

W. q.a

AGENDA COVER MEMORANDUM

AGENDA DATE:

February, 2006

PRESENTED TO:

Board of County Commissioners

PRESENTED BY:

Greta Utecht, Human Resources Manager

AGENDA TITLE:

IN THE MATTER OF PROVIDING A STATUS REPORT REGARDING THE WORK OF THE VACANCY REVIEW COMMITTEE, AND REQUESTING DIRECTION AS TO ITS

FUTURE SCOPE

I. ISSUE

The Vacancy Review Committee (VRC) has been in place for three years. It was established as a result of work done in conjunction with the County's Strategic Plan implementation, and is one of the management tools approved by the Leadership team in December 2002. After three (3) years of reviewing vacancies, with almost no questions or concerns arising from the review, the committee requests further direction from the Board as to whether the committee should continue.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Background

The VRC first started reviewing positions in December 2002. At the same time, personnel analysts began checking with every department to clarify the status of vacancies listed in the budget as funded positions. Because BRASS (the County's budget projection system) and PeopleSoft (our personnel and payroll tracking system) were not in agreement as to which positions were truly vacant, Human Resources and Information Services staff worked together to create new reports that accurately list the number of current budgeted vacancies in each department. The new reports also track eliminated positions.

In summary, the formation of the VRC was the catalyst for several system improvements, and HR and budget staff now has much more accurate information with which to make sure that budget authority and position management are in alignment.

As of November 2005, Human Resources (HR) had tracked more than 630 vacant positions. Of those, 38 were approved directly by the Board of Commissioners so did not go before the VRC. In order for the committee to make a determination on a vacancy, the department is asked to complete the vacancy review checklist (attached), which asks about the position's funding and status. For the 38 positions not reviewed by the VRC, a checklist was still completed.

The checklist also asks whether the department has engaged in process improvement, streamlining or reorganization analysis prior to deciding to post the vacancy. Of the more than 630 positions reviewed, more than 245 were the result of some form of process improvement or reorganization. In several cases where the manager checked "no" to the question asking whether process improvement had taken place, a comment was added indicating that reorganization or process improvement would be welcome if he or she had more information as to how to go about it.

Over the past 18-24 months, the VRC has reviewed positions electronically in order to avoid a physical meeting each week. This has worked well for the members of the committee, since most of the "in person" meetings were over in less than 20 minutes, while travel time to get to them took longer for many members. However, maintaining the electronic process and tracking the positions has been quite time consuming for HR staff.

B. Analysis

The committee has yet to veto any request, although in several cases the hiring managers were asked to clarify information presented. In two cases, regular positions were changed to temporary status directly as a result of the VRC's .feedback. The major issue the VRC has had is in approving part-time positions, particularly AFSCME positions that that fall below 30 hours. This is because AFSCME regular part-time positions (unlike non-represented, Public Works Local 626 and Public Works Admin-Pro positions) accrue full health insurance benefits. With the other groups listed above, a regular part-time employee receives health benefits for themselves only, not for spouses and dependents. The VRC has consistently questioned the need to establish part-time positions that on a per/hour total compensation basis cost the County more that their full-time counterpart

During the VRC's initial year, 65 positions were either eliminated or had their funding de-authorized. Because of the foresight and planning in the affected departments, to date no employees who were laid off remain out of work. Whenever budget reductions were likely, departments held vacancies and did not request that they be refilled.

Also, because the checklist is so detailed and comprehensive, and because it requires department director approval before submittal to the VRC, positions have gone through a rigorous analysis within the departments before ever getting to the VRC. Managers don't take positions to the VRC until they have reviewed them thoroughly and can justify their posting.

It is because of this rigorous analysis and the fact that the Board has already approved many of the positions coming before the VRC that the committee has not found cause to deny any position. In addition to the factors listed above, a position's funding source has a major influence in the level of scrutiny it receives. If a position is funded by a dedicated revenue source (e.g., road fund, waste fund) that is currently stable and has a stable forecast, the need for vacancy review is mitigated. Finally, given that the Board has gone through a rigorous process to prioritize general fund services as part of the budget process, the question arises as to whether the VRC is needed any longer.

C. Alternatives/Options

- 1. Disband the Vacancy Review Committee;
- 2. Disband the Vacancy Review Committee but continue to require that departments submit the Vacancy Review Checklist to Human Resources before posting a vacancy. HR will continue to track vacancy information and provide annual reports to the board regarding vacancy status.
- 3. Continue the Vacancy Review Committee.

D. Recommendation

Approve Option 2. This will allow HR to continue gathering information while considerably shortening the posting process timeline, and reducing the administrative overhead that attending, staffing and managing the committee review process involves.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION/FOLLOW-UP

Following Board action, members of the VRC will be notified that the committee no longer needs to meet or review vacancies; supervisors and managers will be informed about the amended process.

V. ATTACHMENT

Vacancy Review Checklist

PROCESS FOR REVIEWING POSITION VACANCIES



"When vacancies occur, it is in the best interest of the County and its citizens to review work processes and to determine whether the vacant positions and associated resources can be better utilized."

Adopted Lane County Strategic Plan, A4(c)

Answers to questions should be described or justified fully. For example; if the service delivery will be impacted, please explain how on a separate attachment/sheet.

REQUESTED DATE FOR REVIEW:					
Position Title/Classification: Position #:					
Full Time *Part Time *If Part Time - Number of hours scheduled per week					
How long vacant?					
Dept./Division: Dept Contact & Phone:					
Position vacated due to: Retirement 🔲 Termination 🔲 Resignation 🔲 Other 🔲					
Employee Group Designation: Will someone attend the VRC to discuss? YES NO					
If so, who?NOTE: Meetings are held every Tuesday in the Cheryl McCawley Training Room from 3-4 p.m.					
1. POSITION FUNDING 1a. Is the position in the General Fund?	YES 🗆	NO □			
ra. Is the position in the General Fund:	123 [110			
1b. Is the position funded through the General Fund and other funds? YES ☐ NO ☐					
If yes, please specify:	123 [NO 🗆			
1c. Is the position funded through Grants, Contracts, and/or Enterprise Funds?					
	YES	ΝО □			
If yes, please specify:					
1d. What is the full cost of this position (include benefit and indirect charges)? \$					
2. SERVICE NECESSITY		-			
2a. Is the position key to service being delivered?	YES 🗌	NO 🗌			
If yes, please describe:					
2b. Is the service mandated or core?	YES 🗌	NO 🗌			
If yes, please describe:					
{Step 1. NOTE: Strategic Plan, B3, Funding Priorities - immediate and critical life and health safety needs; 2. Direct response to broad County goals such as personal safety, property safety, infrastructure safety, health safety, basic					
needs, serving youth; 3. Other mandated services with demonstrated cost-effectiveness and broad public support; 4.					
Contributes to the attainment of broad County goals and there an	e sound fiscal reaso	ons to continue}			
2c. Will there be unintended negative impacts if not filled?	YES 🗌	NO 🗆			
If yes, what impacts?					
3. POSITION REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS					
3a. Can the work be done differently or combined with other positions (RPI type analysis)? YES ☐ NO ☐					
If not, why not? If yes, what is the plan? (If y					
3b. Is the service supported by the Strategic Plan's funding priorities (section B3)?					
	YES [ΝО □			
If yes, how?					
3c. How will service delivery be impacted if done differently or re	eorganized?				

3d. Is it reasonable to review consolidation If not, why?	options?	ES 🗌	NO 🗆	
3e. Is this a one of a kind position and/or fu	ınction? Y	ES 🗌	NO 🗌	
4. ORGANIZATIONAL REDESIGN 4a(1). Use of positions funding for a limited	I time?	ES 🗌	NO 🗌	
4b(2). Are technology investments involved If yes, please describe:	1? Y	ES 🗌	NO 🗆	
4c(3). Will there be or are there process in Please provide some description of F			NO 🗆	
5. NATURE OF THE POSITION				
5a. Is it a limited duration position: (1) not technically a temp position? (2) what is the length of funding? (3) what is the funding source (e.g. gra	<u>_</u>		NOT TEMP [
5b. If left vacant for now, could this position provide a place for an employee otherwise likely to be laid off? YES □ NO □				
If no, why not?	•			
5c. Are there likely to be labor relations issues created if this position is held vacant or eliminated? YES ☐ NO ☐				
If yes, what are they likely to be?				
6a. Does this create a "learning" or apprenticeship" position? A career ladder? YES NO NO 6b. Is the classification too broad or narrow or no longer representative of what is needed? YES NO 6c. Do classification specifications accurately reflect tasks and functions (e.g. changes in technology)? YES NO If no, please describe:				
Signature:	Dr D	ate:		
REMINDER: Please email an electronic copy to LC HR Vacancy Review. The signed hard copy should be forwarded to your HR Analyst.				
				
,	DO NOT WRITE IN TH Committee and Human		Use Only	
	Committee and naman			
7. OUTCOME OF REVIEW				
Position Eliminated				
Authorized for Internal PostingAuthorized for External Posting				
Return to Department for Addition	nal Analysis			
☐ Hold for Potential Layoffs	na viala		•	
		n .		
Signature:Chair/Vice-Chair VI	RC	Date:_		