After studying this chapter, you should be able to

- Identify the profound trends and paradoxical tensions affecting traditional classification strategies that may remake position management systems in the 21st century
- Differentiate among the three overarching types of personnel systems that are found—generally in layers—in almost all public sector organizations
- Understand the two fundamentally different uses of position classification and understand how jobs are grouped together in theory and in practice
- Distinguish between the related concepts of job analysis and job evaluation
- Conduct informal job analyses and job evaluations and understand when and how more formal, rigorous methods are used

Position management is generally thought to be a dry science of little interest to anyone but a few specialists in human resource departments. Such a notion is full of irony and paradoxes, if not outright misconceptions. First, position classification is as much an art as a science, because it is actually composed of different systems, each with distinctly different value biases. Furthermore, the biases of each system shift over time. The art, then, is understanding the different values that exist in various systems at specific times. The science is the rational implementation of that set of values. Unfortunately, when system values become too rigid and when classification and compensation issues are treated as laws based on hard science, an unbalanced characterization of position management exists. This tendency was well expressed in a classic essay by Wallace Sayre (1948) titled, “The Triumph of Techniques Over Purpose.”

The second point is related in that the rational order conveyed by classification systems is generally overstated. Most classification systems of large organizations are quite fragmented,
and sometimes they are haphazard because competing stresses such as politics, market forces, merit, social equity, and union influence distort them over time. The classification systems of most small organizations (which make up the vast majority of American governments) are actually piecemeal personnel systems rather than true position management systems.

Third, although formal methods of job analysis and job evaluation are often preached in management texts and elsewhere, they are not always used in practice. Informal methods are as common, and such skills are equally important for employees and managers. Finally, although classification may seem to be a subject of little utility to non-personnelists, it is actually a critical source of knowledge and, by extension, power in agencies. Understanding the central organizing structures is as important as budgeting or management principles (Condrey, 1998).

Although classification systems generally convey a sense of judiciousness, they are probably more accurately viewed as jigsaw puzzles. One should not be put off by this realization, however. Because of their importance to job aspirants, wage earners, status seekers, career strategists, managers, executives, and legislators, one should consider them fascinating cornerstones in the complex organizational universe. Decisions about position management are very important in all professional lives, as well as in the health of organizations. Mastering general knowledge of the tools used in classification is critical.

THREE TYPES OF PERSONNEL STRATEGIES

The American public sector is composed of three fundamental personnel strategies, each of which is represented in a layered fashion in all government personnel systems. Selection is the core principle in each of these strategies, and it equally affects the subsequent classification and management of positions. The three systems are based on either election, appointment, or rules (composed of merit, seniority, and representativeness factors).2 Although discussed in the previous chapter, it is important to review it here in the context of position classification.

Election as a strategy for policy making in personnel selection is the foundation of democratic states. The people choose who will make and execute the laws and, to some degree, interpret them as well. Electoral systems emphasize values, debate, political responsiveness, and generalized (rather than expert) knowledge of government. Elected officials are selected as the leaders of most public sector systems but are required to serve terms and be reelected periodically if they want a career in government. Two types of elected officials are common. The most visible is the full-time official who serves in a major office and whose salary is sufficient to provide a living. The more common type, however, is the “citizen-legislator” who serves part-time and whose salary is modest or inconsequential.3

A second personnel strategy is appointment made by elected officials. Generally, appointed officials serve at the will of those who select them. The most visible appointed officials are those who run agencies as cabinet level secretaries, directors, and commissioners, and their chief deputies. Appointed employees also typically include policy-related advisers and confidential staff. Ideally, elected officials select individuals for full-time paid jobs who they believe are competent or meritorious and who are generally in agreement about their policy positions. Common practice used to allow elected officials to choose appointees in general government service on the spoils principle—either to reward political supporters or to...
indirectly enhance one’s personal situation (such as through the appointment of family members). Gross spoils selection at the career level is rare today, largely because of court action (Hamilton, 1999), although the “thickening” of government (Introduction) with numerous high- and midlevel political appointees should not be overlooked. Some of the most common are those who serve as “citizen-appointees” on innumerable boards and commissions at all levels of government on a part-time basis for little or no remuneration.

The third strategy is rule-based selection, which affects the bulk of those in the public service and is the primary focus of this chapter. This strategy gives precedence to merit and is based on technical qualifications and competitive selection as judged by experts. Removal from office is often only for cause (see Chapter 10). Advanced forms of the merit philosophy in organizations evolved only in the 19th century. Two fundamental merit strategies exist (see Exhibit 5.1 for a comparison of the two strategies). Rank-in-job personnel strategies are very common in the United States but less common elsewhere. Rank and salary are determined by the job that one holds. Substantial salary increases and higher status are attained only through a better job (promotion or reclassification), but multiple promotions within an organization are uncommon beyond the predetermined job series, such as City Planner I, II, and III. Career development is the responsibility of the incumbent, and promotions are normally open competitions, including lateral entry from outside the organization (leading to the term open personnel system). Merit selection has relied heavily on systems with many grades or levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT 5.1 Job Versus Rank Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are two approaches to merit classification: job and rank. Although neither may be found in pure form (one sees approximations in organizations), there are very real differences in emphasis. The nearest approximation of the job/position (or “open”) strategy is the civil service; the best approximation of the rank (or “closed”) strategy is the military officer corps. A number of features distinguish the two types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job (Open) Merit Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on work: “Job makes the person”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry based on technical qualifications only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral entry allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion based on open competition in most cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level maintained as long as performance is satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development is largely the responsibility of the incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to focus on/produce specialists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank-in-person strategies are less common in the United States; they include the military, paramilitary organizations such as public safety departments, the foreign service, academic departments, some health agencies, and the federal Senior Executive Service. (Exhibit 5.2 provides some typical examples of occupational ranks.) Rank-in-person emphasizes the development of incumbents over time, especially within the organization, and tends to lead to closed systems. Closed personnel systems provide few opportunities for lateral entry for those outside the organization. They allow for more position mobility because personnel carry their rank with them no matter what their current assignment. Promotions are prized and are expected over time; these systems typically have a strong up-or-out philosophy so that those who are not promoted eventually may be forced to leave the organization. Ranks may number from as few as 3 to as many as 10 for military officers.

Hybrid or mixed strategies are also possible. In selected cases, public servants are appointed but serve for set terms (such as state public safety directors and university regents) like elected officials. Some judges are appointed for life. Today, there is a renewed interest in linking rule-based (merit) selection with termination processes similar to those in appointment strategies, that is, at-will employment in which property rights to jobs are limited. Although at-will employment is still the exception rather than the rule in the public sector, this chapter will discuss important contemporary examples of the drive to reform the civil service. The conclusion will focus on this and other trends affecting rank-in-position and

---

**EXHIBIT 5.2** Three Examples of Rank-in-Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army Officer Ranks</th>
<th>Fire Department Ranks</th>
<th>University/Faculty Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quasi-officers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company officers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field officers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General or flag officers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-star general (general of the army)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District fire chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant fire chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire marshal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy fire chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked/untenured:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked/untenured:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked/tenured:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor with special status (distinguished, regent’s professor, endowed chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
rank-in-person systems (for an example of this debate, see DeSoto & Castillo, 1995; Somma & Fox, 1997; West & Bowman, 2004).

### THE ORIGINS OF POSITION CLASSIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT

In the first century of public sector employment in the United States, from 1789 to 1883, position classification did not really exist as a rational system. Positions tended to be created and salaried in an ad hoc fashion, largely based on a *patronage system*, social class, and regional representativeness, and only coincidentally by merit. The initial period of public service was relatively elitist and staid, but public service evolved over the 19th century into a tumultuous system. Congress enacted legislation in 1853 establishing four major job classes with salary rates for each of the classes; however, this legislation was frequently ignored, and all levels of government struggled with merit, equity, and consistency considerations (Mosher, 1982; Van Riper, 1958).

The civil service reform movement, which had gained steam by the end of the 19th century, changed the landscape of position classification and management over time, but the importance of reform should not overshadow other influences. At the same time that political influence was being reduced in recruitment, selection, promotion, discipline, and other personnel processes, principles of modern management were more generally introduced. By the early 1900s, Frederick Taylor’s scientific management, whether really scientific or not, had great sway over the development of position classification processes. Taylor promoted the idea that there was generally “one best way” to accomplish work, which could be found by thorough work analysis. This effectively combated the Jacksonian notion that the government work was “so plain and simple that men of intelligence may readily qualify themselves” (quoted in Van Riper, 1958, p. 36).

Work analysis provided the means to select superior methods of performance, to identify those who could perform better, and to provide superior training. Systematic job descriptions became more commonplace, and work relationships became rationalized. Work analysis highlights differences and breaks work into component parts. Because of this, the scientific management movement then started a long-term trend of “pigeonholing” work, breaking it into hundreds and ultimately thousands of different jobs at dozens of different levels. See, for example, the old *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* or *DOT* (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991), which had 12,741 occupations listed.⁶

The Classification Act of 1923, consolidating the new wisdom of scientific management, provided a national model of a rational position management system. It established that (a) positions and not individuals were to be classified, (b) *job duties* and responsibilities were the distinguishing characteristics of jobs, (c) qualifications were to be a critical factor in determining classification status, and (d) a member of a class would be qualified for all other positions in the class. This act enhanced legislative ability to monitor and control positions in terms of overall employee numbers, grade ceilings, and salary ranges. The Classification Act of 1949 created a separate schedule for white- and blue-collar workers, typical of a trend to divide personnel systems into occupational clusters. The proliferation of rank-in-position systems promoted the idea of fitting people to jobs. During this period, managerial efficiency and legislative control were emphasized on one hand, and employee
procedural rights were increasingly enhanced on the other. Jobs tended to become narrower and less flexible.

Equal opportunity substantially changed position management through legislation addressing discrimination based on race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, and disabilities. Particularly important was the passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which addressed gender discrimination in pay. The notion of equal pay for equal work, regardless of personal characteristics of the job incumbent, was taken to its logical legal extension, as was equal opportunity for employment and advancement. Labor unions in the public sector continued to increase in numbers and power throughout this period, although unions in the private sector began to experience a marked decline by the 1980s.

Although both equal opportunity and strong worker representation had obvious benefits, the excesses of the position management systems initiated after the Pendleton Act had also become apparent: classification rigidity, excessive specialization and pigeonholing, weak results-oriented employee accountability, and technical complexity. For example, at the federal level critics complained that promotion from one job classification to another had become positively litigious, the 2,500 different job classifications had become excessive, firing non-performing employees had become a nightmare, and the technical complexity of nearly three dozen pay systems had become byzantine. State and local government systems tended to demonstrate the same symptoms on a smaller scale. By the mid-1990s, equal opportunity began to recede as the dominant concern in personnel systems (Ewoh & Elliott, 1997).

Although the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 provided an important initial attempt at reform, the most recent human resources era really starts in the 1990s with an emphasis on broad employee categories, more procedural flexibility, more rigorous employee accountability, and technical simplification. Examples include broadbanding, reinventing government, simplification initiatives in personnel policies and manuals, and revisions in the civil service system. **Broadbanding** occurs when several grades are combined, creating a wide salary range for a position. Formal promotions are not required for pay movement (as is the case with more traditional—and narrow—classification series), although milestone progress is still required and documented. In some versions, people are ranked in a single classification, such as entry level, journeyman, senior, and specialist, but these designations are determined by the unit rather than by a personnel department or civil service commission. Reinventing government and simplification initiatives in the early 1990s tended to decentralize many personnel functions to the field and concurrently to streamline procedures so that field staff (such as field offices, individual departments, or units) can implement them. Current civil service reform focuses on enhancing employee accountability to meet moderate and/or definable performance standards (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board [U.S. MSPB], 1999). The most dramatic examples of this to date are the termination of the civil service system in Georgia in 1996 (see Exhibit 5.3 for a discussion of this case) and the rise of employment contracts as well as posttenure faculty review processes in state universities (Isfahani, 1998). Although the federal classification has yet to undergo major changes with respect to the 1949 act, exemptions from it are increasing (Cipolla, 1999), and recommendations for moderate (Kettl, Ingraham, Sanders, & Horner, 1996) to radical overhaul (Cipolla, 1999; U.S. General Accounting Office [U.S. GAO], 2003) seem to be increasing.

A final historical issue of note is the effort by human resource experts to try to utilize a single overarching taxonomy of job titles so that they can be compared in and across industries. In practical terms, classification systems will ultimately be customized; however, the ideal is that they all use a common language and framework. That framework is the Standard
EXHIBIT 5.3 Reinventing Civil Service in Georgia

On July 1, 1996, the state of Georgia radically changed its personnel system by ceasing to grant civil service protection to incoming employees. After that date, incoming employees are considered “unclassified,” which removes them from the jurisdiction of the State Personnel Board and essentially makes them at-will employees. Eventually, no state employees will be covered by the traditional civil service protections afforded under the State Personnel Board. At least four factors seem to have contributed to the ability of Georgia to pass and uphold such radical legislation:

- Georgia being a right-to-work state
- Gubernatorial success in passing a legislative agenda
- Editorial support from the largest newspapers in the state
- Support from bureaucratic leaders in government

Under the new provisions, employees do not have property interest or tenure rights over their jobs, which means that supervisors will have more discretion in termination proceedings. In addition, recruiting and selection will be done on an agency-by-agency basis.

Even before 1996, some agencies had removed themselves from the civil service system so that 18% of state employees were unclassified. By 1998, the proportion had increased significantly to 33%, and the projections are that by 2006, nearly 90% of the state’s employees will be unclassified.

To date, the changes have resulted in no prominent abuses such as political intervention, bureaucratic nepotism, or managerial bullying; nor have they resulted in widespread organizational changes. Observers will watch this case carefully because of the ramifications. Of particular interest will be whether examples of spoils appointments become evident and evidence of how a widespread reduction in force (RIF) will affect a system without bumping rights.


Occupational Classification (SOC), maintained by the Office of Personnel Management. It divides jobs into 23 major groups, 96 minor groups, 449 broad occupations, and 821 detailed occupations (Pollack, Simons, Romero, & Hauser, 2002). It is used by federal departments such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Occupational Outlook Handbook), Employment and Training Administration (the online Occupational Information Network or O*NET), Bureau of the Census, and OPM (the federal classification system). Although the hope is that other levels of government—as well as the private sector, which uses the products of these agencies—will eventually gravitate toward the revised SOC, this convergence of systems has yet to occur.

PIECEMEAL PERSONNEL PATTERNS VERSUS POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

Piecemeal personnel systems are those that lack grades or ranks and assign salaries on an ad hoc basis. Job relationships may be reflected in an organization chart and brief job descriptions may exist; however, detailed job analyses, well-articulated job series, and civil service protections are partial or nonexistent. Piecemeal personnel systems are still common in small governments. Obvious drawbacks include inconsistency; lack of integration of the human resource functions such as hiring, appraisal, and promotion; and the possibility of legal challenge for
hiring and promotional validity. Piecemeal systems, however, do offer flexibility and a level of informality that may suit small organizations fairly well.

Formal position classification systems provide grades or ranks for all merit positions as well for nonmerit positions. This allows for rational position management systems that assign authorized salary ranges to each grade or rank. In the ideal, all merit jobs are thoroughly analyzed for content and rigorously evaluated for relative worth. Furthermore, the system should provide internal equity among organization members and external equity with those in similar positions outside the organization. The system should also furnish an opportunity to reflect seniority, merit, skill, and other specialized individual equity concerns (such as locale and shift differences). In reality, position management systems rarely meet such standards, partly because of the expense and effort in maintaining such ideals and partly because of the competing and inconsistent demands placed on these systems.

The Two Primary Uses of Classification Systems

Position classification systems are structures that manage, track, and control employment numbers, costs, and levels of positions. Legislators need to know the number of authorized positions versus the number of filled positions and to anticipate total personnel costs so that they can curb the number of positions in specific areas and control position grades or ranks. Position management systems typically number positions, assign locations, and determine an exact system of compensation. Positions can be tracked by function, such as transportation, and by specialty, such as engineering. Positions also can be tracked and monitored by grade or rank. For example, the state of Iowa has 57 pay grades and six steps in most grades; thus, a legislator can determine how many employees work in what agencies, at what level, and at what cost. A position classification system from this perspective is ultimately a management tool to support compensation systems and control costs.

The second primary function of position classification systems is job support and design. Position classification systems provide the basis for the division and coordination of work, recruitment efforts, selection methods, training programs, appraisal systems, and other human resource functions through analysis and organization of jobs in the organization. Although both the control/management and job support/design functions of position classification examine job content, their different purposes often require different methods in practice.

How Are Positions Grouped Together?

Position systems start with the duties and responsibilities of a single individual, whose job is called a position. Clusters of positions with similar characteristics are organized into what is called a job classification, job class, classification, or simply job or class (terms are used interchangeably here). Technically, “jobs” refer to identical positions, whereas “classes” refer to similar positions in which there are equivalent responsibilities and training, although the specific duty assignment may vary. For example, “property appraiser” may be the class, but one individual may be assigned to residential properties and another to commercial. For classification purposes, however, both have generic training with easy rotational opportunities, which is why the concept of job classifications is used (so that excessive numbers of categories will not be created). The number of job classifications varies considerably by organization: The federal government has approximately 2,500, states vary from a high of 4,500 (California) to a low of 550 (South Dakota), and very tiny organizations have just a few classifications.
Classes that are linked developmentally are grouped into class series. For example, the federal government has approximately 450 class series for white-collar workers and another 350 for blue-collar workers. Class series are subsequently grouped into large occupational families. Related occupational families, such as all white-collar jobs, are assigned a pay plan or schedule in which the grades, steps, and related pay are determined.

As rational as this sounds in theory, practice can produce disorderly systems. The size of the jurisdiction, the number of bargaining units, and the history of the jurisdiction produce very different position classification systems with different sorts of challenges and contradictions. Exhibit 5.4 demonstrates two common problems. First, systems often have an unnecessary number of pay plans, which are often driven by labor-management negotiations rather than by rational planning (Levine & Kleeman, 1986). Blue-collar positions in the example are under three different plans, and public safety is under two different plans. Ideally, they would be grouped together. Second, the example illustrates the change of pay plans by individuals as they move up the chain of command. Firefighters are in Pay Plan G, fire captains are in Pay Plan C (for midlevel managers in the city), and the fire chief is in Pay Plan D (for city executives). The number of pay plans seems to increase as the jurisdiction size increases (see Exhibit 5.5, p. XXX, for an example of this problem). Although this may increase responsiveness to market factors and enhance comparability in some cases, it can lead to a system that is complex and unwieldy. Note that the one system with a moderate number of pay plans (the judicial branch of Iowa) was comprehensively reorganized in the 1980s. Other problems are excessively narrow class definitions (sometimes with only a single job incumbent) and positions that have dual classifications (and different compensation patterns) merely because the identical jobs are found in different organizational or bargaining units of the same government.

Rank-in-person systems reduce the number of job classes through the use of a uniform series of ranks for a multitude of operational positions. “Army captain,” “district fire chief,” and “assistant professor” are generic job titles for numerous positions identified by a specific army unit, fire district, or department. Systems with rank are normally closed to lateral entry (entry from outside the organization without first completing a junior level or entry position), unlike position systems.

In sum, although many small jurisdictions have, and function acceptably with, piecemeal personnel patterns, large jurisdictions need formal position classification systems. Such systems help them track and control positions as well as support those positions by logical groupings called job classes, class series, occupational families, and pay plans. Tools of classification are examined next.

JOB ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The two most important tools in position classification and management are job analysis and job evaluation. A job analysis is a systematic process of collecting data for determining the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) required to perform a job successfully and to make numerous judgments about it. In theory, a job evaluation is a special type of job analysis, one that attaches a dollar value or worth to the job (Siegel, 1998a, 1998b). In practice, job evaluations are often so specialized that they operate as a completely different function from job analysis; however, no matter what the exact relationship between the two methodologies, they do share similarities. Both can use either a simple “whole job” assessment strategy or a more rigorous “factor system.” Both have many formal methodologies (see Appendix A to this
**EXHIBIT 5.4** Example of Fragmentation in Classification Systems: The City of Ames, Iowa

The table below presents occupational groupings of employees in the first column (from individual positions to large pay plans), with examples of these in the following columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions ( = 522)</th>
<th>John Doe, unclassified laborer in public works</th>
<th>Jane Doe, fire captain at station&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Bob Smith, fire chief</th>
<th>Helen Brown, engineering technician in transportation</th>
<th>Bill West, police officer assigned to patrol</th>
<th>Betty Hernandez, firefighter with paramedic responsibilities</th>
<th>Zed Vandervere, electric line worker on the first shift</th>
<th>Ellen Jordan, power plant firefighter on the second shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes ( = 224)</td>
<td>Unclassified laborer</td>
<td>Fire captain (example of single-person class)</td>
<td>Fire chief</td>
<td>Engineering technician</td>
<td>Police officer</td>
<td>Firefighter</td>
<td>Electric line worker</td>
<td>Power plant firefighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next class in series</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Deputy fire chief&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Engineering technician II</td>
<td>Police corporal</td>
<td>Fire lieutenant</td>
<td>Electric line foreman</td>
<td>Power plant operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational families ( = 8)</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Nonunion and managers</td>
<td>Department heads and executives</td>
<td>Blue collar unit (IUOE)</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Fire service</td>
<td>Blue collar (IBEW)</td>
<td>Electric production (IUOE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay plan or schedule ( = 8)</td>
<td>Temporary workers</td>
<td>C Pay Plan&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>D Pay Plan</td>
<td>E Pay Plan</td>
<td>F Pay Plan</td>
<td>G Pay Plan</td>
<td>H Pay Plan</td>
<td>I Pay Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Being a small department, Ames does not have a full complement of ranks.

<sup>b</sup> Pay plans A and B are no longer in use.
EXHIBIT 5.5  Increase in Number of Pay Plans as Jurisdiction Size Increases (Examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ames</th>
<th>Iowa Judicial Branch&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>State of Iowa&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>United States Federal Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of positions</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classes</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average size: 2.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(average size: 16.7)</td>
<td>(average size: 22.4)</td>
<td>(average size: 2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pay plans or schedules</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. This branch of government was rationalized and streamlined in 1986, when the system was converted to a statewide system.

b. The positions do not reflect the 24,000 Regents employees (Iowa State, University of Iowa, and University of Northern Iowa). Regents institutions each have separate classification systems for merit, professional and administrative, faculty, and temporary employees.

chapter) that are relatively complex and expensive but that are important for all organizational members to understand in general terms. Finally, each has common informal methodologies that should be a part of a manager’s standard repertoire of skills.

Whole Job Systems Versus Job Factor Systems

Whole job evaluations do not systematically break a job down into its constituent parts; instead, they consider the job in its entirety and make summary judgments based on intuition and past experience. Examples are numerous:

Whole job analysis: A supervisor hires a clerical support person, from another unit in the organization, who clearly has the appropriate skills and already knows the position in general terms. The supervisor needs someone quickly, so no analysis of the position is conducted. Although identified as a “Secretary III” position, the generic job description of the position gives almost no insight into the specific position.

- Whole job analysis: A manager hires a special project coordinator for a new position. Although a rough description of the job elements is provided, it is really only suggestive of the types of knowledge, skills, and abilities that might actually be required.

- Whole job analysis: An executive appraises a high-performing manager in general terms, without a detailed knowledge of the specific tasks that the person conducts on a daily basis.

- Whole job evaluation: A manager in an organization (without a formal position classification system) intuitively selects a salary for a new position that experience indicates will attract competent candidates.
Whole job methods are simple, summary judgments. Their merits include efficiency and a tendency to honor the decision maker’s past experience and wisdom. The difficulties are that they can be hasty and based on insufficient or inaccurate information. They also may yield little information for various human resource functions and provide inadequate management or legal defense when the decisions are faulty. For example, in systems with large job classifications and typical job valuations, whole job methods are generally inappropriate.

**Job factor systems** break jobs down into their component parts. The number and types of factors used vary considerably in job analysis and job evaluation methods. Factors common to both job analyses and job evaluation studies are task requirements, responsibilities, working conditions, physical demands, difficulty of work, and personal relationships (Foster, 1998). Some methods rely on as few as three factors (usually with subfactors), and some use more than a dozen. It is important for the assessor to decide on the exact purposes before selecting the factors and method because formal job factor initiatives are time-consuming and expensive to implement and are scrutinized critically by employees after the fact (for a more complete listing of the limitations of formal job analyses and job evaluations, see Exhibit 5.6.) Successful job factor systems bring a degree of coherence to position management systems that can greatly aid morale and operational efficiency.

---

**EXHIBIT 5.6** Limitations of Formal Job Analyses and Job Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Job Analysis Limitations</th>
<th>Formal Job Evaluation Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• First, there is the problem of expense. External consults are unusual expenses, and internal specialists may lack the expertise or the time.</td>
<td>• First, there is the problem of completeness and integrity. As soon as job evaluations are done, they begin to be compromised by market changes, exceptions, new positions, changes in responsibilities, new technology, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second, there is the problem of obsolescence. The dynamic nature of jobs today means that a formal job analysis soon becomes outdated.</td>
<td>• Second, there is the problem of reward rigidity. Evaluation systems limit the ability of managers to match the abilities and skills of employees with what they are paid. Exceptional and underachieving employees who have “topped out” may receive the same salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Third, there is the problem of organizational rigidity. Today, organizations need employees to be flexible, work in teams, and keep the “big picture” in mind. Formal analyses tend to emphasize narrow job descriptions, individual work, and specialization.</td>
<td>• Third, there are problems of adaptation. Formal evaluation analyses tend to pigeonhole people into categories when those employees need to act in concert with others and may need to fundamentally reformulate their own jobs over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finally, there is the problem of job definition versus job performance. Although job analyses are good at capturing the outline of the work, they tend to be poor at capturing qualities related to excellence and distinguishing among levels of performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uses and Methods of Job Analysis

Job analysis typically is used as a key tool for recruitment, classification, selection, training, employee appraisal, and other functions. In terms of recruitment and position classification, job analysis provides up-to-date information for position announcements and a thorough and rigorous basis for the writing of job descriptions and ranking jobs. For selection, job analysis is decisive for determining valid selection criteria that are both practical and legally defensible. For training and development, it can be indispensable in identifying and detailing the competencies needed as well as the specific gaps that typically exist between those competencies and the incumbents’ general performance. When considering employee appraisal, job analysis can help define concrete performance standards as well as catalog evaluation criteria. In terms of other human resource functions, it is critical in ascertaining how to make reasonable accommodations for disabled applicants and employees as well as how to redesign or enlarge jobs.

The technique is a powerful instrument because it offers a unique opportunity for learning about fundamental aspects of the organization as well as an opportunity for thoughtful examination of current practices. Executives can encourage comprehensive job analyses to make sure that the organizational structure reflects current management practices, technology, and work distribution requirements. In today’s environment, it is likely that job analyses will discover such inefficiencies as excessive middle management, outdated hardware, absence of appropriate software, and areas of under- and overstaffing. Managers can target problem jobs as opportunities for attention and support or clusters of jobs as possibilities for innovation in job design or work flow. Employees can study their colleagues’ positions for cross-training in informal job analyses or their own positions for better understanding and to recommend changes in their positions. Even students outside the organization can use job analysis methodology as a part of their internship experiences and as a marketable skill, similar to finance management or policy analysis.

Job analyses rely on a combination of four major methods of collecting information: questionnaires, interviews, observation, and archival data (Foster, 1998). The methods chosen tend to depend on the number of jobs to be analyzed, the kind of work, and the type of information required. For example, a job analysis of a police sergeant’s position intended to develop a selection test for a large urban city would require different strategies than would a job analysis of all the positions in an information technology department planning to restructure its operations.

- Use of archival data involves a review of job and position descriptions, previous job analyses, performance appraisals, training materials, worker manuals and aids, examples of work products, and other artifacts that help describe and define the position. These data ideally are employed before other analytic steps, but in practice they often become available as the process evolves. An array of archival data provides a potentially invaluable wealth of contextual and detailed information.

- Questionnaires can be either open-ended or structured. Open-ended questionnaires ask incumbents to identify the content of their jobs on their own and quantify the functions by percentage of time (Exhibit 5.7 provides an example). Those surveys are then reviewed by supervisors. The strengths of this method are its low cost, standard form, and use of the incumbent’s
**EXHIBIT 5.7** Position Description Questionnaire

---

**IOWA DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL**  
**POSITION DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (PDQ)**

Read instructions before completing this form.

---

### FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

- M-5# _______
- New Position
- Duties have changed:
  - ______ Position review requested
  - ______ No position review requested
- ☐ Response to IDOP request

### FOR IDOP USE ONLY

- PDQ # ______
- Class Title ____________________________
- 18 Digit Position # _____________________
- Personnel Officer _______________________
- Date _________________________________

---

1. Name of employee (if none, write VACANT)
2. Current 18-digit positions # and class title
3. Department, Division, Bureau, Section and Work Address
4. Hours worked (shifts, rotations, travel)
5. ☐ Full-time (40 hours per week)
   - ☐ Part-time (list number of hours per week)
6. Have the assigned duties changed since this position was last reviewed for a classification decision?  
   - ☐ Yes ☐ No
   - If Yes, place an “X” beside each NEW task written below. Also, describe in detail how those tasks are different from those previously assigned.
7. Name and job classification of the immediate supervisor
8. Description of Work: Describe the work in detail. Make the description so clear that the reader can understand each task exactly. In the TIME/% column, enter the percent of time spent on each task during an average work week. List the most important responsibility first. If this is a reclassification request, the previous PDQ must be attached. This PDQ will be returned if any section is incomplete.

---

### TIME/%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK PERFORMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

CFN 552-0094-4  R 4/99
9. Is this position considered to be supervisory? Yes ____ No ____ If Yes, complete a Supervisory Analysis Questionnaire form (CFN 552-0193) and attach it to this form.

10. For what reasons are you requesting that this position be reviewed? Include, if applicable, significant changes or additions to duties, comparison(s) with other positions, etc. Be specific.

I certify that I have read the instructions for the completion of this questionnaire, that the answers are my own, and that they are accurate and complete. I understand that falsification or misrepresentation made in regard to any information submitted may lead to discipline up to and including discharge.

Signed _____________________________________ _____________________________________
(Incumbent Employee) (Date)

If you have not been notified by your department’s management of their decision to support or deny this request within 30 days, you may send this request directly to IDOP for review. Address it to: Facilitator, Program Delivery Services, Iowa Department of Personnel, Grimes Building, East 14th & Grand, Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0150.

SUPERVISOR REVIEW OF POSITION DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

This section must be completed within 30 days after the PDQ is received from the employee. The employee must be notified of the decision to support or deny the request. Regardless, the request must be forwarded to IDOP. This PDQ will be returned if any section is incomplete.

11. Indicate to what extent, if any, the statements on this form are, in your opinion, not correct or need clarification.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

12. Describe the origin of any new duties, i.e., those marked with an “X” in Item 8. If new duties have been added, where were they performed prior to being assigned to this position? Are these duties performed by anyone else? If so, identify the person(s) and the position classification of their positions.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

13. What is the basic purpose of this position?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

14. Identify the essential functions that must be performed by the incumbent, with or without reasonable accommodation for disabilities. Identify any certifications or licenses that are required. Refer to the instruction sheet and Section 3.15 of the Managers and Supervisors Manual for more information on essential functions.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

(Continued)
knowledge of the position. Unfortunately, questionnaires generally require significant follow-
up to fill in gaps and are susceptible to incumbent embellishment or, in some cases, diffi-
dence. Closed-ended or structured instruments provide task lists (usually lengthy) from which
to select. They provide highly detailed information about the job but require computer-based
aggregation and trained staff analysis for effective utilization.

- **Interviews** can be conducted with individuals or groups. The content of jobs can be
analyzed through semistructured or wholly structured question protocols of either job incum-
bents or supervisors. This is a particularly useful method for managerial, technical, and pro-
fessional positions. Group methods are useful when a class of positions has relatively little
variation or when a list of unstructured elements is being elicited, such as critical incidents.
The major drawback of interviews is their time-consuming nature.

- **Observation** involves watching individuals actually perform their jobs. It is particularly
effective for analyzing blue-collar positions for which the activities can be observed and is
less useful in analyzing white-collar occupations. It provides the analyst with firsthand expe-
rience, which in some cases may be enhanced by the analyst performing the functions.

Formal methods are time-consuming and frequently expensive. In practice, they are
employed in a small number of important cases. First, formal job analysis should always be
used when there is an employment test that can be challenged easily on the grounds of valid-
ity. Validity challenges (see Chapter 4) are most common for large, entry-level classifications,
especially for jobs that are highly sought because of their professional potential and that
require basic knowledge— or skill-based tests. Examples include firefighter and fire lieutenant,
police officer and police detective/corporal, sheriff’s deputy, FBI agent, IRS investigator, and
auditor. Analysis is also important to determine reasonable accommodations for those with disabilities. These types of analyses are conducted by personnel specialists but are frequently subcontracted to specialized consulting firms. Some jurisdictions, especially small ones, use off-the-shelf tests that have been validated by vendors for positions like firefighter or police officer.

Formal job analysis may be used in reclassifications when there is pressure to upgrade the position. Reclassifications generally are formally requested by the incumbent, must be supported by the supervisor, and are administered and approved by the human resource department. It is highly useful for those requesting, supporting, or discouraging reclassifications to understand formal job analysis methodology (note that Exhibit 5.7 can be used in reclassifications as well as the classification of new positions).

Formal job analysis also may be used as a preliminary step in a job evaluation study in which the positions of a division or entire organization are being recalibrated. Such studies normally are subcontracted to consulting firms, if only for the neutrality that external assessors are perceived to possess. Except for relatively consistent (but highly generic) job descriptions, however, this may supply information of limited value. Finally, formal job analysis is sometimes used for comprehensive training studies (Exhibit 5.8 is an example of such a comprehensive study by the U.S. Coast Guard).

EXHIBIT 5.8 Example of a Comprehensive Job Analysis Leading to a Training Program

The U.S. Coast Guard periodically reviews its jobs in a comprehensive manner to revise job tasks and pay scales, to review staffing levels, to help design career ladders and identify worker satisfaction, to ensure the proficiency of certification programs, to help distinguish training problems from management problems, and to help establish realistic training objectives and standards and refine training content.

When the Coast Guard decided to review the position of machinery technician, the training manager and a line manager spent 3 months preparing for the work of a nine-member panel. The nine panelists were themselves machinery technicians chosen from a range of experiences and sent to Yorktown, Virginia, to the Coast Guard training center. The panel was instructed to use the Lippert Card Approach, which meant that every possible machinery technician task needed to be written down on a different card. The panel broke the job down into categories (e.g., internal combustion engines). Then all possible tasks were identified (e.g., fabricate battery cables). When they were done, the panelists had identified approximately 10,000 different tasks. Next, they had to cluster the tasks to reduce the number to a more manageable quantity. They eventually reduced the task list to 1,503 items.

The next phase was to send a questionnaire to all machinery technicians—more than 3,000 of them. The questionnaire asked for background information about the task inventory and for a work summary. Every machinery technician was asked three questions about every task finally identified: (a) Do you ever do the task? (b) What is the relative time spent on the task? and (c) What should the training emphasis be?

Although the task was long, often tedious, and expensive, the methodological treatment provided a wealth of useful information for decisions to be made by human resource specialists, managers and administrators, and training specialists.

To summarize, job analysis can be used not only by human resource departments but also by managers and employees. Its formal methods tend to be practiced by internal experts or consultants, but informal usage involves generic management skills.

JOB AND POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

One of the most important uses of job analysis is for job and position descriptions. Although the terms are used nearly interchangeably, with job description being the collective reference, they actually represent somewhat different concepts. It is useful to exaggerate the differences for clarity because job and position descriptions are the building blocks of position classification and management systems. Both are written statements about a job that describe or list the duties, but the focus of the two often varies significantly, as do the uses, writers, and level of specificity.

Job descriptions are statements that codify the typical or average duties (sometimes by using work examples), levels of responsibility, and general competencies and requirements of a job class. They are generally prepared by human resource specialists or personnel consultants. Their primary uses are for systems management (placement of positions in specific classes) and compensation decisions; job descriptions tend to be maintained by the human resource department. The language is usually generic so that a description covers many positions, and the examples used may or may not apply to a specific position. Although the format varies tremendously, the underlying structure of job descriptions does not.

Position descriptions are statements that define the exact duties, level of responsibility, and organizational placement of a single position (or essentially identical group of positions). Although they are sometimes written by personnel specialists, they are generally written by job incumbents or their supervisors. Their primary purposes are for recruitment (where they are modified as job announcements), reclassification (where the duties and responsibilities tend to be compared to the job classification requested), and performance appraisal (where work standards and accomplishments tend to be emphasized). Because of the wide variety of objectives, their format varies considerably. Their maintenance is generally dependent on the specific use or the culture of the local unit; true position descriptions are rarely centrally maintained. An example of a comparison of job and position descriptions using the class “equipment operator 2” is located in Appendix A of this chapter. The job description is for a class with more than 1,000 positions; the position description was used as part of a successful effort to reclassify the position from an equipment operator 1 to an equipment operator 2.

In practice, very small organizations may not maintain job descriptions and may use position descriptions only occasionally, such as when they need to recruit. Small and medium-sized organizations that have overhauled their position classification system within a decade or so often find that they are able to maintain job descriptions that have many characteristics of position descriptions because the number of incumbents is small in each class. In bigger organizations with many large classes, job descriptions generally are maintained conscientiously (and used for all purposes even if they prove less than ideal for recruitment and appraisal), whereas position descriptions are created selectively for management and human resource purposes.

Finally, it should be noted that traditional and contemporary job and position descriptions vary in two significant regards. The Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) has had
a profound effect on job descriptions, position descriptions, and position announcements. Traditionally, jobs were defined as having 3 to 10 major duties (core area of responsibilities), each of which might have two or more job tasks (discrete work activities necessary to the performance of a job and that result in an outcome usable to another person). Because the ADA prohibits discrimination against “an individual with a disability, who with or without reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the employment position,” the language more commonly used today is adapted to essential and nonessential functions rather than duties and tasks. Furthermore, physical, manual, and special requirements are now routinely spelled out in job and position descriptions. Second, the new management emphasis on accountability and results has led to the incorporation of performance standards in some cases. It remains to be seen whether results-oriented job and position descriptions become a norm in the public sector.

**Writing Job Descriptions**

Writing job descriptions is a specific skill that takes some study to master. In practice, many templates are used, but the style invariably is terse. The simple format used as an example here is a job summary, essential functions, physical and environmental standards required to perform essential functions, and minimum job requirements and qualifications for a town accounts payable/payroll clerk.

The job summary begins with the level of responsibility and identifies the department and level of supervision, if any, followed by a list of major duties.

Example: Under general supervision, this position works in the office of the city administrator. This position is responsible for financial support tasks including payroll processing, accounts receivable, accounts payable, bank deposits and reconciliations, and other general clerical support duties for the administrator and council as assigned.

The second category identifies essential functions, generally those that constitute more than 5% of the incumbent’s time and are central to the job. These start with a verb followed by an object and sometimes an explanatory phrase. Ideally, 5 to 7 functions are listed, but there may be as few as 3 and as many as 10. Long, unorganized task lists once were typical but now are considered poor form. Tasks should be clustered into duty areas and combined where necessary. It is possible to place a performance standard at the end of each statement.

Example: Processes biweekly time sheets and enters payroll information into computer; computes used and accrued sick and vacation time and overtime hours; pays required federal and state taxes; deducts insurance and related payroll costs; prints payroll checks and payroll reports. Extreme accuracy and timeliness is required in performing this critical function.

The third category identifies the physical and environmental standards required to perform essential functions. Physical standards should articulate the exact physical abilities required to accomplish job tasks as normally constituted, knowing that reasonable accommodation may be necessary for a qualified applicant or incumbent who is disabled. Environmental standards include such conditions as working outside, dangerous conditions, and nonstandard working hours. Generally, this section uses a format similar to that used for the essential functions.
Example: Requires the ability to handle a variety of documents and use hands in typing, data entry, using a calculator and related equipment; occasionally lift and carry books, ledgers, reports, and other documents weighing less than 25 pounds; use personal automobile in depositing monies at local banks; requires visual and hearing ability sufficiently correctable to see clients, hear phones, and operate in an office environment that has limited auxiliary support.

The fourth category identifies minimum requirements and qualifications. Here, required KSAs are identified, as well as special certifications, degrees, and training. Requirements for excessive credentials should be avoided to ensure consistency with merit principles and equal employment opportunity. Substitutions generally are listed.

Example: Graduation from high school or GED and 3 years of general accounting/bookkeeping experience; substitution of successful completion of a business or accounting curriculum at a recognized college or school may be made for part of the experience requirement. Must also have good interpersonal skills and excellent ability to coordinate and balance numerous, sometimes hectic, activities in a calm fashion without letting technical accuracy suffer.

Job analysis, then, has various functions including the writing of job and position descriptions. It has many levels of rigor (see Appendix A to this chapter). Job evaluation, discussed in the next section, tends to rely exclusively on formal methods.

Using Factors for Job Evaluation

Historically, jobs originally were evaluated using a whole job methodology: What was a particular job thought to be worth in general terms? Despite the flexibility and immediacy of such systems, they are prone to distortions based on personalism, limited information, and excessive focus on the job incumbent. Position classification ushered in an age of factor systems in which job grades or levels were commonly established. Graded systems took into account (often implicitly) such factors as level of responsibility, job requirements, difficulty of work, nature of the relationships, and level of supervision. This led to far more rational and equitable compensation systems; however, the factor methodologies used in most position management systems can use factors quite dissimilarly for different positions. They also allow for considerable subjective judgment in making decisions about the grade of positions.

Today point factor methods are considered more rigorous methodologies and are utilized to reevaluate position management and compensation practices. They are generally used when organizations find that their position classification systems have become too inconsistent and outdated. In the majority of cases, an external consultant conducts the underlying pay study to design the new system because of the time and expertise required to accomplish such a large task.

A point factor system starts with the assumption that factors should be broad enough to apply consistently to all jobs in an organization or schedule. In practice, 4 to 12 factors generally are selected. For instance, the Federal Evaluation System (FES) uses 9 for the General Schedule. Each factor is then weighted by determining a maximum number of points that can
be assigned to it. In the case of the FES, note the tremendous differences in the weights of the different factors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Evaluation Weight (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge required</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory controls</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and effect</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contacts</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of contacts</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical demands</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the factors are defined by levels or standards that are used to determine the actual number of points a job classification will receive. Three to five standards interpret the various levels; descriptions are provided of what high, medium, and low levels mean in each factor. Factors may be further subdivided into a number of subfactors. All jobs are then evaluated by individuals, committees, or both. This part of the process should provide internal equity because of the consistency of the process. After all jobs have been evaluated and arranged from lowest to highest, point ranges are selected to determine grade levels.

Point factor systems are excellent for internal equity but by themselves do not ensure external equity. External equity is maintained by linking the entire point factor system to compensation comparisons of select jobs outside the organization. A portion of the classifications are chosen as benchmark jobs, anchored to general market salary ranges as indicated by reliable compensation survey information. In large organizations, it may be as few as 5% or 10% of the positions; in small organizations it may be as high as 25%. Benchmark jobs are used for each major class series to ensure external equity and that the entire system is in line with market compensation practices. Today, these relatively complex, hybrid “point factor benchmark” systems are what are most commonly used by consulting firms, although they are usually simply referred to as point factor systems.

As a straightforward example, suppose that an organization finds that its position classification system is outdated, that most job descriptions do not reflect ADA standards, and that there is a good opportunity to modestly increase salaries, which are currently below the market in most cases. An external consulting firm is hired that specializes in government compensation studies. The consultant uses four factors: level of responsibility, complexity of problem solving, degree of accountability, and working conditions. Multiple raters examine 7% of the job classes, using the four factors to ensure reliability. This provides reference points (benchmark jobs) in the evaluation of other jobs.

All classes then are analyzed and evaluated using the four factors. (As a by-product of the evaluation process, new job descriptions are generated that provide essential and nonessential duties as well as physical requirements and environmental conditions for compatibility with the ADA.) The evaluation assigns a specific point value to each job class. After all the classes have been arrayed on a point scale from lowest to highest, intervals are selected that determine the grade levels. Those benchmarked jobs are then matched to
salary survey data to ensure comparability to market salaries. Throughout the process, the organization has a task force assigned to work with the external consultant, which includes the human resource specialist for compensation. After completing the study, the results are forwarded to the entire organization, which has an opportunity to review the analysis and to provide further input to the task force. The task force presents the study to the governing body, with its recommendations for adoption (or rejection) and for specific changes. Because such studies usually represent some salary expense increase, the governing board may or may not accept the study or the accompanying organizational recommendations.

Because comprehensive job evaluations (pay studies) are expensive and time-consuming, they occur infrequently. Managers, executives, and legislators need to be aware of how compensation factors were arrived at in the past, how well the compensation system has fared over time, and when a new compensation study and pay plan may be called for, as well as the auxiliary features that such research can produce with planning (see Exhibit 5.9 for a discussion of when to conduct a job evaluation study).

---

**EXHIBIT 5.9 When to Conduct a Job Evaluation Study**

Because organizationwide job evaluation studies are expensive, time-consuming, and often controversial, they should not be used as feasibility studies. If the adoption of the final study (with modifications) is not propitious, it is better not to begin at all. Nor should a comprehensive job evaluation analysis be used if only a few job classifications are at issue; in that event, only those cases or class series should be evaluated.

First, preliminary questions must be asked. How and when were jobs last evaluated (using what methodologies) and by whom? How much controversy does the system seem to generate, and what are its major problems (internal equity such as pay inconsistencies; external equity such as widespread below-market salaries; special problems such as hard-to-recruit and hard-to-retain jobs, excessive job plateauing, inadequate financial incentives)?

Second, the purpose of a proposed study needs to be clearly outlined. Is it for an occupational family, a pay plan, or the entire organization? Would the analysis primarily target internal inequities, overall external inequities such as depressed salaries across the board, more flexible salary plans, merit-based pay systems, or a variety of factors? Who would conduct the evaluation, and how would they be commissioned? What would be the role or input of employee unions? Defining the purposes of the initiative ensures that the organizational or legislative leaders and the evaluators do not have two separate notions of what is to be accomplished (which is not uncommon).

Third, feasibility and political reality must be assessed candidly. If the overall problem with the compensation plan is depressed salaries across the board but government revenues are limited because of economic or financial exigencies (such as a recession or an expensive capital building plan), then a job evaluation study will do little but agitate workers, put executives in an uncomfortable position, and annoy elected officials (who will turn down the plan). Practical questions include the following: Will there be money to both pay for the analysis and increase some or all salaries? Do legislators really understand the underlying need (because the study itself is unlikely to convince them) as well as the general plan of implementation? How can the study be used as a means of enhancing labor-management relations rather than become another bone of contention?

Finally, the jurisdiction needs to be clear if it wants more than just a compensation study conducted. A common outcome desired is job descriptions that have wider human resource utility. Such a by-product must not be assumed and should be carefully spelled out before the process.
For their part, it is essential for employees and managers to understand job evaluation factors to maximize the prospects for success in petitions for reclassification. Too frequently, a good employee is performing well but has weak grounds for a reclassification, which is based on the nature of the position and not on the job incumbent’s particular skills or assignments. Unless grounds can be established that the position itself has been fundamentally and permanently altered, a reclassification request is likely to be turned down (although a classification specialist might assist with a market adjustment, special step increase, bonus, or other pay modification suggestion). Because of this type of problem, as well as the perceived rigidity of position management systems in general today, alternative systems such as broadbanding (discussed in the next chapter) frequently are recommended.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

Position classification became more of a judicious plan throughout the last century than it ever was before. Outright corruption is uncommon; rational plans for managing jobs in terms of compensation and other human resource functions exist in all large organizations and are tailored to their needs and histories; and specific tools now exist in this area, such as job analysis and job evaluation, which include both highly sophisticated methodologies as well as informal methods commonly used by managers.

Nevertheless, the ability to have greater (but not perfect) control, consistency, precision, and rationality (which position classification and management theory and practice have enabled managers to achieve) should not disguise the underlying truth that it is only partially a science and largely an art. The decisions made in position management systems ultimately are founded on value choices, not universal laws (Van Wart, 1998). Many of the values assumed over the last half century are shifting dramatically because of changed economics, politics, and technology. Furthermore, even at its most rational and ideal, the position classification system of large organizations is a combination of at least three fundamentally different personnel systems based on election, appointment, and rule-based criteria. Indeed, rule-based (i.e., merit) criteria are themselves divided between position-based systems and less common rank-based systems, sometimes occurring in the same organization. Finally, the sheer organizational complexity and level of change in organizations today means that extensive, expensive, difficult-to-maintain position classification systems naturally tend to become less rational, less consistent, and out of date. Paradoxically then, as much as position classification systems are judicious plans, they are also ever-changing jigsaw puzzles of shifting values, of radically different personnel approaches, and of competing human resource needs to control, on one hand, and to support and design jobs, on the other.

The new value changes emanate from elemental transformations in the public sector landscape in terms of what people want public sector organizations to do and how they want them to do it (De Leon & Denhardt, 2000; Yergin & Stanislaw, 1998). Rather than an emphasis on employee rights and internal procedural consistency, there is a far greater interest in employee accountability and concrete achievement translating into an increased reliance on at-will systems (with appointment-based features) and performance standards (Grady & Tax, 1996; Radin, 1998; U.S. MSPB, 2002). This has certainly prompted extensive debate about the advantages and potential liabilities of contemporary civil service reforms (see, for example, the debate between Hays & Kearney, 1999; Kearney & Hays, 1998; and Van Wart, 1999).
emphasize on efficiency and effectiveness is in line with the historic tradition of scientific
management and can be seen as a logical progression of the art of position management.

Other trends promise to take position management into new domains and configurations.
The demand for agencies that are flexible, flatter, and more entrepreneurial requires not only
new organizational structures but also new internal management systems in the United States
(Leavitt & Johnson, 1998; Marshall, 1998) and elsewhere in the world (Farnham, 1997). Such
trends will propel institutions to reexamine their complex systems and to simplify them.
Efforts to use broadbanding (fewer classes and enlarged jobs) and work teams are examples,
as are attempts to simplify massive management systems. Contemporary initiatives to decen-
tralize responsibility to local managers who will be more accountable for results, but allowed
more flexibility, will also change the landscape. Indeed, some predict the “death of the job”
(Crandall & Wallace, 1998) as virtual work designs stretch people beyond narrow, predicable
tasks by extending not only their line of sight (understanding outcomes and how their activi-
ties relate to them) but also their line of impact (confidence stemming from affecting results).

However, whether one comes to view position management systems more as judicious
plans or as jigsaw puzzles, they will remain the core of the human resource function that man-
egers, employees, and job aspirants cannot afford to mystify or underutilize.
APPENDIX A

Comparison of a Job and Position Description

SAMPLE JOB DESCRIPTION

Equipment Operator 2, Class Code: 08111

Definition: Under general supervision, performs specialized and routine roadway and right-of-way maintenance activities including physical laboring activities, the operation of self-propelled mobile equipment, skilled equipment operation, and/or limited direction of work crews; performs related work as required.

Work Examples

(The Work Examples and Competencies listed are for illustrative purposes only and not intended to be the primary basis for position classification decisions.)

- Assists a supervisor by performing limited lead work in accordance with set procedures, policies, and standards, such duties as instructing employees about tasks, answering questions about procedures and policies, distributing and balancing the workload and checking work; makes occasional suggestions on appointments, promotions, and reassignments.
- Works on district paint crew in rotation with other paint crew positions.
- Works on the district bridge crew.
- Acts as a maintenance sign crew leader in maintenance areas where work on signs requires a full-time sign crew.
- Acts as a lighting specialist and may be assigned to the state lighting crew to assist that crew in the maintenance and construction of roadway lights.
- Cleans ditches and culverts, excavates soil, straightens drainage channels, and resets culvert ends using a dragline or hydraulic excavator in a residency or districtwide area.
- Operates a mud pump, grout pump, or high reach in a residency or districtwide area.
- Operates the curb-making machine in a residency.
- Performs herbicide spraying operations in right-of-way areas by using a backpack sprayer, driving truck, and/or operating a pressure sprayer as required.
- Loads and unloads material, demolishes structures, loads debris, etc., using a small bulldozer; and may be required to run a large erosion dozer for erosion control purposes in a district or residencywide area.
Competencies Required

- Knowledge of specialized highway maintenance equipment, its operation, and use.
- Knowledge of highway maintenance procedures and techniques.
- Knowledge of highway maintenance terminology.
- Ability to work outside during inclement weather and to be on call during emergency situations such as snowstorms, pavement blowups, floods, etc.
- Ability to operate a 90 pound jackhammer in the operation of breaking and removing pavement materials.
- Ability to lift and load bagged material weighing up to 95 pounds to a truck that is 55 inches above ground.
- Ability to drive trucks and other vehicles in a safe and conscientious manner.
- Ability to understand and carry out written and oral instructions.
- Ability to direct the work of and train crew members.
- Ability to meet customer needs in a consistently helpful and courteous manner.
- Ability to work cooperatively with others as part of a team.
- Ability to apply personal work attitudes such as honesty, responsibility, and trustworthiness required to be a productive employee.
- Skill in the operation of specialized highway maintenance equipment that requires hand, foot, and eye coordination.

Education, Experience, and Special Requirements

- The equivalency of 1 year full-time experience in the operation of heavy equipment, performing highway or other related maintenance functions, or in subprofessional engineering program areas.
- All positions in this job class require applicants to possess a commercial driver’s license, class A, at the time of hire. Endorsements may also be required.
- For designated positions, the appointing authority, with Iowa Department of Personnel prior approval, may request applicants possessing a minimum of 12 semester hours of education, 6 months of experience, or a combination of both, or a specific certificate, license, or endorsement in the following areas: air brakes, doubles/triples endorsement, hazardous materials endorsement, tank vehicles. Applicants wishing to be considered for such designated positions must list applicable course work, experience, certificate, license, or endorsement on the application.

Special Notes

- After accepting an offer of employment, all persons are required to have a physical examination by a doctor of choice verifying the physical ability to perform the duties described.
- Employees must be available to travel and may be required to stay away from home overnight during assignments.
- Certain designated positions require the employee to be certified by the Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship as a Pesticide Applicator.
- Employees must respond to emergency conditions, which requires them to live within a 15-mile distance or be able to report within a 30-minute period of time to their assigned facility.
SAMPLE POSITION DESCRIPTION
(INTENDED USAGE: RECLASSIFICATION)

Incumbent: John Doe
Agency: Iowa Department of Transportation
Division: Highway Maintenance Division
Unit: District 2
Place of work: Waterloo Maintenance Garage, US 63 and West Ridgeway
Position number and class title of position: 645 S44 5520 08110 111
Existing position:
Hours worked: 7:00 A.M. through 3:30 P.M., Monday through Friday
Immediate supervisor: Robert Fisck, Highway Supervisor 1
Position requested: Equipment Operator 2

Description of work (List in detail the work you do. List the most important duties first. Indicate the percentage of time or hours in an average work week spent on each duty.)

Time Work Performed

45% Grout Pump. Operate a grout pump over a districtwide area. Re-establishing pavement support by undersealing, and includes marking and drilling of injection holes and injecting a mixture of cement flash grout under low pressure to completely fill any voids under the pavement. Must understand and be able to locate longitudinal subdrains and any other drains located under the pavement to make sure that the drains are not plugged with grout. Must constantly monitor roadway, shoulder, and under the bridge while pumping to make certain not to damage the bridge, shoulder, or roadway in any way. Train and direct a crew of seven to nine operators on the pump and on proper traffic control. Must understand the mechanics of the grout pump so if any problem occurs can take the pump apart and get the grout out of the machine, so as not to have a flash set before a mechanic can get to the job site.

20% Routine roadway and right-of-way maintenance activities include the following: (surfaces) patch spalls, seal/fill joints and cracks, remove bumps, fill depressions, remove and replace damaged pavements; (shoulders) fill edge ruts, operate blading equipment to smooth shoulders, patch paved shoulders, etc.; (roadsides) pick up litter, cut brush, repair fences, control weeds by mowing and spraying, erect and dismantle snow fences; (bridges) clean decks, clean and lubricate working members, spot paint; (traffic services) repair guardrails, flag traffic, maintain lighting, erect and maintain signs; (drainage) repair and maintain drainage structures and tile lines, clean ditches. Performance of these tasks includes the use of physical labor and operation of self-propelled mobile equipment such as dump trucks, front end loaders, tractors, motor graders, and an array of support equipment and hand tools such
as chain saws, pneumatic hammers, hand drills, weed eaters, lawn mowers, and shovels.

20% Snow removal. Operate snow removal equipment such as single axle dump truck or a tandem axle dump truck, each of which may be equipped with a tailgate or hopper spreader, a straight blade or V-plow, a wing plow and underbody ice blade. Procedures include the removal of snow, packed snow, and/or ice by plowing and/or spreading abrasives and de-icing chemicals on the roadway surface.

10% Equipment maintenance. Service and perform preventive maintenance on all assigned equipment traditionally used in the performance of highway and bridge maintenance.

5% Other duties. Miscellaneous duties are assigned from time to time.

SOURCE: Iowa Department of Personnel, agency documents.
There are many methods of formal job analysis. One researcher describes 18 job analysis methods in detail (Gael, 1988). Because each method involves a good deal of complexity, the purpose here is restricted to providing general familiarization with some of the methods and their strengths and weaknesses.

The strengths of the different methods can be considered on at least three different dimensions. First, what is the purpose of the job analysis? Because the methods' focus varies substantially, this is an important question. Second, how much organizational time can be devoted to the project? This will affect the degree to which inside versus external support is enlisted and the complexity of the design used. Third, to what degree is cost a factor? Consultants and proprietary instruments bring expertise and cut down the time, but they add to the expense.

Another important dimension to consider when reviewing job analysis methods is the degree to which the job tasks will be emphasized versus the job traits. Job traits are defined broadly here as KSAs (knowledge, skills, and abilities) as well as job behaviors. On one hand, it is possible to analyze jobs primarily by task and the complexity of those tasks. The Department of Labor uses a task-oriented method to generate the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. The difficulty of the job is evaluated by determining the complexity of worker functions on three dimensions: data, people, and things. Below are the 24 functions used in the DOL method:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Synthesizing</td>
<td>0 Mentoring</td>
<td>0 Setting up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Coordinating</td>
<td>1 Negotiating</td>
<td>1 Precision working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Analysis</td>
<td>2 Instructing</td>
<td>2 Operations-controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Compiling</td>
<td>3 Supervising</td>
<td>3 Driving-operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Computing</td>
<td>4 Diverting</td>
<td>4 Manipulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Copying</td>
<td>5 Persuading</td>
<td>5 Tending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Comparing</td>
<td>6 Speaking-signaling</td>
<td>6 Feeding-offbearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Serving</td>
<td>7 Handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Taking instructions-helping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The DOL method is excellent at job descriptions. The Functional Job Analysis, developed by Sidney Fine and associates, is a variation of the DOL method. Most job evaluation methods (considered in a separate section below) rely heavily on task analysis.

It is possible to focus nearly exclusively on job traits or KSAs in analyzing a job. McCormick and his associates developed the Position Analysis Questionnaire, which primarily evaluates the level of complexity of worker behaviors. Ernest Primoff of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management developed another method for the United States government in the 1970s. In his original method (called the Job Elements Method), a panel of experts first generates a comprehensive list of KSAs (Primoff’s job elements) for a job classification. Next, the job elements are rated in four categories. The ratings from the four scales are combined to form a weight for each element. A distinction must be made, however, when using a method for job evaluation or selection. The Job Elements Method was used for selection purposes, but it was later successfully challenged as requiring too great an inferential leap for complex jobs. That is, job elements or KSAs were not sufficient when determining the selection criteria for jobs. Thereafter, nearly all methods relied on combined task-trait methodologies, which does add balance to the analysis but enhances the complexity of the job analysis process.

Some well-known task-trait methodologies include the Threshold Traits Analysis, developed by Lopez in the early 1970s; the Critical Incident Method, developed by Flanagan in the 1950s as an assessment and training tool; the Fleishman Job Analysis Survey, which assumes that the task analysis has already been completed; and the Job Components Inventory, which is useful for lower-level jobs. In all these methods, job task lists are generated, traits are weighted, and the jobs are then assessed.

A second dimension to consider is the use of questionnaires or experts in the generation of task lists, trait lists, and data analysis. Two of the methods mentioned use questionnaires extensively: the Position Analysis Questionnaire (well known in the United States) and the Job Components Inventory (well known in England). Although nearly all the methods supply forms as a guideline, they require extensive expert input relative to each position. Questionnaire-based methodologies provide standardized databases and rapid analysis capacity.
Class Discussion

1. Canvass the class to determine if any members of the class have been a part of a reclassification effort or an organizationwide job evaluation. What happened? Was it successful or not?

2. Ask those in the class who now work or have ever worked in the public sector what position management challenges they have experienced.

3. There is perhaps no better example of the grand paradox of needs (Introduction) than position management. Discuss and seek pathways through the paradox as well as subparadoxes found in various position management techniques.

Team Activities

4. Does the position management function help or hinder in resolving the twin paradoxes introduced at the outset of the book?

5. Analyze a public sector organization’s classification system. Determine the number of positions, classes, and pay plans. What are the number of elected, appointed, and merit appointees? Does the system “work” and does the checkerboard make sense to those using the system?

6. A large, growing county decides to place a new service center in another city. None of the current employees is interested in relocating. Furthermore, there is some concern that many of the offices are using outdated technology and old-fashioned methods of customer delivery. For example, services related to building permits, licenses, land records, and tax assessment are scattered throughout a variety of buildings in the county seat. The new model of customer service recommends a single, long service counter for related services, with employees who are cross-trained. Almost all the job descriptions are at least a decade old (some are 25 years old!), and nearly all the “training” is on the job. How might a job analysis study be useful? Specifically, what functions might be supported by such a study, and how?

7. As a class, determine which members are currently employed in the public sector and then select some of them to be interviewed in small groups. The small groups are to write a job description. The person interviewed should not do any of the writing, nor should he or she suggest the format to be used. Compare the results as a class and make friendly suggestions for improvements.

8. You are a manager whose best worker has “topped out”; that is, the employee is at the top step of her pay grade. Furthermore, her job is properly classified. Unfortunately, the government jurisdiction for whom you both work is 20% to 30% below the market in most positions. You know that the person will leave soon if the situation is not altered. You could assign a few people to her to justify a reclassification and pay increase, although it would not make much sense.
functionally. Take an imagination break (Exhibit 0.3). What would you do? Teams should compare and justify their recommendations.

**Individual Assignments**

9. The reform of civil service will be an important discussion and debate for the next several decades. What are the implications of the civil service reform initiative in Georgia? Do you think that the movement to replace independent civil service commissions with executive branch personnel agencies is a good one? Do you think that job property rights should be abolished in all public sector systems? Will the widespread use of at-will systems lead to patronage problems again, as they did in the 19th century?

10. What are the similarities and dissimilarities between broadbanding and rank-in-person systems?

11. If you were the analyst looking at the position reclassification request in Appendix A (for the equipment operator 2), what would the positive and negative points be? Would you grant the request?

**NOTES**

1. Position management and position classification are related, but not identical, concepts. Position classification primarily refers to categorization of positions with a rational set of principles. Position management generally refers to the allocation of positions for budgetary purposes. A position classification system is one of the elements of a position management system, but position classification systems can have nonbudgetary purposes as well, such as the fundamental division and coordination of work, selection, training, and performance appraisal. Position management can have aspects not directly related to classification, such as budget authorization, budget “caps,” downsizing, privatization, contracting out, loadshedding, and so on.

2. In the past, hereditary selection was common, and it still exists today, even in some advanced democracies.

3. This type includes most city council members, school board members, township trustees, boards, and commissions that are locally elected, as well as some county supervisors, among others.

4. Also known as rank-in-position.

5. In at-will jobs, the incumbent must prove that he or she was removed from the job for an illegal reason such as discrimination based on race, age, or gender. This puts the burden of proof on the job incumbent and provides a narrow scope of appeal. In most civil service positions, the employer must prove “cause” for termination; that is, the incumbent must be documented to be incompetent, to exhibit inappropriate or illegal behavior, and/or to be unwilling to reform derelict or improper behaviors.

6. The current version is called the O*NET, standing for the Occupational Informational Network; it is an online electronic database compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor. It has consolidated the occupational listing to under 1,200 entries, which are more fully analyzed than those in the old DOT. Although the definitive resource is now the online O*NET, some people may elect to use the O*NET Dictionary of Occupational Titles (O*NET DOT), which includes all the occupations but considerably summarizes the information about those jobs.

7. The Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 provided for (a) the bulk of the Civil Service Commission’s routine work to be administered by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), an executive agency; (b) the creation of a Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) to be a watchdog...
of merit employees’ rights; (c) a reorganized Federal Labor Relations Authority; (d) the creation of a Senior Executive Service (SES), a quasi-rank-based corps that was more flexible and mobile than the former supergrades (grades 16–18); (e) a merit and bonus pay system for GS grades 13–15; and (f) the mandate of performance appraisal systems in the various agencies.

8. Class series and occupational series are used interchangeably. Both refer to a normal progression pattern that can be followed by employees, sometimes designated by a roman numeral (secretary I, II, III, IV) and sometimes by a traditional management series (lead worker, foreman, supervisor, manager).

9. Usage of the term task varies. Here the term task means broad activities such as (to use the upcoming example for a payroll clerk) processing time sheets, printing the payroll, and deducting appropriate expenses such as taxes. Another common usage (seen in Exhibit 5.8) for the term task is as a synonym for “step performed.” For example, paying payroll taxes requires the use of different exemptions, distinguishing between salary and reimbursements, and controlling and paying out from a separate tax account. These subtasks are here referred to as “job elements.”

10. Depending on the position and the individual, such physical, manual, or special requirements may require a reasonable accommodation.

11. Because there is a range in the market, the organization must decide whether it wants to be in the middle of the range, at the top, or at the bottom. This is commonly referred to as the “meet, lead, or lag” question (Chapter 6). Because most governments are labor cost–intensive, small differences can be important in terms of budget outlays.

12. These are the general categories for the well-known Hay system.

13. On the other hand, in larger jurisdictions, job evaluation of individual job classes or class series is often constant. This helps with currency but generally leads to inconsistency in the long term in the absence of occasional pay studies to rationalize the overall system.
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