PLACER COUNTY
PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT
145 Fulweiler Avenue, Suite 200
Auburn. California 95603-4578

**CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**
John Costa
Ron Le Doux
Don Nelson
Andrae Randolph
Rick Ward

# MEMORANDUM

Lori Walsh, Director
Main Office: 530.889.4060
FAX: 530.886.4626
www.placer.ca.gov

**To:** Board of Supervisors
**From:** Civil Service Commission
**By:** Lori Walsh, Personnel Director
**Date:** May 19, 2015
**Subject:** Introduction of an Ordinance to the Allocations of Positions to Departments resulting from the Information Technology Classification Study

---

**Action Requested**

1) Introduction of an ordinance, waive the first reading, amending the un-codified Allocations of Positions to Departments ordinance regarding information technology related classifications.

2) Introduction of an un-codified ordinance, waive the first reading, amending the Classified Service – Schedule of Classifications, Salary Plan and Grade ordinance modifying allocated positions related to information technology classifications.

**Background**

At their meeting held April 13, 2015, the Civil Service Commission approved:

1. Revisions to the classification specifications for the following classifications:

- Geographic Information System Analyst I/II
- Geographic Information System Technician I/II
- Information Technology Analyst I/II
- Information Technology Analyst Senior
- Information Technology Supervisor
- Information Technology Technician I/II
- Technology Solutions Analyst II
- Technology Solutions Analyst Senior

2. Abolishment of the following classifications:

- Information Technology Technician - Senior
- Technology Solutions Analyst I
- Telecommunications Technician I/II

3. The administrative placement of the incumbents into the recommended classifications, pursuant to Placer County Code section 3.08.480, with the exception of eight (8) employees who submitted formal appeals prior to the published appeal deadline and will have their appeal heard at a later date.

**Basis for Recommendation**

Information technology (IT) classifications were previously studied and updated in 2002. Over the years, the field of information technology has evolved tremendously, as have the needs of County departments and the roles and responsibilities of various IT staff. Any recommendations to update class specifications or reclassify positions have been reviewed by the IT review panel, comprised of specific information technology specialists from various departments in order to maintain consistency and continuity Countywide.

In October 2013 Placer County entered into a contract with CPS-HR Consulting to undertake a county-wide classification and organizational study involving all information technology related classifications, as well as any non-technology positions in departments that were performing technology related tasks for their assigned unit. The primary goal of the study was to identify the appropriate classification structure and optimal organizational structure for information technology classifications across the County, identify current service level requirements and best practices, and to develop updated class specifications to better reflect current services, technology, and job functions.

The classification study encompassed one hundred thirty nine (139) positions allocated to the nineteen (19) IT specific classifications. Of these, one hundred twenty (120) are currently filled and nineteen (19) are vacant. Staff from the IT division of Administrative Services, CEO, and Personnel worked closely with the consultant to facilitate the desired outcomes listed above. Management staff from County departments were also included in discussions regarding technology related needs and services as they relate to the current classification structure in order to identify potential improvements.

Per classification industry standards, the following factors were considered during the analysis when drafting class specifications and allocating individual positions:

- duties and responsibilities currently assigned;
- knowledge and abilities required to perform essential duties;
- supervision exercised and received;
- independence of decision making/authority;
- consequence of error;
- person to person contacts in the normal course and scope of work.

Because classification analysis is based on the work currently assigned and performed for each position, the following were not considered when making recommendations:

- duties performed occasionally or those not considered essential or critical;
- volume of work;
- employee job performance;
- personality/interpersonal skills;
- efficiency at performing job tasks;
- personal qualifications exceeding current job duty requirements;
- longevity/history with the County;
- prior work experience or assignments that were at a higher level.

*Methodology*

The classification analysis was completed using the following process:

- CPS staff, IT division management staff, and Personnel staff conducted multiple orientation sessions all affected employees to discuss the process, review Position Inventory Questionnaires (PIQ's) and answer any questions as part of the project initiation and kick off.

- Staff completed and submitted pre populated PIQ's. Content of the PIQ's was based on information technology industry standards grouped by service area/job function, information from current County class specifications, and feedback/input from the County's IT Review Committee. Completed PIQ's were reviewed by immediate supervisors as well as management staff, and then submitted electronically directly to the Consultant for review and analysis.

- CPS consultant staff met individually with all participants requesting a follow up interview as well as a representative sample of affected staff across class levels, assigned departments, and work locations. These meetings either took place individually or as a group, with just under 60% of employees interviewed. Any follow up questions or issues regarding information contained in the PIQ's was discussed with staff either in person or over the phone by CPS staff.

- Class plan structure and class plan concepts were drafted and reviewed with County Executive's Office staff, Personnel staff, IT Division management, and the IT Review Committee. Following this review, draft class specifications were also reviewed, with the opportunity for updates/changes to language included in the class specifications.

- Based on the classification plan structure and information contained in the draft class specifications, the IT review panel drafted position study checklists to consider when responding to individual allocation study requests after implementation.

- Based on the information contained in the PIQ's and feedback received during the follow up meetings with incumbents and supervisory/management staff, draft allocation recommendations were submitted to the Personnel Department and the IT division for initial review.

- Due to a reorganization that occurred in the IT division in May of 2014, management staff expressed concern that the information contained in the PIQ's was no longer current or reflective of employees' scope of work. Therefore, additional information was submitted to the consultant for review to determine whether allocation recommendations needed to be updated. As a result of this review new allocation recommendations were submitted to the County in the fall of 2014.

- Personnel staff met with management personnel from each department to review allocation recommendations for their specific positions, which included an overview of the study results, criteria considered in making allocation recommendations, and any budgetary implications of these recommendations. Additional information was then provided by management staff regarding position requirements and follow up discussions were scheduled with consultant staff and managers as requested in order to clarify updated position scope and respond to any follow up questions or concerns.

- All employees included in the study were notified of the consultant's allocation recommendation and provided with a copy of the draft class specification for their position. Per County code, each employee was given the opportunity to review and comment on the recommendations. For those staff who had questions as to the allocation and review process, Personnel staff held informational meetings out at work sites and responded to questions as they arose.

- All feedback forms submitted as a result of the employee review process, along with comments from immediate supervisors and managers, were submitted for further review and analysis to the consultant.

- Based on information contained in the PIQ's, follow up information obtained from incumbents, supervisors, and managers, and information in the employee feedback forms, a final classification report, including final allocation recommendations and revised/updated class specifications incorporating suggested/updated language, was submitted by the consultant to the Personnel department.

- Outcomes included the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of employees with no changes/title changes only | 93 |
| Number of changes | 26 |
| • Number of promotions | 17 |
| • Number of transfers | 7 |
| • Number of demotions/y-rates | 2 |

*Results & Recommendations*

Overall, the current structure for management and supervisory classifications still appears to be appropriate, with minor updates to language recommended. However, additional changes were recommended to the non-management and technical classifications in order to better reflect the actual work performed and distinguish each job family from the others. Since the original class study in 2002, many jobs at the non-management level have evolved based on service needs and advancements in information technology. Furthermore, information technology services have shifted and reorganized over the past

As a result of an analysis of current position requirements and work flow, overall findings and recommendations are summarized below.

1. Update language on class specifications to more clearly reflect the work performed and current technology used in order to better facilitate recruitment efforts and remain consistent with industry best practices and standards.

- Given the broad range of assignments, each of the primary areas of assignment within the Information Technology Analyst classification are described in order to clarify job requirements and facilitate recruitment efforts at this level.

- Outdated functions and terminology were replaced with language which more accurately reflects the work being performed.

2. Consolidate classifications where the duties and responsibilities of the work assigned are sufficiently similar in scope and complexity.

- There was significant overlap on the allocation factors between the Telecommunications series and the Information Technology Technician I/II series. Absorbing the telecommunications function into the broader IT series allows for greater flexibility and is consistent with the County's broad classification structure.

- The possibility of combining the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) job family with the Information Technology job family was also explored, but the work performed and skill set required for Geographic Information Systems is so specialized that employees would not be able to rotate in and out of GIS without specific training and experience in this area. Therefore, this job family was kept separate to reflect substantially different job functions and requirements.

3. Provide clearer distinctions among the different classifications and the levels within each classification series.

- Additional language in the Distinguishing Characteristics section of each class specification was included to provide information regarding the differences between each classification and the classifications directly above and below them.

- Over the years there has been some overlap between the Technology Solutions Analyst and the IT Analyst series as departments have reorganized and information technology services have been re-centralized. Redefining the Technology Solutions Analyst I/II as a single-level Specialist classification more accurately clarifies the type and level of work performed, as anyone assigned to this classification would be expected to perform at the full journey level. While assignments within this class may vary depending on assignment, incumbents must be able to provide a wide variety of services to their customers and requiring detailed or specialized knowledge in one or more particular applications.

- There currently does not appear to be a need for a Senior level IT Technician. Incumbents studied were either working at the technical or specialist level, with lead responsibilities assigned at the higher level. Therefore it was recommended that the senior level technician class be abolished.

*Employee Review*

As provided by Chapter 3, Section 3.08.520, each study participant has had an opportunity to review the both the study's final recommendations for his/her position and has been notified of the opportunity to appeal the recommendation to your Commission specifically for his/her position. A total of eight (8) requests to appeal were received by the stated deadline. These appeals will be reviewed by the Commission at a future meeting. No changes will be made to these positions until the appeal

**Fiscal Impact**
Reclassification of the IT classifications will result in an annual increased cost of $67,381.00 which will be absorbed by the respective departments.

Attachments:
Attachment 1 - Ordinance

# Before the Board of Supervisors
# County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of:

Ord. No: _____

An ordinance amending the Classified and Unclassified Schedule of Classifications, Salary Plan and Grade Ordinance and the un-codified Allocation of Positions to Department Ordinance as a result of the Countywide Information Technology classification study.

First Reading: _____

The following Ordinance was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held _____ by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

_____
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

_____
Clerk of said Board

---

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer, State of California, does hereby ordain as follows:

(Additions to ordinance shown in bold and underlined, deletions shown with strike-through.)

That the Classified Service – Schedule of Classifications, Salary Plan and Grade Ordinance and the un-codified Allocation of Positions to Department Ordinance are hereby amended as follows:

**Section 1.** That the Classified Service – Schedule of Classifications, Salary Plan and Grade Ordinance is hereby amended to read as follows:

| JOB CODE | CLASSIFICATION TITLE | SALARY ADMIN PLAN | GRADE |
|---|---|---|---|
| ~~15703~~ | ~~Telecommunications Technician I~~ | ~~GNRL~~ | ~~94~~ |
| ~~15703~~ | ~~Telecommunications Technician II~~ | ~~GNRL~~ | ~~106~~ |
| ~~15708~~ | ~~Information Technology Technician – Senior~~ | ~~GNRL~~ | ~~112~~ |
| ~~15710~~ | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I~~ | ~~PROF~~ | ~~238~~ |
| 15711 | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst II~~<br>**Information Technology Specialist** | PROF | 230 |
| 15722 | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst – Senior~~<br>**Information Technology Specialist - Senior** | PROF | 238 |

**Section 2.**

That the un-codified Allocation of Positions to Departments Ordinance is hereby amended to read as follows:

| **ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **(a)** | **Administrative Services** | |
| | | Information Technology Analyst I/II | ~~25~~ **18** |
| | | Information Technology Analyst - Senior | ~~9~~ **11** |
| | | Information Technology Supervisor | ~~5~~ **6** |
| | | Technology Solutions Analyst I/II* | ~~12~~ **3** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst – Senior~~ | ~~4~~ **0** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | **13** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist – Senior** | **4** |
| | **(c)** | **Telecommunication Services** | |
| | | Administrative Technician | ~~1~~ **0** |
| | | Information Technology Analyst I/II | ~~11~~ **9** |
| | | Information Technology Analyst - Senior | ~~3~~ **5** |
| | | Information Technology Technician I/II | ~~1~~ **3** |
| | | ~~Telecommunications Technician I/II~~ | ~~1~~ **0** |

*Pending appeal to CSC June 2015

| ASSESSOR | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Information Technology Analyst I/II** | | **1** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst - Senior~~ | ~~2~~ | **0** |

| AUDITOR | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Information Technology Analyst I/II** | | **2** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst – Senior~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |

| CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Information Technology Technician I/II** | | **1** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Information Technology Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst – Senior~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |

| COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE AGENCY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(a)** | **Administration** | | |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **3** |
| | | Geographic Information System Tech I/II | ~~1~~ | **2** |
| | | ~~Geographic Information Systems Technician - Senior~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst – Senior~~ | ~~2~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |

| COUNTY CLERK RECORDER | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Information Technology Technician I/II | ~~1~~ | **3** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **2** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist – Senior** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Information Technology Technician - Senior~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~2~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst - Senior~~ | ~~2~~ | **0** |

| DISTRICT ATTORNEY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **2** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~2~~ | **0** |

| FACILITY SERVICES | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | **Administration & Management** | | |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | (g) | **Environmental Utilities** | | |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |

| PERSONNEL | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | **Personnel** | | |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist - Senior** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst - Senior~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | (b) | **Employee Benefits** | | |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |

| PROBATION | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | **Probation Office** | | |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist - Senior** | | **1** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **1** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst – Senior~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |

| SHERIFF | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (b) | **Sheriff Administration and Support** | | |
| | | **Information Technology Analyst - Senior** | | **1** |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | | **2** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst - Senior~~ | ~~1~~ | **0** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~2~~ | **0** |

| TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | **Treasurer- Tax Collector** | |
| | | **Information Technology Specialist** | **1** |
| | | ~~Technology Solutions Analyst I/II~~ | ~~1~~ **0** |

**Section 3**. That this ordinance shall be effective the first day of the pay period 30 days following adoption.

**Section 4**. That this ordinance amendment is adopted as an un-codified ordinance.