisors	Fewer Supervisors	→

Management layers are also components of organizational structure. Overly hierarchical organizations create challenges with communication, decision making and flexibility.

San Mateo County’s Study

Closer to Sonoma County, San Mateo used a consultant to conduct a study of their management percentages and span of control in 2010-2011. San Mateo’s consultant stated collecting comparative data was significantly complicated and difficult to validate for a variety of reasons. These reasons include differences in services, organizational structure, and how respective agencies define “management”. Ultimately, it appears San Mateo developed management staffing and span of control

guidelines to ensure a thoughtful process to allocating management and supervisory positions to control their span of control.

The comparative data that San Mateo published in 2010 is as follows:

County	Percentage of Management
Alameda	26%
Contra Costa	15%
Marin	22%
Santa Clara	11%
San Mateo	9%

County	Staff : Supervisor Ratio ¹ (Span of Control)
Alameda	9.1:1
Contra Costa	8.8:1
Marin	7.4:1
Santa Clara	9.6:1
San Mateo	5.7:1

Contra Costa, Santa Clara and San Mateo have medical centers/hospitals which significantly changes their workforces as compared to Counties that don't have hospitals. The County's without a hospital have a higher percentage of management positions.

What Can be Gleaned from Mandated Span of Control Ratios

In speaking with a high level human resources manager from Oregon, the individual commented that their ratio was arbitrary and a thoughtful and analytical method of determining the ratio was not conducted. This individual stated attempts have been made to amend the Oregon legislation to deal with the lessons learned in administering the legislation, and taking too big of a "bite at the apple" with the initial legislation.

In speaking with the Texas Auditor's Office, manager of the state's classification division, the legislation has not led to any aggressive initiatives. The Auditor's Office creates an annual full-time equivalent report in which the span of control ratios is a component of the report; however, they only report on the state's average and do not detail state department ratios. Overall, the state is meeting the mandated ratios, and they are not actively requiring departments that are not meeting the ratio to take any action. The manager was not aware of the rationale behind the ratio.

In speaking with these managers and in other research, it appears neither Texas nor Oregon had any benchmark performance metrics to compare organizational effectiveness and service quality prior to, or post implementation of the legislation. The Oregon manager stated employee morale, particularly the managers and supervisors, has been significantly negatively impacted by the legislation and the processes and methods that were followed to meet the ratio requirements. In Oregon, positions have either been eliminated or manager/supervisors have been reclassified and the supervisory responsibilities eliminated and distributed amongst the remaining supervisors, thus increasing the workload of the remaining supervisors/managers.

Iowa also has span of control legislation that has been amended since initially adopted. It appears that in 2011, the ratios were not achieved across all state agencies and the overall ratio was 1:10. In 2011, a bill was introduced to attempt to repeal the legislature suggesting amendments were desired due to challenges with the initial legislation.

¹ A supervisor may reside in a management or non-management classification

It is important to note that in those states that passed legislation, supervisors are not represented by unions. In California, under the Meyers Milias Brown Act, supervisors can be represented.

It's critical to note that in all of the comparative efforts, there is no qualitative and performance measurement data studied or published that correlates higher/lower percentage of management or narrow/wide span of control with performance-based measures, neither before, during, nor after any review or legislation. Also, staff could not find any data that indentifies the fiscal saving from these efforts.

Exhibit C is a matrix of comparative efforts.

LOOKING INTERNALLY: COUNTY OF SONOMA DATA

Methodology

The review is an evaluation of position data and organizational structure to inform the organization and facilitate organizational and workforce decision-making; it was not the intent of this review to conduct a historical review of changes in the organization's positions. In this analysis, Human Resources assessed the organization's ratio of management to non-management positions, the organization's span of control and management layers. The scope of the review includes all County departments and the Fairgrounds, Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA), Sonoma County Agriculture and Preservation Open Space District (SCAPOS), Sonoma County Retirement Association (SCERA) and Sonoma County Community Development Commission (SCCDC).

Information on allocated positions and actual employees was collected from the Human Resources Management System (HRMS) and by working with department staff, particularly to ensure accurate reporting relationships. The data excludes extra-help employees and temporary service employees and includes vacant, regular positions. Because position information is very fluid, data used and cited reflects the organization as of January 30, 2013.

Specific data was collected and analyzed:

- Position allocations
- Actual number of employees (as opposed to position allocations)
- Direct reporting relationships
- Types of duties being performed by a sample group of management positions
- Departmental Organization (to determine management layers)²

Exhibit D, Report of Management Employees to Non Management Employee Ratios, and Exhibit E, Span of Control Report, contain the collected data and analysis.

Data from Comparative Agencies Was Not Collected

² Departmental organization charts are not standardized, may show extra-help, etc., and positions may not reconcile with HRMS position data; organizational charts were used to determine management layers.

Reviewing comparable agency data with Sonoma's data was not an objective of the review because of the inherent challenge with finding truly comparable data. Many factors make this a significant challenge: other agencies are organized differently; services provided often differ and are not always in the "match" department of another agency; the use of automation/technology can result in significantly different staffing models; agencies may define management or supervisory positions differently; and finally, many agencies do not have this data readily available and in an "apples to apples" reporting format.

Management to Non Management Employee Data

In the past two budget cycles, the County has reported on the number of management allocations to non-management allocations. Looking at the data in this perspective, management allocations currently equate to 14.9% and a ratio of 1:5.7. However, allocations do not accurately portray the workforce, the number of employees does. The HRMS provides the ability to look at the number of employees. The County has 3822 *employees*, of which 557 are in a management designated classification and bargaining unit. These bargaining units consist of Department Heads (52), Administrative Management (50), and DSLEM and SCLEMA. These 557 employees equate to 14.6% of the total employees and in comparing these management employees to non management employees, the ratio is 1:5.9.

Three hundred seventy five management positions have direct reports and supervise a total of 1,944 employees. This demonstrates that 67% of the management employees are performing management defined responsibilities as well as managing and supervising employees. The ratio of managers who supervise as compared to the direct number of employees supervised is 1:5.2.

Adjusted Management Data:

Consistent with past reporting on management allocations, management positions have been shown with an adjusted number. For this review, more analysis has been conducted to determine which classes to consider when developing this adjusted number. Specifically, the classifications excluded from management in the adjusted number are: Department Analyst, Program Planning and Evaluation Analyst, Accountant III, Accountant/Auditor, Retirement Investment Analyst, Risk Management Analyst, Human Resources Analyst, Administrative Analyst, Major Project Architect, Patient Care Analyst, Deputy County Counsel. These job classifications are by definition FLSA administrative and professional exempt. These classifications' primary duties include providing high/professional level direct services that require significant experience, significant analysis and independent judgment on complex matters, and must work autonomously and regularly have a high level of decision making with limited supervision. Additionally, these classifications are not distinguished or defined as classes in which managing work units/divisions is a primary responsibility, although some may lead and supervise staff and/or oversee programs.

This adjusted number of management employees is 381 and 3441 non-management. These 381 employees equate to 10% of the total number of positions and the adjusted ratio of management to non-management position is 1:9.

Common Organizational Principles: Management Layers and Span of Control

Research suggested that the most pertinent analysis of organizational structure and workforce is span-of-control and management layers.

Management layers were counted and are reported for each department in Exhibit F. Departmental organizational charts are on file with the Clerk of the Board. The number of management layers in the departments ranges from 2-6 layers. Human Services, the Sheriff's Office, Health Services and Transportation and Public Works have some instances of six layers. These four offices are considered large departments. The majority of the departments have four or less management layers.

In order to evaluate the span of control numbers, all supervisory positions are analyzed *regardless* of their represented status or if they are in a management bargaining unit against the number of direct reports. The analysis found that there are a total of 666 employees that supervise. There are 3,765 employees reporting to the 666. *Note:* there are more employees reporting to the supervising positions than there are total employees because positions may be counted more than once in the analyses. For example, a supervisor may be a direct report and is also a supervisor. Comparing the total number of supervisory positions to their direct reports, the aggregate span of control ratio is 1:5.7. Similar to the analyses of the lower percentage of management positions, those departments with a narrow, focused scope of services have a wider span of control than the aggregate. The data also demonstrates that employees who have direct reports, but are not in a management job class have a ratio of 1:6.6.

What do Management Employees Do? A Look at Additional Data from Five Departments

Management positions perform necessary duties and provide services. Management level positions require a significant level of subject matter knowledge and expertise. These positions use independent judgment on matters that are complex and have significance and impact. They work independently with minimal direct and day-to-day supervision. While not an all inclusive list, they are typically expected to perform the following types of duties: ensure policies, laws, programs, etc. are delivered appropriately; resolve and advise on complex issues; analyze complex information, make recommendations, and implement actions; manage projects and/or programs of significance; and lead and supervise employees. These duties include performing direct services, or are indirectly related to the organization's ability to deliver services. Providing services can be in many forms and can be internally or externally focused; it would be a misnomer to only consider positions that have direct contact with the external community as providing direct-services.

Five departments (County Counsel, Child Support Services, Department of Health Services, Human Services and General Services) were asked to complete a more detailed spreadsheet to reflect the general duties that each management position is performing. These departments are a sampling of departments which had either a narrow or wide span of control and one department whose number of management to non-management positions was impacted by the County's broad definition of management and how the positions have been placed in Bargaining Unit 50. From this data, which represents a total of 230 positions in Bargaining Unit 50, we can better understand the role of many management positions:

- The County Counsel’s Office has a very high percentage of positions in Bargaining Unit 50. It’s easy to understand that in the County Counsel’s Office, 97% of their management positions are performing professional legal services for internal customers due to the fact that their attorneys are in BU 50. In reality, six positions, or 20% of their management positions, are responsible for the overall management and administration of their office of 41 positions. Of these six positions, they are working managers and provide direct services by handling the most complex and critical legal matters.
- The Department of Child Support Services has a low percentage of management positions. This can be attributed to the focused scope of services that are supported by automation and relatively clear laws, policies and procedures. In this department of 102 positions, five, or 83% of their management positions are responsible for the overall management and administration of the department. Of their management positions 67% are performing direct services and all of them are responsible for performing complex research and analysis.
- The Department of Health Services has 609 employees in the department of which 94 are management, or 15%. Seventy percent of the management employees have direct reports and 99% have responsibility for administering or managing policies or programs. Eighty-three percent of their management employees are providing direct services.
- Human Services has 756 employees in their department of which 70 are management, or 9%. Like Health Services, 70% of Human Services’ management employees have direct reports and the majority of their positions have responsibility for administering or managing policies or programs and are providing direct services.
- General Services has 118 positions of which 30 are management positions. General Services could be considered a mid-sized department, but they provide a variety of distinct and professionally different services. Over 70% have direct reports and 93% are providing some kind of direct service. The majority of their management positions are performing a wide variety of management level duties; 23% of their positions are performing professional work (per FLSA).
- Of this subset of five departments: 64% have direct reports, 80% regularly administer policies and programs; 70% conduct complex research and analysis; over half have fiscal responsibilities and approximately 80% perform regular, day-to-day services to internal or external “clients”.

Exhibit G is rolled up data from the five selected departments. Detailed spreadsheets are available on file with the Clerk of the Board.

The Story is not all Told in the Math: Additional Departmental Experiences

There are factors to consider when reviewing a department’s number/percentage of management positions or span of control that are not going to be clear when only analyzing positions in a mathematical context.

It’s also important to note that the number of management positions is influenced by a variety of factors. Those departments that have a high number of professional and administrative exempt positions per FLSA have a high number of management employees such as the County Counsel’s Office,

Human Resources and County Administrator's Office. These offices have a high number of professional and analyst classes. Another example is the Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office. This department has a high number of management positions because they have a high number of Accountant/Auditor positions which are designated to BU 50.

Without diminishing the importance and the impact of the services provided, those departments that have a narrow and focused scope of services have fewer management positions such as Department of Child Support and the law enforcement and public legal offices. The largest departments who provide significant front-line public services also have less management positions than the aggregate percentage such as Human Services, Transportation and Public Works and Permit and Resources Management.

Departments that have varied and in many cases, distinctly different types of services, tend to have more management positions due to the difficulty in consolidating distinct services. Distinct services tend to require specific experience and subject matter knowledge. Staffing models also impact the number of supervisors or managers.

Some departments provided perspectives on their work which the math doesn't convey:

Agricultural Commissioner: The department has a significant amount of seasonal work that is done by extra-help staff over a six to nine month season. This staff currently consists of 19 extra-help employees. These employees translate to management and supervisor workload, and widen the span of control when these employees are working. The department has two, distinct major service areas, agriculture and weights and measures, and they must service the entire county; therefore, consolidating these two distinct functions is not a viable operational change. The supervisory positions are "working supervisors", meaning they are responsible for performing some of the total workload in addition to supervisory duties. The department's budget is complex and 55% of its total operating budget is from 19 distinct state and federal grants. Each of these grants requires some level of work plan development, monthly reporting, and funding negotiations, all which are management level duties. Supervisors must ensure the efforts of the line-staff are coordinated in a strategic manner to ensure that all revenue opportunities are fully leverage and that the highest priority of non-funded work is addressed. This leads to an added complexity for supervisors when assigning work.

Fire and Emergency Services: The department uses volunteers and extra-help employees extensively due to the 14 volunteer fire companies, over 300 volunteer firefighters and over 130 other volunteers. Additionally, certain services or workload are cyclical and do not require full-time, ongoing staff. The department employs over 40 extra-help employees to perform these intermittent services.

Information Systems: Information Systems manages a large number of systems, activities, projects, external consultants and a large number of vendors. Traditional management level duties are required for these positions such as analyzing customer needs, project planning and resourcing, cost and budget analysis, etc. Therefore, the department has some management positions that are not intended to be a unit/staff manager, but rather, are intended to focus on managing projects and systems. These positions must be able to flexibly move to new assignments as projects are completed or move into long-term maintenance status and not planning and implementation.

Permit and Resource Management: PRMD provides a variety of services which are distinct and separate in profession such as planning, civil engineering, environmental health, building inspection and code enforcement. They also have a complex operation servicing the public. Operationally, they must have a

manager with the appropriate professional knowledge for each of these distinct functions. These management positions also perform the highest level staff work in addition to supervising and managing day-to-day functions.

Probation: The department's Juvenile Hall is a 24/7 operation with a fluctuating population; operations and coverage has specific legal mandates to adhere to. For cost efficiencies, the work of core staff is supplemented by well trained Extra Help employees to allow the department to meet the needs of the youth they serve. As a result, the department currently has about 90 extra-help employees. These employees translate to management and supervisor workload, and widen the span of control when these employees are working.

Sonoma County Employee Retirement Association (SCERA): SCERA has a unique governing board that reviews and initially approves their organizational structure and recommended positions; the County Board approves their positions as a formality. Ensuring their fiduciary duties are upheld is of the utmost importance and their management positions are critical in this responsibility.

Water Agency: Approximately one third of the Agencies' workforce is staffed by technical and professional extra-help employees. These extra-help resources cover the increased workload with seasonal changes in water and wastewater supply needs, stream maintenance, environmental complaints, implementation of the Biological Opinion and its educational programs. These employees translate to management and supervisor workload, and widen the span of control when these employees are working.

Factors Have Impacted the Organization and Demographics of the County's Workforce

The County's workforce and delivery of services is different than it was a decade ago. Technology and process improvements have resulted in significant efficiencies thereby alleviating the need for clerical support staff to perform work that has been replaced by technology and process improvements. For example, in the Human Resources' Recruitment Division, there is now one Senior Office Assistant who functions as the department's receptionist; in 2000, there were 6.45 and one clerical supervisor. The division began using an applicant processing system in 2003 which automated the majority of the work that had been performed by these positions. However, the higher level and more complex duties being performed by the management/analyst positions remained. The system provided so much efficiency that what little clerical work there was could be absorbed by the paraprofessional positions and the analysts, and the remaining staff could still perform the same and higher volume of workload than they did with many clerical support staff.

Departments have reorganized and consolidated, particularly in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Consolidation provides the opportunity to evaluate and re-organize internal support structures. The consolidation effort has been coupled with the general change in technology resulting in the need for less support positions.

Business models and service delivery has changed, particularly in the Department of Health Services and Human Services. The positions in Health Services have significantly changed in the last 15 years or so due to changes in how their services have been and are delivered to the public. The County no longer has a hospital and Health Services is no longer in the "clinical business" as they once were in the earlier part of the 2000s. The Department has had to be creative and agile in their service delivery and responsibility due to changes in federal and state funding, and they have the option to legally outsource

many services. Due to these pressures, and the conclusion that the services can be maintained and provided to the public in a more cost effective manner if provided by a community provider, many line staff positions have been eliminated. However, management and analyst positions are required in the case of outsourced services in order to oversee, analyze and ensure the quality and services being delivered by the community provider, as well as analyze and recommend service enhancements or changes due to community and environmental factors.

FINDINGS

Other Organizations Efforts and Research on Organizational Concepts

- Span of control and hierarchy are the organizational and management principles that have the most impact on organizational performance. This principle takes into consideration organizational structure and evaluates important components that help determine the appropriate combination of supervision taking into account scope of responsibility and complexity of functions. These principles acknowledge there are risks if span of control is too wide due to insufficient supervision.
- There is no “one size fits all” approach of management percentages, span of control ratios or management layers. Research indicated that the appropriate number of managers or span of control “depends”, and a variety of factors need to be taken into consideration when analyzing these principles.
- In the few cases that have mandated a specific span of control ratio, there is no benchmark data that measures and correlates organizational effectiveness, performance, and improved services before or after the specific ratio was mandated; those organizations that have a mandated span of control ratio have not necessarily become more effective or higher performing organizations.
- There is no data from the review of the other agencies/stated noted above that identifies the fiscal savings achieved by adjusting staffing ratios to rebalance the ratios of staff to supervisor.

Sonoma County’s Data and Practices

- The County’s workforce and delivery of services is different than it was a decade ago, thereby impacting the types of skills and positions needed in the workforces. The County’s work force has adjusted over the years in response to these changes.
- Business models and service delivery has changed and the County is employing service models in some areas that rely on community providers and partners, who can provide services more cost effectively. This change in service model has reduced the need for line positions in some areas.
- The contributions of all employees in the county workforce are valued for the service they deliver. Many Management employees, along with line employees, are part of teams that deliver direct services to the community.

- The management layer data demonstrates that the layers of management are proportionate to the size of the departments and not unreasonably hierarchical. The largest departments have up to 6 layers, the mid-sized departments generally have up to 4 layers, and the smaller departments have up to 3.
- Overall, the percentage of management allocations and ratio has been consistent and does not indicate an unbalanced growth in management positions, employees or management to non-management ratios.
- When looking at the County's percentage of management staff as compared to the data that was collected by San Mateo's consultant, the County's percentage of management is in alignment with the other Counties and is significantly less than those Counties that do not have a hospital like Sonoma.
- As an aggregate, the County of Sonoma's span of control can be considered narrow, particularly when looking at San Mateo's comparative data. As stated above and throughout this report, the optimal span of control depends on a variety of factors. However, this comparable data, although limited and from 2010, suggests the County should consider steps to ensure span of control is considered when filling vacancies, planning reorganizations and establishing new positions. There are 15 departments which have a narrower span of control than the aggregate total.
- Due to the County's Employee Relations Policy broad definition of management, Bargaining Unit 50 has job classes that are intended to manage staff and organizational units/functions combined with job classes that are performing professional and administrative exempt/management level job duties that by FLSA definition are exempt job duties. Consideration should be given to the differences in management positions to the extent that labor relations laws and rules allow to better distinguish those classifications from one another.

In conclusion, this review does not suggest there needs to be an immediate or aggressive approach to changing management positions or span of control ratios. There appears to be some opportunities to improve, or widen span of control ratios through gradual organizational review and careful thought when planning or filling management or supervisory positions.

RECOMMENDATIONS/NEXT STEPS

Given the wide array of organizational structures and services in County departments, the data found from this analysis should be recognized as a starting point, or benchmark, for learning and determining where opportunities exist in which widening (or narrowing) span of control will result in service and performance improvement. The County is committed to achieving high levels of performance and service delivery, and in ensuring the workforce is appropriately structured and skilled to achieve the County's strategic goals. The following are recommended next steps to maximize responsibility and accountability to this effort:

1. All actions must ensure improved and positive impacts on service delivery, lead to a professionally managed organization and support the goals of the County Strategic Plan and its strategic organizational vision. Performance indicators that are identified and tracked pursuant to the strategic plan should provide the mechanism for measurement.
2. Consistent with number one above, staff recommends using the day-to-day opportunities to analyze positions as they arise such as:
 - a. when filling vacancies, evaluate the position;
 - b. when requesting new positions (management and supervisory), continue the requirement for business case justification and classification review;
 - c. when planning reorganizations;
 - d. when studying positions during formal classification studies.
3. Direct departments to analyze span of control when creating or filling positions with the goal of achieving optimal service delivery and keeping in mind strategic objectives
 - a. HR, CAO, and Departments evaluate and provide guidance on optimal span of control
 - b. Include as a measurement for department head evaluations effective use of organizational structure and span of control concepts.
4. Direct Human Resources to evaluate the Employee Relations Policy, definitions and bargaining unit designations for management classifications and pursue actions where needed to delineate bargaining units.
5. Direct staff to meet with unions to explore potential and appropriate collaborative opportunities related to span of control.
6. Continue the practice of management reviews of departments and include organizational structure and span of control in the analysis.
7. Direct staff to develop an organizational leadership philosophy that demonstrates the commitment to being a high performing organization that values all employees.

Exhibits:

Exhibit A - Definitions

Exhibit B - Permanent Position Summary

Exhibit C - Matrix of Comparative Studies

Exhibit D - Management Data

Exhibit E - Span of Control Data

Exhibit F - Management Layers

Exhibit G - Roll-up Analysis of Departmental Management Positions (5 Departments)

On file with the Clerk of the Board:

Departmental Management Responsibility Analysis (5)

Departmental Organization Charts

Definitions

For purposes of understanding the data, the following are the definitions used and reported in this review:

Management to non-management reporting:

Management (Administrative Management): means an employee customarily having responsibility for formulating, administering or managing the implementation of County policies and programs.¹ This includes employees in Salary Resolution Bargaining Units, 52, and 50. Sonoma County Law Enforcement Management Association (SCLEMA/BU 44), and Deputy Sheriff Law Enforcement Management (DSLEM/BU 43).

Non-management: this means all regular positions not in the above bargaining units/associations.

Professional Employee: in relevant part means an employee engaged in work that is: 1) predominantly intellectual and varied in character as opposed to routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work; 2) involving the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance; 3) of such a character that the output produced or the result accomplished can not be standardized in relation to a given period of time; and 4) requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning, as distinguished from a general academic education or from an apprenticeship or from training in the performance of routine mental, manual or physical process. (Some management to non-management data in this report may exclude what would be possible to designate as a professional position and will be noted as such.)²³

Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) Exemptions:

A) Executive Exemption - the employee's primary duty must be managing the enterprise, or managing a customarily recognized department or subdivision of the enterprise, must customarily and regularly direct the work of at least two or more other full-time employees or their equivalent, and the employee must have the authority to hire or fire other employees, or the employee's suggestions and recommendations as to the hiring, firing, advancement, promotion or any other change of status of other employees must be given particular weight;

B) Administrative Exemption - the employee's primary duty must be the performance of office or non-manual work directly related to the management or general business operations of the employer or the employer's customers, and the employee's primary duty includes the exercise of discretion and independent judgment with respect to matters of significance.

C) Professional Exemption - significantly similar to above definition of professional employee.

¹ Per the County Employee Relations Policy

³ Per the County Employee Relations Policy

Management layer: Without including or counting the lowest level of line staff, means the maximum number of people including the department head through which a line staff employee must report in order to reach the department head.

Span of Control: Span of control is defined as the number of subordinates reporting directly to one manager or supervisor. For example, a department that has 5 managers/supervisors and 20 non-managers/supervisors would have a ratio of 1:4. Span of control is a tool used to determine how relationships and direct reporting structures are established. Span of control is important because it directly affects supervision and control, efficiency, communication channels, workload balance, performance, morale and labor costs. The organizational structure should be a means to a high performing organization and should support the organization's objectives and services. Span of control is referred to as being "narrow" or "wide". A narrow span of control indicates that one manager/supervisor directly supervises few subordinates and inversely for a wide span of control.

Span of Control reporting:

Supervisor: means any employees having authority, in the interest of the County to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if, in connection with the foregoing, the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment,³ and management designated positions that also have direct reports and supervisor responsibilities as described in this definition. A supervisor for purposes of span of control may reside in a management or non-management job classification and may or may not be represented.³

Non-supervisor: means all positions not acting as a supervisor as described in the definition of supervisor.

³ Consistent with the prevalent and widely published definition of span of control, and comparative legislation

X	154.5	41	195.5
A	5.75	21.8	27.55
B	10	26.05	36.05
C	19.5	27	46.5
D	88.5	22	110.5
E	80.2	32	112.2
F	90.73	10	100.73
G	55	36	91
H	85	11	96
I	2.5	2	4.5
J	69	12.55	81.55
K	164.02	19.75	183.77
L	553	37	590
M	57.75	51	108.75
N	230.6	17	247.6
O	19	26	45
P	584.6	68	652.6
Q	394.99	71.4	466.39
R	95.5	12	107.5
T	26.75	6	32.75
U	3.75	0	3.75
V	14.4	5	19.4
W	19.52	7	26.52
Y	37	6	43
Grand Total	2861.56	567.55	3429.11

Comparative Span of Control/Organizational Streamlining Initiatives

	Summary	Ratio	Definitions
Oregon, 2011 - present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation intended to reform “span of control” requiring state agencies with 100 or more FTE to manage the ratio of public employees to <u>supervisory</u> employees. (Supervisory employees are not represented.) • Phased approach; exception process. • Departments provide a report to the Joint Committee on Ways and Means. • Must provide report in the budget process that includes: ratio of public employees to supervisory employees; ratio of public employees to managerial employees; and number of positions authorized for managerial employees who do not act in a supervisory capacity and the description of the duties assigned to those positions. 	1:11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Supervisory employee</u>: any individual having authority in the interest of the employer to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances. • <u>Managerial employee</u>: possess authority to carry out management decisions or who represents management’s interest by taking or recommending discretionary actions that control or implement employer policy, and who has discretion in the performance of these management responsibilities beyond the routine discharge of duties; need not act in a supervisory capacity. • <u>Public employee</u>: employee of the public employer excluding elected officials and board appointed commissioners or those serving on boards, or persons who are confidential, supervisory or managerial employees.
Texas, 2006-present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation requiring state agencies with 100 or more FTE to develop procedures to achieving the required supervisor to non supervisor staff ratio. • State agencies may appeal the ratio requirement to the Legislative Budget Board, and some special agencies are exempt from the ratio including the Department of Family and Protective Services and Park’s field based operations. 	1:11	Per State Auditor’s Office FY 2011 FTE report: “span of control” or the number of employees who report to a single manager or supervisor.
San Mateo, 2010-2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of management staffing percentages. • Analysis of supervisor span of control. • Developed a Management Staffing and Span of Control Guideline to have 10% or less management staffing and increase spans of 	Goal of maintaining management staffing at 10% or below total number	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management staffing are non-represented and attorney positions. • Span of control is the ratio of supervisors (managers and non-managers) to non-supervisors (managers and non-managers) in a department or departmental work unit.

Comparative Span of Control/Organizational Streamlining Initiatives

Exhibit C

	control where possible.	of positions	
Iowa, 2009-present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government Reorganization Act targets the aggregate span of control ratio of supervisory employees to other employees shall be 1:15. Allows exceptions due to legally mandated ratios and allows requests for waivers to be heard by a five-person review board. In times of layoff, requires middle management reductions to correspond to the relative number of direct service position layoffs. Annual report filed with the Governor and the General Assembly detailing the effects of the policy on the composition of the workforce, cost savings, efficiencies and outcomes. 	1:15	<p><u>Supervisory employee</u>: means a public employee who is not a member of a collective bargaining unit and who has authority, in the interest of a public employers, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other public employees, to direct such public employees, or to adjust the grievances of such public employees, or to effectively recommend such action.</p>
City of Kansas City, 2002	Performance audit of the City's span of control in which they determined the actual span of control and analyzed where span of control was too high or too low; and evaluated the city's management layers.	No specific ratios goals; median span of control was 1:4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Span of control</u>: how many people a manager or supervisor can control while maintaining productivity and discipline, and the number of employees reporting to a supervisor. <u>Supervisors</u>: employees who write and are the primary signers of their subordinate employees' performance evaluations and are likely responsible for hiring, disciplining, and directing work. <u>Employees</u>: full-time, part-time, seasonal and contract employees as of the date the audit data was developed. <u>Direct reports or subordinates</u>: employees whose performance evaluation is signed by the same supervisor. <u>Management Layer</u>: reporting levels in an organization with the exception of the bottom layer of non-supervisory line workers.
City of Portland, 1994 and 2011	Span of control review and report with recommendations to evaluate organizational structures and seek to streamline where possible.	No specific ratio goals	Span of Control is defined as the number of subordinates reporting directly to one manager or supervisor.
City of Seattle, 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study to evaluate span of control and number of management layers. 	No specific ratio goals; avg. ratio was	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Span of control</u>: Number of staff reporting directly to a supervisor or manager.

Comparative Span of Control/Organizational Streamlining Initiatives

Exhibit C

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations included having departments attempt to consolidate positions where possible; invest in training managers/supervise so they can effectively manage larger teams; evaluate classification, compensation, and layoff policies. 	1:5.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Management layer</u>: the maximum number of people including the CEO through which a line staff employee must report in order to reach the chief executive of an organization.
Federal Government – National Performance Review Initiative, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive order to streamline and downsize the federal government yet minimize reductions in force. • U.S. Office of Personnel Management carried out oversight program to ensure agencies exercised their delegated personnel authorities in accordance with Merit System Principles. • Objectives included decreasing supervisory positions and increasing the supervisory span of control from 1:6.5 to 1:15 over a 5-year period (13% of workforce was supervisory in 1994). 	1:15	Span of control: supervisory positions as compared to nonsupervisory positions.
Flattening Organizations: Practices and Standards , 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Research Bureau, California State Library as requested by California State Senator, Mike Thompson. • Report/White Paper. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flattening the Organization: reducing the layers between chief executives and front-line supervisors by targeting “middle managers”. • Layers of Management: one or more supervisors of the same level or rank in a hierarchy, beginning with first level supervisory staff up to and including the chief executive officer. • Span of Control: the number of employees or subordinates that report directly to a supervisor or manager.

County of Sonoma Management Data

Exhibit D

as of 01/30/13

All Management to Non-management

Counts all positions in BU 52, 50, 44, 43 to all positions not in one of those bargaining units

Adjusted Management to Non-Management

Excludes certain job classes from BU 50**

Department	Total allocated FTE in Dept.*	Allocated Mgmt FTE	# of Non Mgmt FTE	% Mgmt	Ratio of Mgmt Allocations	Total Employees in Dept	Total # of Mgmt	# Non Mgmt	% of Mgmt Employees in Dept	Ratio of Mgmt Employees in Dept	# of Mgmt Employees Excluding Certain Job Classes	Adjusted Non-Mgmt Employees	% of Revised Mgmt Employees in Dept	Ratio of Revised Mgmt Employees in Dept
Agricultural-Commissioners Office	30.23	6.68	23.55	22.10%	3.5 : 1	31	7	24	22.6%	3.4 : 1	6	25	19.4%	4.2 : 1
Auditor-Controller	94	42	52	44.68%	1.2 : 1	94	42	52	44.7%	1.2 : 1	22	72	23.4%	3.3 : 1
Clerk Recorder Assessor	106.73	11	95.73	10.31%	8.7 : 1	107	11	96	10.3%	8.7 : 1	10	97	9.3%	9.7 : 1
Community Development Commission	33	6	27	18.18%	4.5 : 1	33	6	27	18.2%	4.5 : 1	6	27	18.2%	4.5 : 1
County Administrator's Office	20.55	12.8	7.75	62.29%	0.6 : 1	21	13	8	61.9%	0.6 : 1	8	13	38.1%	1.6 : 1
County Counsel	38	28	10	73.68%	0.4 : 1	41	30	11	73.2%	0.4 : 1	7	34	17.1%	4.9 : 1
Department of Child Support Services	101.5	6	95.5	5.91%	15.9 : 1	102	6	96	5.9%	16 : 1	5	97	4.9%	19.4 : 1
Department of Health Services	528.66	92.4	436.26	17.48%	4.7 : 1	609	94	515	15.4%	5.5 : 1	63	546	10.3%	8.7 : 1
District Attorneys Office	111.75	10	101.75	8.95%	10.2 : 1	114	10	104	8.8%	10.4 : 1	9	105	7.9%	11.7 : 1
Economic Development Board	8	3.5	4.5	43.75%	1.3 : 1	9	4	5	44.4%	1.3 : 1	4	5	44.4%	1.3 : 1
Fairgrounds	33.75	7	26.75	20.74%	3.8 : 1	34	7	27	20.6%	3.9 : 1	7	27	20.6%	3.9 : 1
Fire and Emergency Services Department	21.85	7	14.85	32.04%	2.1 : 1	23	7	16	30.4%	2.3 : 1	7	16	30.4%	2.3 : 1
General Services Department	115.1	30	85.1	26.06%	2.8 : 1	118	30	88	25.4%	2.9 : 1	21	97	17.8%	4.6 : 1
Human Resources Department	51	30.5	20.5	59.80%	0.7 : 1	52	31	21	59.6%	0.7 : 1	8	44	15.4%	5.5 : 1
Human Services Department	746.6	69	677.6	9.24%	9.8 : 1	756	70	686	9.3%	9.8 : 1	41	715	5.4%	17.4 : 1
Information Systems Department	106.5	22	84.5	20.66%	3.8 : 1	108	22	86	20.4%	3.9 : 1	19	89	17.6%	4.7 : 1
Permit Resource Management Department	102	11	91	10.78%	8.3 : 1	102	11	91	10.8%	8.3 : 1	9	93	8.8%	10.3 : 1
Probation Department	274.1	19	255.1	6.93%	13.4 : 1	276	19	257	6.9%	13.5 : 1	13	263	4.7%	20.2 : 1
Public Defender's Office	49	4	45	8.16%	11.3 : 1	49	4	45	8.2%	11.3 : 1	4	45	8.2%	11.3 : 1
Regional Parks Department	75	12	63	16.00%	5.3 : 1	76	12	64	15.8%	5.3 : 1	8	68	10.5%	8.5 : 1
Retirement	15	7	8	46.67%	1.1 : 1	15	7	8	46.7%	1.1 : 1	6	9	40.0%	1.5 : 1
Sheriff	626	40	586	6.39%	14.7 : 1	631	40	591	6.3%	14.8 : 1	34	597	5.4%	17.6 : 1
So Co Ag Preserv and Open Space District	24.75	6	18.75	24.24%	3.1 : 1	26	6	20	23.1%	3.3 : 1	6	20	23.1%	3.3 : 1
Transportation and Public Works	186.02	21	165.02	11.29%	7.9 : 1	189	21	168	11.1%	8 : 1	16	173	8.5%	10.8 : 1
UC Cooperative Extension	5.25	1	4.25	19.05%	4.3 : 1	6	1	5	16.7%	5 : 1	0	6	0.0%	0.0
Water Agency	199.5	46	153.5	23.06%	3.3 : 1	200	46	154	23.0%	3.3 : 1	42	158	21.0%	3.8 : 1
Total	3703.84	550.88	3152.96	14.87%	5.7 : 1	3822	557	3265	14.6%	5.9 : 1	381	3441	10.0%	9 : 1

*The total differs from Exhibit B; Exhibit B does not include list Retirement allocations and does include allocations for the Board of Supervisor and their District Directors

**Excludes employees in the following job classes: Department Analyst, Program Planning & Evaluation Analyst, Accountant III, Accountant/Auditor, Retirement Investment Analyst, Risk Management Analyst II, HR Analyst, Administrative Analyst, Major Project Architect, Patient Care Analyst, Deputy County Counsel

County of Sonoma Span of Control Data

Exhibit E

as of 01/30/13

Department	Total Employees in Dept	Management With Direct Reports <small>Counts all positions in BU 52, 50, 44, 43 who have <u>direct</u> reports</small>				Supervisors With Direct Reports <small>Counts all positions excluding BU 52, 50, 44, 43 who have <u>direct</u> reports</small>			Span of Control Data <small>Counts represented and unrepresented who have <u>direct</u> reports</small>		
		Mgrs Who Supervise (BU 52, 50, 43, 44)	# of Staff Supervised by Mgrs	% of Mgmt w/staff	Reporting Ratio for Mgrs Who Supervise	# of Supervisory Positions supervising	# of Staff Reporting to Supervisors	Reporting Ratio Supervisors	# of Supervisory Positions	# of Staff Reporting to Supervisors	Span of Control Ratio
Agricultural-Commissioners Office	31	6	18	85.7%	3 : 1	4	13	3.3:1	10	30	3 : 1
Auditor-Controller	94	25	76	59.5%	0.1	7	13	1.9:1	32	89	2.8 : 1
Clerk Recorder Assessor	107	9	35	81.8%	3.9:1	12	71	5.9:1	21	106	5 : 1
Community Development Commission	33	4	15	66.7%	3.8:1	5	17	3.4:1	9	32	3.6 : 1
County Administrator's Office	21	7	18	53.8%	2.6:1	2	2	1:1	9	20	2.2 : 1
County Counsel	41	6	40	20.0%	6.7:1	0	0	0	6	40	6.7 : 1
Department of Child Support Services	102	5	27	83.3%	5.4:1	10	73	7.3:1	15	101	6.3 : 1
Department of Health Services	609	66	543	70.2%	8.2:1	28	155	5.5:1	94	609	6.5 : 1
District Attorneys Office	114	9	71	90.0%	7.9:1	5	32	6.4:1	14	103	7.4 : 1
Economic Development Board	9	1	8	25.0%	8:1	0	0	0	1	8	8 : 1
Fairgrounds	34	6	31	85.7%	5.2:1	1	2	2:1	7	33	4.7 : 1
Fire and Emergency Services Department	23	6	22	85.7%	3.7:1	0	0	0	6	22	3.7 : 1
General Services Department	118	22	69	73.3%	3.1:1	8	48	6:1	30	116	3.9 : 1
Human Resources Department	52	13	51	41.9%	3.9:1	0	0	0	13	51	3.9 : 1
Human Services Department	756	49	222	70.0%	4.5:1	70	524	7.5:1	119	746	6.3 : 1
Information Systems Department	108	16	100	72.7%	6.3:1	2	9	4.5:1	18	109	6.1 : 1
Permit Resource Management Department	102	9	38	81.8%	4.2:1	8	60	7.5:1	17	98	5.8 : 1
Probation Department	276	16	65	84.2%	4.1:1	25	213	8.5:1	41	273	6.7 : 1
Public Defender's Office	49	4	45	100.0%	11.3:1	2	17	8.5:1	6	48	8 : 1
Regional Parks Department	76	7	39	58.3%	5.6:1	9	37	4.1:1	16	76	4.8 : 1
Retirement	15	5	14	71.4%	2.8:1	0	0	0	5	14	2.8 : 1
Sheriff	631	31	126	77.5%	4.1:1	63	503	8:1	94	629	6.7 : 1
So Co Ag Preserv and Open Space District	26	5	24	83.3%	4.8:1	0	0	0	5	24	4.8 : 1
Transportation and Public Works	189	14	60	66.7%	4.3:1	27	128	4.7:1	41	188	4.6 : 1
UC Cooperative Extension	6	1	4	100.0%	4:1	0	0	0	1	4	4 : 1
Water Agency	200	33	183	71.7%	5.5:1	3	13	4.3:1	36	196	5.4 : 1
Total	3822	375	1944	67.3%	5.2:1	291	1930	6.6:1	666	3765	5.7 : 1

County of Sonoma Department**Management Layers**

Agricultural Commissioner	2 – 4 layers
Auditor/Controller/Treasurer/Tax Collector	2 – 5 layers
CDC	2 – 3 layers
Child Support Services	2 – 4 layers
Clerk-Recorder-Assessor	2 – 4 layers
County Administrator	2 – 4 layers
County Counsel	2 – 3 layers
District Attorney	2 – 5 layers
Economic Development Board	2 layers
Emergency Services	2 - 3 layers
Fairgrounds	2 – 3 layers
General Services	2 – 5 layers
Health Services	2 – 6 layers
Human Resources	2 – 3 layers
Human Services	2 – 6 layers
Information Systems	2 – 4 layers
Open Space	2 layers
PRMD	2 – 4 layers
Probation	3 - 5 layers
Public Defender	2 – 3 layers
Regional Parks	2- 4 layers
Retirement	2 layers
Sheriff	3 – 6 layers
Transportation & Public Works	3 – 6 layers
UC Coop	2 layers
Water Agency	2 – 5 layers

Exhibit G

Roll-up Analysis of Departmental Management Positions

Dept	Mgr Positions	# of Mgmt with Direct reports	# of Employees Reporting to Mgr	% with Direct Reports	Prof/ Tech	% Prof/Tech	General Admin	% General Admin	Research & Analysis	% Research & Analysis	Budget/ Fiscal	% Budget/ Fiscal	Direct Services	% Direct Services	Contract/ Grant Admin	% Contract/ Grant Admin
CoCo	30	6	40	20%	29	97%	6	20%	30	100%	3	10%	29	97%	1	3%
DCSS	6	5	27	83%	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%	2	33%	4	67%	2	33%
DHS	94	66	543	70%	42	45%	93	99%	62	66%	57	61%	78	83%	72	77%
GS	30	22	69	73%	7	23%	28	93%	27	90%	24	80%	28	93%	19	63%
HSD	70	49	222	70%	19	27%	51	73%	39	56%	35	50%	41	59%	34	49%
Total	230	148	901	64%	98	43%	183	80%	164	71%	121	53%	180	78%	128	56%

Definitions:

Professional/Technical: engages in a variety of work predominantly intellectual involving consistent exercise of discretion and judgment; work requires knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning or a hospital. (i.e. Attorneys, Medical Professionals, Professional Architects)

General Administration: customarily formulates, administers and/or manages policies and/or programs with autonomy and using independent judgment.

Research & Analysis: Conducts research of a complex nature that requires judgment and critical thinking; typically related to programs, policies, and/or complex data, which results in written or verbal summary, analysis and recommendations.

Budget/Fiscal Administration: administers/manages the department's budget/revenue, aspects of a department's budget/revenue, or for a specific program or group of programs.

Direct Services: Provides direct services to internal and/or external customers; services are varied, complex and not routine in nature requiring independent judgment and a considerable knowledge of the subject.

Contract/Grant Administration: Coordinates and administers grants/contracts/agreements; ensures compliance and appropriate delivery of services or products, or grant compliance; may conduct and coordinate RFPs; may seek grant funding.