

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE PROJECT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT SPONSORS



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



SPUR

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

NOV - 7 1979

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

September 21, 1979

Hon. Dianne Feinstein
Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Mayor Feinstein:

Attached is our final report and recommendations for the Senior Executive Service project. The report has been reviewed extensively by an advisory committee chaired by Rudy Nothenberg of your office and John Jacobs, Executive Director of SPUR. In addition, it has been modified in response to comments from Department heads who would be affected if the recommendations are implemented.

As you know, a Charter amendment authorizing the Civil Service Commission to establish a Senior Executive Service will appear on this November's ballot (Proposition B). This measure will permit the detailed regulations and procedures for SES to be established by rule, after full public hearings and "meet and confer" sessions with the appropriate employee organizations.

Our report outlines a comprehensive system of Civil Service rules and classifications for the City's top management positions. It is more than a simple reclassification of existing jobs. Fundamental changes are proposed in every aspect of personnel management including eligibility, selection, performance standards and evaluation, promotion, compensation, consequences of poor performance and career development.

As Mayor, you realize that the demand for city services can only be met by increasing expenditures or improving management. Since the former seems unlikely, it is imperative that the City deal forcefully with the need for better management.

At the first meeting of the SES Advisory Committee, we agreed on an overall objective for the project: "appoint competent top managers, give them the authority to do their jobs, develop standards of measuring their performance, reward them if they meet the standards and fire them if they don't." The Senior Executive Service is designed to provide a framework for achieving this objective in San Francisco.

Very truly yours,

Touche Ross & Co.

≡ REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

of the Advisory Commission on the

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE:

A NEW SYSTEM OF CIVIL SERVICE RULES AND CLASSIFICATIONS
FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S TOP MANAGEMENT POSITIONS

Touche Ross & Co.

SEPTEMBER, 1979

CONTENTS

- I BACKGROUND
- II DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROPOSAL
- III TRANSITION TO A SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE (SES)
- IV PROPOSED SES CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM
- V POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES

APPENDICES

- I PROFILE OF THE CITY'S TOP MANAGERS
- II PROFILE OF THE CITY'S TOP POSITIONS
- III REVIEW OF PRACTICES IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS
- IV PRESENT CIVIL SERVICE RULES AND PROCEDURES
- V DESCRIPTION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS (LEVELS I-VI)
- VI DESCRIPTION OF SES FUNCTIONAL GROUPINGS
- VII PRELIMINARY LISTING AND PROPOSED RECLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS
TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE
- VIII CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITION B - NOVEMBER, 1979 BALLOT)
- IX BALLOT ARGUMENTS ON PROPOSITION B (PRO AND CON)

BACKGROUND

- THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TOP MANAGEMENT IN SAN FRANCISCO CITY GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN SEVERELY HAMPERED BY:
 - UNWIELDY, INFLEXIBLE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS ESTABLISHED IN ORDINANCES AND THE CITY CHARTER
 - PERSONNEL POLICIES WHICH DO LITTLE TO SUPPORT OR ENCOURAGE MANAGERIAL EXCELLENCE
- SPECIFIC LEGAL PROBLEMS INCLUDE LIMITATIONS ON:
 - ELIGIBILITY. UNTIL RECENTLY, OUTSIDE APPLICANTS HAVE BEEN BARRED FROM COMPETITION FOR MOST NON-EXEMPT POSITIONS
 - SELECTION. THE RULE OF THREE SERIOUSLY LIMITS THE POOL FROM WHICH TOP MANAGERS MAY BE SELECTED
 - MOBILITY. MANAGERS CANNOT EASILY TRANSFER FROM ONE DEPARTMENT TO ANOTHER, ALTHOUGH THE SKILLS REQUIRED MAY BE SIMILAR

- PROMOTION. THE RATE OF ADVANCEMENT IS STRICTLY LIMITED, MAKING IT EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO REWARD GOOD PERFORMANCE
- COMPENSATION. PAY FOR MANY POSITIONS IS NOT COMPETITIVE AND DOES NOT REWARD SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE
- TERMINATION. PROCEDURES FOR REMOVING MANAGEMENT-LEVEL PERSONNEL ARE COMPLEX AND RARELY UTILIZED, EXCEPT IN CASES OF GROSS MISCONDUCT

● IN ADDITION, CITY PERSONNEL PRACTICES HAVE IMPEDED THE DEVELOPMENT OF:

- TRAINING. UNTIL RECENTLY, MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL RECEIVED LITTLE OR NO TRAINING IN MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES
- PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. ALTHOUGH A RUDIMENTARY EVALUATION SYSTEM WAS IMPLEMENTED SEVERAL YEARS AGO, PERSONNEL DECISIONS ARE MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO AN EMPLOYEE'S PERFORMANCE RECORD
- CAREER DEVELOPMENT. TO DEVELOP EFFECTIVE MANAGERIAL SKILLS, PROMISING MIDDLE-LEVEL EMPLOYEES MUST HAVE THE ABILITY TO WORK IN A WIDE RANGE OF POSITIONS WITHIN ONE OR MORE DEPARTMENTS; NO MECHANISM EXISTS AT PRESENT TO PERMIT THIS TYPE OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CITY GOVERNMENT
- DECENTRALIZED PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT. ALL DECISIONS REGARDING NON-EXEMPT MANAGEMENT POSITIONS ARE MADE CENTRALLY, BY THE CITY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, LIMITING THE CONTROL EXERCISED BY TOP MANAGERS OVER THEIR OWN DEPARTMENTS

DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROPOSAL

- THE PROPOSAL FOR A SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE WAS DEVELOPED AS A JOINT PROJECT OF SPUR (SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING AND URBAN RESEARCH ASSOCIATION) AND THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR.
- RESEARCH AND POLICY ANALYSIS WAS PROVIDED BY THE MANAGEMENT CONSULTING FIRM OF TOUCHE ROSS & CO., WITH FUNDING FROM THE U.S. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT (FORMERLY U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION).
- THE PROPOSAL WAS REVIEWED AND CRITIQUED BY AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF:
 - ROGER BOAS, CAO
 - RUDY NOTHENBERG, MAYOR'S OFFICE
 - JOHN JACOBS, SPUR
 - DARREL SALOMON, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
 - LOUISE RENNE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 - RICHARD SKLAR, PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 - JOHN WALSH, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
 - TOM MALLOY, RECREATION & PARK DEPARTMENT
 - GEORGE NEWKIRK, MUNICIPAL RAILWAY
 - PETER HENSCHER, MAYOR'S FIRM PROJECT
 - VINCE COURTNEY, LOCAL 400
 - DENNIS BOUEY, PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
 - PAT JACKSON, CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION
 - JAMES LAZARUS, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
 - ROBERTA BORGONOVO, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

TRANSITION TO A SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

- AS THE FIRST STEP IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SES, THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION WILL ESTABLISH DETAILED GUIDELINES TO ASSIST DEPARTMENTS IN CONVERTING THEIR MANAGEMENT POSITIONS TO THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.
- AS A PRE-REQUISITE, ALL PARTICIPATING DEPARTMENTS MUST COMPLETE THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES THROUGH THE MAYOR'S FIRM PROJECT. UNLESS SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDED (SEE APPENDIX VII) ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS WILL BE REQUIRED TO PARTICIPATE IN SES; A DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE WILL BE PREPARED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.
- DEPARTMENT HEADS WILL PREPARE AN SES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THEIR DEPARTMENT, CONSISTING OF THE MANAGEMENT POSITIONS TO BE INCLUDED AND THE LEVELS AND FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS FOR THOSE POSITIONS. THE SES CLASS AND LEVEL FOR THE DEPARTMENT HEAD WILL BE SET IN ADVANCE BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.
- THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND, IF ACCEPTABLE, WILL BE APPROVED ON AN INTERIM BASIS.
- DURING THE FIRST 90 DAYS OF IMPLEMENTATION, EACH DEPARTMENT HEAD AND SENIOR EXECUTIVE WILL AGREE ON A SET OF SPECIFIC STANDARDS TO BE USED TO EVALUATE HIS OR HER PERFORMANCE DURING THE COMING YEAR. A DIFFERENT SET OF STANDARDS WILL BE DEVELOPED FOR EACH POSITION AND WILL SUPPORT THE DEPARTMENTAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES ESTABLISHED THROUGH THE FIRM PROJECT.
- TWO LEVELS OF STANDARDS WILL BE AGREED UPON:
 - MINIMUM STANDARDS: THE RESULTS THAT MUST BE OBTAINED TO ACHIEVE A SATISFACTORY RATING

- IF A MANAGER AND A DEPARTMENT HEAD CANNOT AGREE ON A SET OF STANDARDS, THE POINTS OF DISPUTE WILL BE RESOLVED BY A HEARING OFFICER SELECTED BY BOTH PARTIES FROM A LIST OF OFFICERS APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION. THE DECISION OF THE HEARING OFFICER WILL BE BINDING UPON BOTH PARTIES.
- AT THE END OF THIS 90 DAY PERIOD, DEPARTMENT HEADS WILL BE PERMITTED TO AMEND THEIR INTERIM IMPLEMENTATION PLANS - SUBJECT TO CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REVIEW. IF NO CHANGES ARE MADE, INTERIM PLANS WILL BE AUTOMATICALLY ADOPTED; FINAL REVIEW WILL BE PROVIDED FOR ALL OTHER PLANS AT THIS TIME.
- ONCE AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN HAS BEEN APPROVED, A SECOND 30 DAY PERIOD WILL BEGIN DURING WHICH MANAGERS IN SES-DESIGNATED POSITIONS WILL BE ASKED TO DECIDE IF THEY WISH TO JOIN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE OR REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT CIVIL SERVICE POSITION AND CLASSIFICATION. PERSONS WHO JOIN AT THIS TIME WILL NOT CHANGE THEIR CIVIL SERVICE STATUS (E.G., PERMANENT, TEMPORARY) AND WILL NOT BE REQUIRED TO SERVE A PROBATION PERIOD.
- PERSONS REMAINING IN THEIR PRESENT CLASS WILL CONTINUE TO BE PAID BY FORMULA, AS PROVIDED BY CITY ORDINANCE. PERSONS JOINING THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE WILL BE PAID BY FORMULA DURING THEIR FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE. IN THE SECOND AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS, SUPERIOR MANAGERS WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR ANNUAL RAISES GEARED TO THE PRECEDING YEAR'S SALARY (E.G., 15% ANNUAL INCREASE). MANAGERS PERFORMING BELOW MINIMUM STANDARDS COULD RECEIVE NO INCREASE IN SALARY.
- PERSONS REMAINING IN THEIR PRESENT CLASS WHO DO NOT MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS WILL BE SUBJECT TO TERMINATION FOR CAUSE AT ANY TIME, AS IS CURRENTLY PROVIDED BY CHARTER (SECTION 8.341).

- MANAGERS WHO JOIN THE SES AND PERFORM BELOW MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS WILL BE DEMOTED TO THEIR PRECEDING POSITION. DEMOTED EMPLOYEES WILL HAVE THE RIGHT TO "BUMP" ANOTHER EMPLOYEE SERVING IN HIS OR HER OLD POSITION AND CLASSIFICATION, BUT WILL BE REQUIRED TO SERVE A PROBATION PERIOD IN THE LOWER LEVEL POSITION. PERFORMANCE BELOW MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR A DEMOTED EMPLOYEE WILL RESULT IN DISMISSAL AND REMOVAL FROM THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.
- PROMOTIONS FOR ALL SENIOR MANAGERS WILL REQUIRE ENTRY INTO THE SES. WHEN AN INCUMBENT ELECTS TO RETAIN HIS OR HER CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION, THE POSITION WILL BE CONVERTED TO SES AS SOON AS IT IS VACATED. ANY PERSON INTERESTED IN BEING PROMOTED TO THAT POSITION MUST ENTER THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE THROUGH A COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION OR THROUGH PROMOTION FROM A LOWER LEVEL SES JOB.
- LISTS OF ELIGIBLES FOR CLASSES INCLUDED IN THE SES WILL BE CONSOLIDATED, FORMING A SINGLE LIST FOR EACH SES CLASSIFICATION. AT THE EXPIRATION DATE OF EACH EXISTING LIST, CANDIDATES WILL BE DROPPED FROM THE SES LIST UNLESS THEY HAVE BEEN FOUND QUALIFIED IN A NEW EXAMINATION FOR THAT CLASSIFICATION.
- LISTS WILL BE "AUGMENTED" FROM TWO SOURCES: CANDIDATES WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE A COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION AND SES INCUMBENTS WHO RECEIVE A SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS. THUS, SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE WILL LEAD AUTOMATICALLY TO THE APPOINTMENT OF SES MANAGERS TO THE NEXT HIGHER LIST IN HIS OR HER CURRENT FUNCTIONAL GROUPING, WITHOUT THE NEED TO TAKE AN EXAMINATION.

- SES INCUMBENTS WILL BE PERMITTED TO TAKE ANY EXAMINATION FOR A NEXT HIGHER CLASSIFICATION AFTER THREE YEARS IN AN SES POSITION (I.E., CAN COMPETE IN EXAMINATIONS FOR ANY OF THE SEVEN FUNCTIONAL GROUPS ONCE THEY HAVE MET THE EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS). SES EMPLOYEES WHO RECEIVE A SATISFACTORY RATING IN TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS CAN TAKE ANY EXAM AFTER TWO YEARS. OUTSIDE APPLICANTS WILL BE REQUIRED TO HAVE THREE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN AN SES-EQUIVALENT POSITION PRIOR TO TAKING AN EXAMINATION AND MAY BE REQUIRED TO HAVE SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EXPERIENCE. THE CLASSES ELIGIBLE TO TAKE SES LEVEL I EXAMINATIONS WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AFTER A REVIEW OF EXISTING PROMOTIONAL LINES.
- THE APPOINTING OFFICER WILL BE PERMITTED TO FILL A VACANCY WITH ANYONE ON AN SES LIST.
- PERSONS WHO DO NOT CHOOSE TO ENTER THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE DURING THIS 30 DAY PERIOD, AND LATER DECIDE TO JOIN, WILL BE REQUIRED TO COMPETE IN AN OPEN EXAMINATION. THE EMPLOYEE MAY KEEP HIS OR HER JOB WITHOUT FURTHER TESTING, AS LONG AS PERFORMANCE IS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER. A SUMMARY OF THE KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SES AND NON-SES STATUS IS PROVIDED IN EXHIBIT A.

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SES AND
NON-SES CIVIL SERVICE STATUS

<u>KEY PROVISIONS</u>	<u>NON-SES STATUS</u>	<u>SES STATUS</u>
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	REQUIRED FOR ALL MANAGEMENT POSITIONS	REQUIRED FOR ALL SES POSITIONS
FAILURE TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS	RESULTS IN DISMISSAL (PER CHARTER SECTION 8.341) SUBJECT TO EXISTING APPEAL PROCEDURES	RESULTS IN DEMOTION TO PREVIOUS POSITION, SUBJECT TO LIMITED APPEAL
COMPENSATION	SET BY FORMULA (NO CHANGE IN PRESENT PROCEDURES)	SET BY FORMULA IN FIRST YEAR; SALARY INCREASES AFTER THAT DEPEND ON PERFORMANCE
	SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE HAS NO IMPACT ON SALARY	SIGNIFICANT INCREASES (E.G., 15% IN ONE YEAR) PROVIDED FOR SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE
	PERFORMANCE BELOW MINIMUM STANDARDS HAS NO IMPACT ON SALARY	BELOW AVERAGE OR ZERO INCREASE IN SALARY PROVIDED FOR PERFORMANCE BELOW MINIMUM STANDARDS
PROMOTION	REQUIRES ENTRY INTO SES THROUGH A COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION; ALL SES-DESIGNATED POSITIONS WILL BE CONVERTED TO SES WHEN VACATED	MAY BE PLACED ON AN SES LIST IF RECEIVE SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE RATING IN 2 CONSECUTIVE YEARS OR SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE COMPETITIVE EXAM

PROPOSED SES CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

- AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE WILL BE THE CONSOLIDATION OF 266 MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATIONS, INCLUDING 190 SINGLE POSITION CLASSES, INTO 24 SES CLASSES.
- THE CONSOLIDATION IS DESIGNED TO:
 - EXPAND THE PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SES EMPLOYEES; AN EMPLOYEE WHO IS NOW ELIGIBLE FOR PROMOTION TO ONE OR TWO POSITIONS COULD BE CONSIDERED FOR AS MANY AS 60 POSITIONS FROM A SINGLE LIST OF ELIGIBLES.
 - ENCOURAGE EMPLOYEES TO MOVE BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS DURING THEIR CAREER WITH THE CITY; 89% OF TOP MANAGERS IN SAN FRANCISCO HAVE REMAINED IN THE SAME DEPARTMENT SINCE ENTERING CITY SERVICE.
 - SIMPLIFY THE ADMINISTRATION OF MANAGEMENT POSITIONS; THE NUMBER OF EXAMINATIONS REQUIRED UNDER SES, FOR EXAMPLE, WILL BE HALF OF THE CURRENT NUMBER FOR THE SAME MANAGEMENT JOBS.
- THE SYSTEM OF 24 CLASSIFICATIONS WAS DEVELOPED AFTER A CAREFUL STUDY OF CITY ORGANIZATION CHARTS AND JOB DESCRIPTIONS FOR MANAGEMENT CLASSES.

- THE LOWER-LEVEL SES POSITIONS ARE GROUPED INTO SEVEN FUNCTIONAL AREAS:
 - FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING
 - DATA PROCESSING
 - HEALTH SERVICES
 - POLICY DEVELOPMENT
 - PERSONNEL AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
 - HUMAN SERVICES
 - ENGINEERING AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT
- EACH FUNCTIONAL GROUP IS DIVIDED INTO THREE LEVELS ACCORDING TO SALARY AND RESPONSIBILITY. TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE IS MOST IMPORTANT IN LEVEL ONE POSITIONS, AND MANAGEMENT SKILLS ARE SOMEWHAT LESS IMPORTANT. EACH HIGHER LEVEL INVOLVES GREATER EMPHASIS ON MANAGEMENT ABILITY AND LESS ON TECHNICAL SKILLS.
- AT LEVELS IV, V AND VI - THE HIGHEST CLASSIFICATIONS IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE - TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR MOST POSITIONS. INSTEAD, CANDIDATES WILL BE EVALUATED ON THEIR RELATIVE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE AND ABILITY.
- PROMOTION AND TRANSFER WITHIN THE SES WILL FOLLOW FUNCTIONAL LINES THROUGH LEVEL III, AFTER WHICH PROMOTION WILL BE CITY-WIDE.

- THE PRELIMINARY DESIGNATION OF SES LEVELS AND FUNCTIONAL GROUPS FOR SENIOR MANAGEMENT POSITIONS WAS MADE ON THE BASIS OF SALARY. AN ASSUMPTION WAS MADE THAT DIFFERENCES IN SALARY REFLECT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY. SES CLASSIFICATIONS AND SALARY INFORMATION WERE TRANSCRIBED TO DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION CHARTS AND ADJUSTED AS NEEDED TO PROVIDE AN INTERNALLY CONSISTENT STRUCTURE WITHIN EACH DEPARTMENT.

- THE RECLASSIFICATION RECOMMENDATIONS (SEE APPENDIX VII) HAVE BEEN PREPARED AS A PRELIMINARY GUIDELINE TO DEPARTMENT HEADS. THE FINAL DETERMINATION OF POSITIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE WILL BE MADE BY DEPARTMENT HEADS SUBJECT TO CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REVIEW.

- THE SYSTEM AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED INCLUDES APPROXIMATELY 450 SENIOR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES IN EVERY CITY DEPARTMENT EXCEPT:

- POLICE	- DISTRICT ATTORNEY
- FIRE	- PUBLIC DEFENDER
- COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT	- SHERIFF
- BOARD OF EDUCATION	- SUPERIOR COURT
- REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY	- MUNICIPAL COURT
- HOUSING AUTHORITY	- CALIFORNIA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
- CITY ATTORNEY	- BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- THE POLICE, FIRE AND SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENTS WERE EXCLUDED BECAUSE OF THE SPECIALIZED TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO UNIFORMED PERSONNEL. THE COMMUNITY

COLLEGE DISTRICT AND BOARD OF EDUCATION WERE EXCLUDED BECAUSE THEY OPERATE AS INDEPENDENT ENTITIES FROM THE CITY. THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND HOUSING AUTHORITY ARE CURRENTLY EXCLUDED FROM CIVIL SERVICE AND WOULD CONTINUE ON THAT BASIS. EXECUTIVE POSITIONS IN THE OTHER DEPARTMENTS ARE FILLED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE APPOINTING OFFICER AND HAVE TRADITIONALLY BEEN INDEPENDENT OF CIVIL SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.

- THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT, ONCE THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE IS OPERATING SUCCESSFULLY IN THE OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF THE CITY, THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION SHOULD STUDY THE FEASIBILITY OF INCORPORATING THE EXCLUDED DEPARTMENTS IN SES OR DESIGNING AN SES-TYPE SYSTEM FOR EACH DEPARTMENT.
- CHARTER-EXEMPT MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES ARE INCLUDED IN THE SYSTEM FOR PURPOSES OF SALARY SETTING AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. THE PROPOSED RULES ON ELIGIBILITY, SELECTION AND PENALTIES FOR POOR PERFORMANCE WOULD NOT APPLY TO EXEMPT PERSONNEL SINCE THEY ARE HIRED AND SERVE AT THE PLEASURE OF THE APPOINTING AUTHORITY. ANY EXEMPT EMPLOYEE WOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO TAKE AN EXAMINATION FOR THE NEXT HIGHER CLASSIFICATION IN SES OR TO BE PLACED ON AN SES LIST OF ELIGIBLES THROUGH THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS. ELECTED OFFICIALS ARE INCLUDED IN THE SYSTEM FOR PURPOSES OF SALARY SETTING ONLY.
- A CHART ILLUSTRATING THE ORGANIZATION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS IS PRESENTED IN EXHIBIT B. A SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF POSITIONS, CLASSIFICATIONS AND DEPARTMENTS INCLUDED IN EACH SES CLASS IS PROVIDED IN EXHIBIT C.

EXHIBIT C

SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY LISTING OF POSITIONS
TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

SES Classifications		Estimated*	Est. No. of*	Est. No. of*	Salary Range**	
		No. of Positions	Existing Classi- fications	Departments Involved	Low	High
Finance and accounting	I	8	6	5	\$20,772	\$24,388
Finance and accounting	II	19	9	13	27,192	32,916
Finance and accounting	III	11	10	7	32,474	43,068
Level to be determined		<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	NA	NA
Total finance and accounting		46	33	NA	NA	NA
Data processing	I	3	1	2	26,436	26,436
Data processing	II	4	2	2	35,544	35,544
Data processing	III	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>40,068</u>	<u>40,068</u>
Total data processing		9	4	NA	NA	NA
Health services	I	2	2	1	23,016	23,016
Health services	II	22	10	2	25,320	31,404
Health services	III	<u>16</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>31,236</u>	<u>41,652</u>
Total health services		40	19	NA	NA	NA
Policy development	I	13	5	5	20,488	27,463
Policy development	II	6	5	6	28,392	33,769
Policy development	III	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>36,048</u>	<u>39,312</u>
Total policy development		28	19	NA	NA	NA
Personnel and general administration	I	40	18	21	19,992	28,944
Personnel and general administration	II	26	19	90	25,452	33,228
Personnel and general administration	III	<u>28</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>30,636</u>	<u>41,286</u>
Total personnel and gen- eral administration		94	56	NA	NA	NA
Human services	I	18	7	5	20,880	25,080
Human services	II	38	15	8	25,812	31,876
Human services	III	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>29,634</u>	<u>40,848</u>
Total human services		69	32	NA	NA	NA
Engineering and facil- ity management	I	18	14	8	19,080	26,676
Engineering and facil- ity management	II	38	34	11	26,052	33,384
Engineering and facil- ity management	III	16	19	8	29,076	39,876
Level to be determined		<u>35</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>1</u>	NA	NA
Total engineering and facility management		107	102	NA	NA	NA
Level IV		64	47	29	27,463	51,610
Level V		19	19	16	46,272	58,776
Level VI		<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>55,496</u>	<u>59,352</u>
GRAND TOTAL		<u>478</u>	<u>333</u>	NA	NA	NA

*Final determination to be made by department heads, subject to civil service review.

**Based on maximum annual salary for FY 1978-79.

NA - not applicable

POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES

- THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE WILL BE GOVERNED BY RULES ADOPTED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION UNDER A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL APPEAR ON THE NOVEMBER, 1979 BALLOT.
- THE POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES THAT WILL GUIDE THE OPERATION OF THE SES ARE SUMMARIZED IN THIS SECTION. THE AREAS COVERED INCLUDE:
 - ELGIBIILITY
 - SELECTION
 - PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND EVALUATION
 - PROMOTION
 - COMPENSATION
 - CONSEQUENCES OF POOR PERFORMANCE
 - CAREER DEVELOPMENT
- THE SPECIAL RULES AND PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN THE TRANSITION TO SES ARE SUMMARIZED IN SECTION III OF THIS REPORT.

POLICY

THE POOL OF CANDIDATES SHOULD BE AS BROAD AS POSSIBLE; BARRIERS TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF EXISTING CITY EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE ELIMINATED WHEREVER FEASIBLE.

KEY PRINCIPLES

OPEN TESTING: ALL EXAMINATIONS FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITIONS SHOULD BE OPEN TO OUTSIDE APPLICANTS AS WELL AS CITY EMPLOYEES.

NOTICE OF VACANCIES AND EXAMINATION DATES: AVAILABILITY OF JOBS SHOULD BE PUBLICIZED AS WIDELY AS POSSIBLE (E.G., TO EXECUTIVE RECRUITERS, BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, JOB NEWSLETTERS).

EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS: OUTSIDE APPLICANTS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO HAVE THREE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN A POSITION EQUIVALENT TO THE NEXT LOWER SES CLASSIFICATION IN ORDER TO TAKE AN EXAM. CITY EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE COMPLETED THREE YEARS IN AN SES POSITION SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO TAKE AN EXAMINATION FOR THE NEXT HIGHER LEVEL, EXCEPT THAT EMPLOYEES WHO RECEIVE A SATISFACTORY RATING FOR TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS IN THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO TAKE AN EXAM AFTER TWO YEARS.

TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS: OUTSIDE APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO MEET CERTAIN TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN AN SES EXAM. ANY SES INCUMBENT WHO MEETS THE EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO TAKE ANY EXAM FOR THE NEXT LEVEL IN SES.

SELECTION

POLICY

SELECTION: PROCEDURES SHOULD BE DESIGNED TO PRODUCE THE BEST QUALIFIED CANDIDATES.

KEY PRINCIPLES

DURATION OF LISTS OF ELIGIBLES: LISTS FOR MANAGEMENT POSITIONS SHOULD BE MAINTAINED CONTINUOUSLY AND SHOULD BE AUGMENTED THROUGH EXAMINATIONS AND THE SES PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS.

FREQUENCY OF EXAMINATIONS: EXAMINATIONS FOR SES POSITIONS SHOULD BE GIVEN BI-ANNUALLY OR ANNUALLY AT A MINIMUM.

PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY: CANDIDATES SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO REMAIN ON AN SES LIST FOR UP TO TWO YEARS.

SCORING OF EXAMS: APPLICANTS SHOULD BE EVALUATED BY PLACING THEM IN GENERAL CATEGORIES (E.G., SUPERIOR, SATISFACTORY, NOT ACCEPTABLE) RATHER THAN RANKING THEM BY MEANS OF PRECISE NUMERICAL RATINGS.

SELECTION RULES: A "RULE OF THE LIST" SHOULD GOVERN THE SELECTION OF ALL MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL (I.E., THE APPOINTING OFFICER SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO SELECT ANY CANDIDATE FOUND QUALIFIED BY CIVIL SERVICE OR ELIGIBLE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SES).

SELECTION (CONT'D)

KEY PRINCIPLES

DEVELOPMENT AND CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS: CITY DEPARTMENT HEADS AND TOP MANAGERS (OTHER THAN THE APPOINTING OFFICER) SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF EXAMINATIONS, AND ASSIST ORAL BOARDS AS MEMBERS OR ADVISORS.

DEFINING POSITION REQUIREMENTS: JOB RESPONSIBILITIES AND SPECIAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR MANAGEMENT POSITIONS SHOULD BE DEFINED BY THE DEPARTMENT HEAD, SUBJECT TO CIVIL SERVICE REVIEW.

PROBATION PERIOD: BEFORE BEING PERMANENTLY APPOINTED, EMPLOYEES SHOULD SERVE A 2 YEAR PROBATION PERIOD WHEN THEY ENTER A NEW SES CLASSIFICATION. DURING THIS PERIOD, AN EMPLOYEE COULD BE DEMOTED OR TERMINATED AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO AN APPEAL TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (SEE CONSEQUENCES OF POOR PERFORMANCE FOR A DESCRIPTION OF THESE PROCEDURES).

PERSONNEL FILES: A PERSONNEL FILE ON EACH EMPLOYEE IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED INCLUDING A STATEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, EMPLOYMENT HISTORY (WITHIN THE CITY AND OUTSIDE), A WRITING SAMPLE FROM MATERIALS PREPARED ON THE JOB, A COPY OF ALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORMS AND RATINGS EARNED IN COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS. THIS FILE SHOULD BE FOR THE CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD AND ANY APPOINTING OFFICER CONSIDERING AN EMPLOYEE FOR APPOINTMENT.

POLICIES

DEPARTMENT STANDARDS: EACH DEPARTMENT SHOULD DEVELOP SPECIFIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES THROUGH THE MAYOR'S FIRM PROJECT.

POSITION STANDARDS: AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH CALENDAR YEAR, DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD DEVELOP MEASURABLE STANDARDS FOR EACH MANAGEMENT POSITION THAT SUPPORT DEPARTMENTAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. THE STANDARDS SHOULD BE AGREED UPON IN ADVANCE BY THE AFFECTED MANAGER AND THE DEPARTMENT HEAD.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: THE ACTUAL PERFORMANCE OF MANAGERS SHOULD BE COMPARED WITH THE STANDARDS AT THE END OF EACH YEAR. THE RESULTS OF THIS EVALUATION SHOULD IMPACT PROMOTIONS AND COMPENSATION.

KEY PRINCIPLES

POSITION STANDARDS: OBJECTIVES FOR EACH MANAGER SHOULD BE STATED IN TERMS OF RESULTS (NOT PROCESS OR ACTIVITIES) AND SHOULD BE SPECIFIC, MEASURABLE, AND DATED. TWO LEVELS OF STANDARDS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED FOR EACH POSITION: MINIMUM STANDARDS THAT MUST BE ACHIEVED TO OBTAIN A SATISFACTORY RATING AND GOALS FOR SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE THAT MUST BE ACHIEVED TO OBTAIN A SUPERIOR RATING. WHERE POSSIBLE, THE VIEWS OF SUBORDINATES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE (E.G., EMPLOYEE ATTITUDE SURVEYS).

REVIEW OF POSITION STANDARDS: THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION STAFF SHOULD PERIODICALLY REVIEW SELECTED POSITION STANDARDS TO DETERMINE IF THEY ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE. IF A MANAGER AND A DEPARTMENT HEAD CANNOT AGREE ON A SET OF STANDARDS, THE POINTS OF DISPUTE SHOULD BE RESOLVED BY A HEARING OFFICER SELECTED BY BOTH PARTIES FROM A LIST OF OFFICERS APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION. THE DECISION OF THE HEARING OFFICER SHOULD BE BINDING UPON BOTH PARTIES.

KEY PRINCIPLES

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD MEET WITH EACH MANAGER AT THE END OF THE CALENDAR YEAR TO REVIEW HIS OR HER PERFORMANCE AND PREPARE A WRITTEN EVALUATION. THE RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO APPEAL BEYOND THE DEPARTMENT HEAD LEVEL. SPACE SHOULD BE PROVIDED ON THE EVALUATION FORM FOR EMPLOYEES TO RECORD POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT WITH THE EVALUATION. RATING CATEGORIES (E.G., SUPERIOR, SATISFACTORY, NOT ACCEPTABLE) SHOULD BE THE SAME AS THOSE USED IN COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.

STANDARDIZATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS: A COMMITTEE OF DEPARTMENT HEADS AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION STAFF SHOULD REVIEW ALL EVALUATION RESULTS AND SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND ADVISE DEPARTMENT HEADS WHEN THERE IS A QUESTION ABOUT THE FAIRNESS OF THE EVALUATION. THE COMMENTS OF THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE EVALUATION OF EACH DEPARTMENT HEAD BUT SHOULD BE ADVISORY ONLY.

TRAINING REQUIREMENTS: IN ADDITION TO ACHIEVING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES, PARTICIPATION IN TRAINING PROGRAMS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING EACH MANAGER'S PERFORMANCE.

DEPARTMENT HEADS: HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS REPORTING TO THE MAYOR SHOULD BE EVALUATED BY THE MAYOR OR A DESIGNEE (E.G., PRESIDENT OF THE APPROPRIATE BOARD OR COMMISSION). HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS REPORTING TO THE CAO SHOULD BE EVALUATED BY THE CAO. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION SHOULD INCLUDE EFFECTIVENESS IN SETTING STANDARDS AND EVALUATING MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE AS WELL AS MEETING OVERALL DEPARTMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.

POLICY

MANAGEMENT SALARIES SHOULD BE COMPETITIVE, EQUITABLE AND USED TO REWARD SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE.

KEY PRINCIPLES

SALARY CONTROLS: THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION SHOULD ESTABLISH THREE TYPES OF CONTROLS OVER MANAGEMENT SALARIES:

- A SALARY RANGE, BASED ON AN ANNUAL SALARY SURVEY, ESTABLISHING THE MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM SALARY THAT MAY BE PAID FOR EACH CLASSIFICATION;
- THE MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE GROWTH THAT MAY OCCUR IN TOTAL SES SALARIES FOR A DEPARTMENT FROM ONE YEAR TO THE NEXT; AND
- THE MAXIMUM ANNUAL INCREASE IN SALARY (E.G., 15%) THAT MAY BE PAID TO ANY INDIVIDUAL SES EMPLOYEE.

SALARY GROWTH: THE MAYOR AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHOULD DETERMINE, AS PART OF THE ANNUAL BUDGETARY PROCESS, THE TOTAL AMOUNT TO BE PAID FOR SES SALARIES (CITY-WIDE). THIS AMOUNT SHOULD AT LEAST EQUAL THE AMOUNT THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN PAID TO SES EMPLOYEES IF THEY HAD BEEN COMPENSATED BY FORMULA. ANY SALARY SAVINGS REQUIRED OF SES EMPLOYEES SHOULD NOT EXCEED THAT FOR ALL CIVIL SERVICE CLASSES COMBINED.

REVIEW OF SALARY RANGES: THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHOULD APPROVE OR REJECT THE RECOMMENDED MINIMUMS AND MAXIMUMS FOR SALARIES PAID TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES (NO CHANGE IN CURRENT PRACTICE).

KEY PRINCIPLES

SALARY RECOMMENDATION: DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD DETERMINE SALARY INCREASES (INCLUDING A ZERO INCREASE) FOR MANAGERS BASED ON ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS, EXCEPT THAT A MANAGER'S SALARY SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED FROM THE PRECEDING YEAR'S LEVEL. AS LONG AS THE INCREASE IN SES SALARIES FOR A DEPARTMENT IS WITHIN THE GUIDELINES DESCRIBED ABOVE, IMPLEMENTATION SHOULD REQUIRE NO OUTSIDE REVIEW AND SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO APPEAL.

MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT FUND: THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHOULD ESTABLISH A MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT FUND TO BE USED BY MANAGERS FOR TRAINING, PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIPS, ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCES, SUBSCRIPTIONS TO PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS AND RELATED PURPOSES. THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION SHOULD OVERSEE THE EXPENDITURE OF THE FUNDS UNDER GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE FUND SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AS A PERCENTAGE OF SES SALARIES (E.G., 1%), AND EACH MANAGER SHOULD BE REIMBURSED FOR ALLOWABLE EXPENSES UP TO THE PERCENTAGE CEILING (E.G., FOR A \$40,000 POSITION, \$400).

DEPARTMENT HEADS: SALARY INCREASES FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED BY THE MAYOR OF THE CAO IN ACCORDANCE WITH CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION GUIDELINES.

PROMOTION

POLICY

ADVANCEMENT WITHIN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE SHOULD BE BASED ON PERFORMANCE, NOT TIME-IN-GRADE.

KEY PRINCIPLES

PROMOTION WITHIN SES: ADVANCEMENT WITHIN THE SES SHOULD NOT REQUIRE INCUMBENTS TO TAKE AN EXAMINATION. EMPLOYEES WHO RECEIVE A SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS SHOULD BE AUTOMATICALLY PLACED ON THE NEXT HIGHER LIST OF ELIGIBLES WITHIN THEIR EXISTING FUNCTIONAL GROUP.

ADVANCEMENT THROUGH TESTING: MANAGERS WHO ACHIEVE A SATISFACTORY RATING IN TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ANNUAL COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION FOR THE NEXT HIGHER LEVEL CLASS IN ANY FUNCTIONAL GROUPING. MANAGERS WHO COMPLETE THREE YEARS IN AN SES POSITION SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO TAKE AN EXAMINATION FOR A NEXT HIGHER LEVEL CLASSIFICATION.

DEPARTMENT HEADS: PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD BE MADE BY THE MAYOR OR THE CAO IN ACCORDANCE WITH CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION GUIDELINES.

CONSEQUENCES OF POOR PERFORMANCE

POLICY

FAILURE TO MEET GOALS AND OBJECTIVES SHOULD RESULT IN PENALTIES FOR MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL AND, IF NECESSARY, DEMOTION OR DISMISSAL.

KEY PRINCIPLES

SALARY RECOMMENDATION: DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD RECOMMEND BELOW-AVERAGE OR ZERO SALARY INCREASES FOR MANAGERS WHO FAIL TO MEET MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

DEMOTION: SES PERMANENT EMPLOYEES WHO FAIL TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS IN TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS SHOULD BE DEMOTED TO THE NEXT LOWER SES POSITION OR THE CIVIL SERVICE POSITION PREVIOUSLY OCCUPIED. DEMOTION SHOULD BE AUTOMATIC, SUBJECT TO APPEAL BY THE AFFECTED EMPLOYEE.

BUMPING RIGHTS: A DEMOTED EMPLOYEE SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO "BUMP" ANOTHER EMPLOYEE SERVING IN HIS OR HER FORMER POSITION, BUT SHOULD SERVE A PROBATION PERIOD IN THE LOWER LEVEL POSITION.

DISMISSAL: PERFORMANCE BELOW STANDARDS FOR A DEMOTED EMPLOYEE SHOULD RESULT IN DISMISSAL AND TERMINATION FROM THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.

RIGHT OF APPEAL: ANNUAL SALARY DECISIONS AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS SHOULD NOT BE APPEALABLE BEYOND THE DEPARTMENT HEAD. APPEALS FOR DEMOTIONS SHOULD BE STRICTLY LIMITED TO CONSIDERATION OF THE FACTS USED IN THE EVALUATIONS THAT RESULTED IN DEMOTION. DISMISSALS SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE SAME APPEAL PROCEDURES CURRENTLY APPLICABLE TO DISMISSALS OF PERMENENT EMPLOYEES.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

POLICY

A CLEAR CAREER PATH FROM MANAGEMENT TRAINEE TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITIONS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED WITHIN CIVIL SERVICE.

KEY PRINCIPLES

PARALLEL SYSTEMS: A PROPOSED ADMINISTRATOR/MANAGER SERIES SHOULD PARALLEL THE PRESENT CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM SO THAT POSITIONS COULD BE FILLED FROM EITHER "TECHNICAL" LISTS OR "MANAGEMENT" LISTS.

FLEXIBILITY: RULES AFFECTING THE SELECTION, PROMOTION, COMPENSATION AND TERMINATION OF EMPLOYEES IN THIS SERIES SHOULD BE MORE FLEXIBLE THAN OTHER CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS.

TRANSFERS: EMPLOYEES SERVING IN THIS NEW SERIES OF CLASSIFICATIONS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO WORK IN A WIDE RANGE OF POSITIONS IN A VARIETY OF CITY DEPARTMENTS.

APPENDICES

- I PROFILE OF THE CITY'S TOP MANAGERS
- II PROFILE OF THE CITY'S TOP POSITIONS
- III REVIEW OF PRACTICES IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS
- IV PRESENT CIVIL SERVICE RULES AND PROCEDURES
- V DESCRIPTION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS (LEVELS I-VI)
- VI DESCRIPTION OF SES FUNCTIONAL GROUPINGS
- VII PRELIMINARY LISTING AND PROPOSED RECLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS
 TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE
- VIII CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITION B - NOVEMBER, 1979 BALLOT)
- IX BALLOT ARGUMENTS ON PROPOSITION B (PRO AND CON)

PROFILE OF THE CITY'S TOP MANAGERS

- THIS PROFILE OF TOP MANAGERS AND POSITIONS IS BASED ON A SAMPLE OF 120 SENIOR MANAGERS AND POSITIONS INCLUDING:
 - DEPARTMENT HEADS
 - SUPERVISORS OF MORE THAN 100 EMPLOYEES
 - MANAGERS PAID MORE THAN \$35,000 PER YEAR

- MOST TOP MANAGERS:
 - ARE WHITE MALES, OVER THE AGE OF 50
 - HAVE WORKED FOR THE CITY MORE THAN 16 YEARS
 - HAVE HELD THEIR PRESENT POSITIONS FOR MORE THAN 6 YEARS
 - HAVE WORKED IN THE SAME DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT THEIR CAREER IN THE CITY
 - ARE PAID ABOUT \$36,000 PER YEAR (MAXIMUM FOR FY 1978-79)
 - HAVE RECEIVED SALARY INCREASES AVERAGING ABOUT 5% PER YEAR

SUMMARY OF CITY'S TOP MANAGERS

	HIGH	LOW	AVERAGE
AGE	64	35	52
YEARS OF CITY SERVICE	43	1	17
YEARS AT PRESENT POSITION	26	1	6
ANNUAL SALARY	\$55,496	\$20,488	\$36,070
AVERAGE YEARLY GROWTH IN SALARY	13.05%	3.14%	5.04%

PERCENTAGES

SEX

MALE 87%

FEMALE 13

RACE

WHITE 79

BLACK 9

ASIAN 8

OTHER 4

LESS THAN 5 YEARS CITY SERVICE 18

REMAINED IN SAME DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT CAREER 89

PROFILE OF THE CITY'S TOP POSITIONS

- MOST OF THE CITY'S TOP POSITIONS ARE EXEMPT FROM CIVIL SERVICE
 - 46% OF THOSE POSITIONS ARE FILLED BY CAREER CITY EMPLOYEES
 - MANAGERS REMAIN IN THESE POSITIONS AN AVERAGE OF 8 YEARS
- FOR THE TOP POSITIONS FILLED THROUGH CIVIL SERVICE:
 - THE CURRENT LIST IS AN AVERAGE OF 6 YEARS OLD
 - EXAMINATIONS ARE SCHEDULED ABOUT EVERY 6 YEARS
 - AN AVERAGE OF 21 PEOPLE APPLY FOR EACH EXAMINATION
 - OF THESE, 66% QUALIFY TO TAKE THE EXAM AND 42% ARE CERTIFIED
 - WHEN A POSITION IS VACATED, IT TAKES AN AVERAGE OF 13 MONTHS TO FILL IT

SUMMARY OF CITY'S TOP POSITIONS

	HIGH	LOW	AVERAGE
AGE OF CURRENT LIST (YRS)	19.9	0.3	6.3
PERIOD BETWEEN TESTS (YRS)	13.3	0.5	5.9
NUMBER OF APPLICANTS PER CLASS	381	2	21
NUMBER TESTED PER CLASS	267	2	14
NUMBER CERTIFIED PER CLASS	120	1	9
TIME TO FILL CIVIL SERVICE POSITION (YRS)*	4.3	0	1.1

* FROM DATE OF TERMINATION TO DATE OF NEXT APPOINTMENT

REVIEW OF PRACTICES IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS

- THERE EXISTS A DEFINITE TREND TOWARD ESTABLISHING SEPARATE COMPENSATION POLICIES FOR MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT - PARTICULARLY IN CALIFORNIA. SINCE ADOPTION OF THE MEYER-MILIAS-BROWN ACT IN 1968 APPROXIMATELY 190 CITIES IN CALIFORNIA HAVE OFFICIALLY DESIGNATED MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL AND/OR HAVE ESTABLISHED SEPARATE COMPENSATION PACKAGES FOR THEIR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES.
- SOME AGENCIES HAVE RETAINED SPECIALIZED JOB TITLES (E.G., CHIEF BUILDING INSPECTOR) AND ASSIGNED THEM UNDER AN UMBRELLA MANAGEMENT CATEGORY, WHILE SOME HAVE DONE AWAY WITH SEPARATE JOB SPECIALIZATIONS AND ASSIGNED TOP MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL TO BROAD EXECUTIVE-MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATIONS.
- THE TREND IS TO TEST FOR MANAGEMENT SKILLS BY RATING PERFORMANCE, RATHER THAN USING TIME-IN-GRADE OR WRITTEN EXAMINATION. SOME AGENCIES HAVE EXPERIMENTED WITH ASSESSMENT-CENTER EVALUATIONS, BUT THIS DEVICE HAS OFTEN PROVED TOO COSTLY AND TIME CONSUMING, ESPECIALLY IF THE APPLICANT POPULATION IS LARGE.
- MOST AGENCIES WITH SES-TYPE PROGRAMS ALLOW TOP MANAGERS BROAD FLEXIBILITY IN SELECTING, DISMISSING, DISCIPLINING AND REWARDING THEIR TOP SUBORDINATE MANAGERS. MOST ALLOW FOR THE RIGHT OF APPEAL FOR CAUSE (SOME LIMITED ONLY TO RACE, RELIGION, COLOR, CREED AND RELATED BIAS PROTECTED BY NON-DISCRIMINATION STATUTES), AND REVERSION TO A LOWER SES-TYPE CLASS OR REMOVAL FOR POOR PERFORMANCE.
- WE SURVEYED TWO LARGE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES AND CONCLUDED THAT THEIR PROGRAMS WERE TOO DISSIMILAR TO PUBLIC SECTOR PROGRAMS TO SERVE AS A BASIS OF COMPARISON.

PROGRAM COMPARISON AGENCY SURVEYED	TOTAL # OF ALL EMPLOYEES/ TOTAL # OF SES-TYPE EMPLOYEES	TESTING METHODS AND POLICIES FOR SES-TYPE OPENINGS	ELIGIBLE LIST TYPE AND DURATION	COMPENSATION POLICY	TRANSITION POLICIES TERMINATION POLICIES PROBATION PERIOD POLICY	RANK-AND-FILE UNION REPRESENTATION ALLOWED	LATERAL TRANSFER POLICIES	REMARKS
City of Los Angeles	45,000/500-600	Assessment Centers and Orals - open and competitive proposed	Rule-of-the List proposed -- 2 years duration	MBO-type proposed	Revert to old Civil Service status - 1 yr probation for director and manager	NO at Executive level - still being negotiated re director and manager levels	Proposed at all levels	IPA funder study similar to S.F. "SES" Project. Public safety classes excluded.
State of Wisconsin	34,000/265	Results - orientated rating guides and orals	Rule of 10 -- list valid until exhausted	Performance rated	Within 1 yr may revert to old Civil Service status - One yr probation	NO	At option of each department	Program entitled "Career Executive Program". No separate management classes, but specified management jobs are assigned to program. Public safety classes excluded.
City of Seattle	10,000/400	No formal exam for Administrator and Director - open and competitive exam for manager	Rule of 5 or 25% of list, whichever is greater	Straight automatic step increases now - studying MBO system	Incumbents had option of entry to program or remain in old Civil Service class. Automatic reversion to old Civil Service classification - One year probation	NO	Formal policy which encourages lateral transferability	Three levels in program: Administrator Director Manager Manager level has distinct technical titles under umbrella "Manager" class.
City of New York	200,000/2,000 (120 uniformed)	IPA-funded study proposes fewer "paper-pencil" tests & more performance rated evaluations and orals - assessment centers too costly because of applicant population. Most exams are open & competitive.	Rule of 3 -- 4 years list duration	10 pay levels - each class in Management Service allocated to a level - levels have no increments	Option within 1 yr to join program or remain in old non-management service job. Reversion to old Civil Service classification. 1 yr probation.	NO	Encouraged as policy, but under-utilized to date	Program called "Management Service Plan".
State of California	115,000/325	"Executive Development Appraisal" system and detailed reports from previous supervisors. Three rating levels: A-superior B-well qualified N-not qualified	Rule of the List -- indefinite duration	5 pay levels with 7 steps in each level - step increases automatic	Absolute return rights to old Civil Service class	NO	Allowed but in practice 95% of appointments come from within each agency	

APPENDIX IV

PRESENT CIVIL SERVICE RULES AND PROCEDURES

● TYPES OF APPOINTMENTS

- EMERGENCY

- TEMPORARY - MAXIMUM OF 130 DAYS.
- MAY BE NON-CIVIL SERVICE IN THAT APPOINTEE DOES NOT HAVE TO MEET ALL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR THE POSITION.
- MAY BE MADE IN THE PRESENCE OF A CURRENT LIST OF ELIGIBLES.

- LIMITED TENURE

- TEMPORARY - EXPIRES AT THE END OF EACH FISCAL YEAR, AND MUST BE RENEWED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.
- TYPICALLY IS MADE AT THE EXPIRATION OF AN EMERGENCY APPOINTMENT.
- APPOINTEE MUST MEET ALL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR THE POSITION AS SPECIFIED BY THE CURRENT EXAMINATION ANNOUNCEMENT.
- MAY NOT BE MADE IN THE PRESENCE OF A CURRENT LIST OF ELIGIBLES.
- MAY BE ENTRANCE OR PROMOTIONAL IN NATURE.

- PERMANENT

- MUST BE MADE THROUGH TRANSFER, REINSTATEMENT, REAPPOINTMENT OR APPOINTMENT FROM A CURRENT LIST OF ELIGIBLES.
- SUBJECT TO A PROBATIONARY PERIOD VARYING FROM SIX MONTHS TO TWO YEARS.

● PERMANENT APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

- CIVIL SERVICE CONDUCTS A JOB ANALYSIS EACH TIME A TEST IS TO BE GIVEN TO DETERMINE THE NATURE OF THE WORK PERFORMED AND THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR THE POSITION. THE JOB ANALYSIS IS NOT BOUND BY THE CURRENT CLASS SPECIFICATION.
- A NOTICE OF EXAMINATION IS THEN POSTED DETAILING MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, DATE OF THE EXAMINATION AND OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION.
- EXAMINATIONS, TYPICALLY ORAL FOR MANAGEMENT POSITIONS, ARE THEN HELD ON THE DATE SPECIFIED. THESE MAY BE:
 - ENTRANCE (CITY AND OUTSIDE APPLICANTS)
 - PROMOTIVE (ONLY CITY APPLICANTS)
 - COMBINED ENTRANCE AND PROMOTIVE
- A LIST OF ELIGIBLES IS THEN PREPARED BASED ON THE EXAMINATION SCORES.
- THE APPOINTING OFFICER WILL THEN SELECT AN APPOINTEE FROM THE TOP THREE ELIGIBLES.

PRESENT CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM
(CONTINUED)

● SIGNIFICANT POINTS OF APPEAL

- NOTICE OF EXAMINATION

- PROMOTIVE CANDIDATES MAY APPEAL IF THE EXAMINATION IS ANNOUNCED AS A COMBINED PROMOTIVE AND ENTRANCE EXAM.
- EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS MAY BE APPEALED.
- EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS MAY BE APPEALED.

- ORAL EXAMINATIONS

- BIAS BY THE ORAL BOARD,
- FAILURE OF AN ORAL BOARD TO APPLY UNIFORM STANDARDS TO ALL CANDIDATES.

- SELECTION OF APPOINTEES

- THE SELECTION OF AN APPOINTEE MAY BE CHALLENGED ON THE BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION BY THE APPOINTING OFFICER.

● REMOVAL OF INCUMBENT

- IN ALL CASES, GOOD CAUSE FOR TERMINATION OR DISMISSAL MUST BE SUBSTANTIATED BY THE APPOINTING OFFICER.
- SUBSTANTIATION MUST TAKE THE FORM OF A WRITTEN NOTICE TO THE EMPLOYEE; A COPY BEING FILED WITH CIVIL SERVICE.

PRESENT CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

(CONTINUED)

- PERMANENT EMPLOYEES

- CHARGES MUST BE HEARD BEFORE A HEARING OFFICER.
- IF THE CHARGES ARE FOUND TO BE VALID, THEN THE INCUMBENT IS DISMISSED.
- THIS MECHANISM IS RARELY USED (196 TIMES BETWEEN 1971 AND 1976).

- PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES

- THE APPOINTING OFFICER MAY TERMINATE ANY PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEE WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.
- IF THE APPOINTMENT RESULTED FROM AN ENTRANCE EXAMINATION, THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION MAY DISMISS THE EMPLOYEE OR RETURN HIS NAME TO THE LIST OF ELIGIBLES.
- IF THE APPOINTMENT WAS PROMOTIONAL, THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION MAY DISMISS THE EMPLOYEE, OR RETURN HIM TO HIS ORIGINAL CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

- TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

- THE APPOINTING OFFICER MAY TERMINATE ANY TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.
- THE COMMISSION MAY DISMISS THE EMPLOYEE, REMOVE HIS NAME FROM THE LIST OF ELIGIBLES, RESTRICT FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN EXAMINATIONS, OR DENY THE TERMINATION AND REINSTATE THE APPOINTEE.
- IF THE EMPLOYEE HAS PERMANENT CIVIL SERVICE STATUS IN ANOTHER CLASSIFICATION, HE MAY BE RETURNED TO THAT CLASSIFICATION.

APPENDIX V

DESCRIPTION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS*

● EXECUTIVE LEVEL I

- POSITION DESCRIPTION

- MANAGER OF A SIGNIFICANT FUNCTIONAL AREA OF A SMALL DEPARTMENT, A SMALL SPECIALIZED UNIT IN A LARGER DEPARTMENT, OR A HIGH-LEVEL STAFF PROFESSIONAL.
- RESPONSIBLE FOR DAY-TO-DAY MANAGEMENT OF A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF NON-PROFESSIONALS OR A SMALL NUMBER OF PROFESSIONALS.
- TECHNICAL EXPERTISE REQUIRED TO ASSIST SUBORDINATES.
- POLICY MAKING RESPONSIBILITIES LIMITED.

- MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

- EDUCATION: SOME COLLEGE WORK DESIRABLE
- EXPERIENCE: 2-4 YEARS OF FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE IN THE APPROPRIATE FUNCTIONAL AREA.

* NOTE: SEE FOOTNOTES AT THE END OF THIS APPENDIX.

DESCRIPTION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS
(CONTINUED)

● EXECUTIVE LEVEL II

- POSITION DESCRIPTION

- MANAGER OF A SIGNIFICANT SPECIALIZED UNIT IN A LARGER DEPARTMENT, A SIGNIFICANT FUNCTIONAL AREA IN A MEDIUM SIZED DEPARTMENT, OR THE DEPARTMENT HEAD IN A VERY SMALL DEPARTMENT.
- JOB RESPONSIBILITIES BEGIN TO DEEMPHASIZE TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE.
- POLICY MAKING RESPONSIBILITY MAY VARY DEPENDING ON THE SIZE OF THE DEPARTMENT.

- MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

- EDUCATION: BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN APPROPRIATE TECHNICAL DISCIPLINE.⁽¹⁾
- EXPERIENCE: 4-6 YEARS SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE IN THE APPROPRIATE FUNCTIONAL AREA, AT LEAST THREE OF THOSE YEARS BEING IN A POSITION EQUIVALENT TO SES EXECUTIVE LEVEL I.

DESCRIPTION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS
(CONTINUED)

● EXECUTIVE LEVEL III

- POSITION DESCRIPTION

- MANAGER OF A SIGNIFICANT FUNCTIONAL AREA IN A LARGE DEPARTMENT, DEPUTY DEPARTMENT HEAD IN MEDIUM SIZE DEPARTMENT, OR DEPARTMENT HEAD IN A SMALL DEPARTMENT.
- A GOOD TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE MAY BE REQUIRED OCCASIONALLY TO ASSIST SUBORDINATES, HOWEVER, PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES ARE WEIGHTED TOWARD MANAGEMENT SKILLS.
- SIGNIFICANT POLICY MAKING RESPONSIBILITY.

- MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

- EDUCATION: BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN APPROPRIATE TECHNICAL DISCIPLINE,⁽¹⁾
- EXPERIENCE: 6-8 YEARS SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE, AT LEAST THREE OF THOSE YEARS BEING IN A POSITION EQUIVALENT TO SES EXECUTIVE LEVEL II.

DESCRIPTION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS
(CONTINUED)

● EXECUTIVE LEVEL IV⁽²⁾

- POSITION DESCRIPTION

- DEPARTMENT HEAD OR DEPUTY DEPARTMENT HEAD.
- MINIMAL TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE IS REQUIRED AND MAY BE GAINED ON THE JOB.
- EMPHASIS ON HIGH-LEVEL MANAGEMENT AND POLICY DECISIONS.

- MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

- EDUCATION: BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN ANY TECHNICAL DISCIPLINE; ADDITIONAL STUDY⁽¹⁾ IN MANAGEMENT OR BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DESIRABLE.
- EXPERIENCE: 8-10 YEARS SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE, AT LEAST THREE OF THOSE YEARS BEING IN A POSITION EQUIVALENT TO SES EXECUTIVE LEVEL III.

● EXECUTIVE LEVEL V⁽²⁾

- POSITION DESCRIPTION

- HEAD OF A LARGE DEPARTMENT OR DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF ONE OF THE LARGEST DEPARTMENTS.
- RESPONSIBILITY CONSISTS ENTIRELY OF HIGH LEVEL MANAGEMENT AND POLICY DECISIONS.

DESCRIPTION OF SES CLASSIFICATIONS
(CONTINUED)

● EXECUTIVE LEVEL V (CONT'D)

- MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

- EDUCATION: BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN ANY TECHNICAL DISCIPLINE; ADDITIONAL STUDY⁽¹⁾ IN MANAGEMENT OR BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ALSO REQUIRED.
- EXPERIENCE: 10+ YEARS OF SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE, AT LEAST THREE OF THOSE YEARS BEING IN A POSITION EQUIVALENT TO SES EXECUTIVE LEVEL IV.

● EXECUTIVE LEVEL VI

- MAYOR
- CAO

FOOTNOTES

- (1) EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS WILL BE WAIVED FOR SES PROMOTIONAL CANDIDATES (I.E., SES INCUMBENTS WHO DESIRE TO MOVE TO THE NEXT LEVEL WITHIN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE).
- (2) A TECHNICAL REQUIREMENT MAY BE ESTABLISHED FOR SOME POSITIONS (E.G., CORONER MUST BE A PHYSICIAN).

DESCRIPTION OF SES FUNCTIONAL GROUPINGSACCOUNTING AND FINANCE

SUPERVISION OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN ACCOUNTING, PAYROLL, INVESTMENTS, OR OTHER FINANCIAL FUNCTIONS. A DEMONSTRATED OVERALL KNOWLEDGE OF FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING IS NECESSARY TO PERFORM THE TASKS OF THE POSITION SUCCESSFULLY. AN IN-DEPTH KNOWLEDGE OF SOME PARTICULAR DISCIPLINE MAY BE REQUIRED FOR SOME POSITIONS (E.G., AUDITING). EDUCATION SHOULD BE IN THE AREAS OF ACCOUNTING, FINANCE, OR BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

DATA PROCESSING

SUPERVISION OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE DATA PROCESSING FUNCTION OF THE CITY. ALL POSITIONS IN THIS CATEGORY REQUIRE PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DATA PROCESSING CONCEPTS AND TECHNIQUES. CERTAIN POSITIONS MAY REQUIRE EXTENSIVE TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE (E.G., TECHNICAL SERVICES), WHILE OTHERS MAY REQUIRE ONLY GENERALIZED KNOWLEDGE OF DATA PROCESSING FUNCTIONS. EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS MAY BE GENERAL; HOWEVER, CERTAIN DEGREE AREAS (E.G., COMPUTER SCIENCES, BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION) ARE DESIRABLE.

DESCRIPTION OF SES FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (CONT'D)

HEALTH SERVICES

SUPERVISION OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES. EDUCATION, LICENSING, AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS MAY BE QUITE SPECIFIC FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS (E.G., NURSES, PHARMACISTS, PHYSICIANS) OR MAY BE MORE GENERAL (E.G., HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION).

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

SUPERVISION OR DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN THE FORMULATION OF CITY POLICY ULTIMATELY AFFECTING THE PUBLIC. AGENCIES INVOLVED IN THIS ACTIVITY INCLUDE THE MAYOR'S OFFICE, THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND THE CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT. PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN FORMULATING PUBLIC POLICY IS IMPORTANT ALTHOUGH EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS MAY BE QUITE FLEXIBLE.

PERSONNEL AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SUPERVISION OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN GENERAL MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION, TRAINING, RECORD-KEEPING, AND MOST SUPPORT FUNCTIONS. EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS SHOULD EMPHASIZE GENERAL SUPERVISORY AND MANAGEMENT SKILLS. MANAGERS INCLUDED IN OTHER FUNCTIONAL AREAS MAY BE REQUIRED TO PERFORM MANY OF THE TASKS INCLUDED HERE AS WELL AS MORE AS MORE TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES.

DESCRIPTION OF SES FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS (CONT'D)

HUMAN SERVICES

SUPERVISION OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN PROBATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES, AND CULTURAL AND RECREATION SERVICES. DEPARTMENTS INVOLVED INCLUDE THE LIBRARY, FINE ARTS MUSEUM, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, JUVENILE AND ADULT PROBATION, AND THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS WILL TYPICALLY BE GENERAL FOR POSITIONS IN THIS FUNCTIONAL GROUPING.

ENGINEERING AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT

SUPERVISION OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN ENGINEERING, FACILITY OPERATIONS AND FACILITY MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES IN THE CITY. ENGINEERING POSITIONS MAY REQUIRE SPECIALIZED EXPERTISE IN A PARTICULAR FIELD OF ENGINEERING; HOWEVER, TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE KEPT TO A MINIMUM. FACILITY OPERATIONS POSITIONS VARY FROM THE MANAGEMENT OF A UTILITY OPERATING DEPARTMENT TO A HOSPITAL CAFETERIA. FACILITY MAINTENANCE INCLUDES THE JANITORIAL AND MAINTENANCE FUNCTIONS FOR BUILDINGS, MECHANICAL TYPE MAINTENANCE FOR BUSES, STREETCARS, ETC., AS WELL AS MAINTENANCE OF STREETS, PIERS, STREETCAR TRACKS, AND PARKING FACILITIES. EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR FACILITY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE POSITIONS SHOULD INCLUDE KNOWLEDGE OF GENERAL LABOR MANAGEMENT, AND SKILLS IN CONTRACTOR NEGOTIATION AND RELATED FIELDS. EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS SHOULD REMAIN GENERAL.

APPENDIX VII

Preliminary Listing And Proposed Reclassification of Positions To Be Included In The Senior Executive Service

Departments Excluded From the Senior Executive Service:

Police	City Attorney
Fire	District Attorney
Board of Supervisors	Public Defender
Community College District	Sheriff
Board of Education	Superior Court
Redevelopment Agency	Municipal Court
Housing Authority	California Academy of Sciences

PRELIMINARY LISTING AND PROPOSED RECLASSIFICATION OF
POSITIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

NOTE: This listing is provided as a non-binding guideline to Department heads and the Civil Service Commission. The final determination of positions to be included in the SES will be made by Department heads subject to Civil Service Commission approval.

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING</u>					
<u>LEVEL I</u>					
	Rec. & Park	Asst. Business Mgr.	3102	75	20,772
	SFGH	Dir. Patient Accts.	A129	199	24,388
	SFGH	Billing & Collection	1664	82	24,252
	Public Health	CMHS Administration	1664	24	24,252
	Dept. of Public Health	Statistics	2816	23	23,700
	Juvenile Probation	Grants, Res. & Records	1806	9	23,460
	Social Services	NA	1806	NA	23,460
	Criminal Justice Coun.	Fiscal Administration	NA	2	NA
<u>LEVEL II</u>					
	Assessor	Chief Auditor	4226	NA	32,160
	Tax Collector	Chief Auditor	4226	43	32,160
	Controller	Payroll	1658	34	32,160
	Controller	General Office	1658	53	32,160
	Controller	Audits	1658	14	32,160
	Controller	Federal & State Grants	1658	12	32,160
	Controller	Budget Control	1658	13	32,160
	MOET	PSE Prog. & Fin.	1658	98	32,160
	Emp. Retirement Sys.	Retirement Acctg.	1114	49	31,404
	PUC - Water Dept.	Com. Div. Asst. Mgr.	1116	NA	26,568
	Rec. & Park	Business Division	3104	76	32,916
	Airport	Chief Accountant	1658	NA	32,160
	Public Health	Administration (CMHS)	2126	33	28,944
	Assessor	Real Estate Analyst	4256	NA	30,636
	Social Services	Audit	1658	75	32,160
	Public Health	Chief Accountant	1658	37	32,160
	Public Works	Bureau of Accounts	1658	24	32,160
	Juvenile	Business Operations	8336	43	27,192
	Treasurer	Chief Asst. Treasurer	4384*	22	31,080

* Charter Exempt Position
NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING</u> (cont'd)					
<u>LEVEL III</u>	Controller	Accts. & Statistics	1672	16	36,228
	PUC	Finance: Grants	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Finance: Accounting	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Finance: Budget	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Water Dept.	Com. Div. Gen. Mgr.	1118	NA	32,916
	Employees Retire. Sys.	Investment Div.	1115	4	43,068
	Airport	Asst. GM: Bus. Admin.	9258	NA	36,474
	Public Health	Fiscal Officer	1666	28	32,474
	Assessor	Chief Appraiser	4269	NA	33,696
	Social Services	Fiscal	1675	NA	35,208
	PUC-MUNI	Financial Mgmt.	1675	NA	35,208
<u>LEVELS TO BE DETERMINED</u>	PUC	Mgr. of Accounting Svcs.	New	NA	NA
	"	Mgr., Financial Plan. and Control (FP&C)	"	"	"
	"	Dep. GM-FP&C, MUNI	"	"	"
	"	" " " , Water & Power	"	"	"
	"	" " " , Revenues	"	"	"
	"	" " " , Capital Exp.	"	"	"
	"	" - Acctg., Payroll	"	"	"
	"	" - Acctg., Cash Mgmt.	"	"	"
<u>DATA PROCESSING</u>					
<u>LEVEL I</u>	EDP	System & Proc. Sup. (2)	1866	118, 41	26,436
	Social Services	Administrative Svcs.	1866	2	26,436
<u>LEVEL II</u>	EDP	Special Projects	1879	32	35,544
	EDP	Operations Division	1880	161	35,544
	EDP	Technical Services	1880	16	35,544
	PUC	Bur. of Info. Systems	1880	NA	35,544
<u>LEVEL III</u>	EDP	Administration	1881	8	40,068
	EDP	Applic. Systems & Prog.	1881	48	40,068

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.
NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>HEALTH SERVICES</u>					
<u>LEVEL I</u>	Public Health	Special Projects	NA	NA	NA
	Public Health	Health Education	2824	9	23,016
<u>LEVEL II</u>	Public Health	Drug Prog. Admin.	2246	7	29,652
	Public Health	Mission: Outpt. Team I	2934	16	27,192
	Public Health	Adult Day Treat.	2593	18	26,052
	Public Health	CMHS Soc. Prob. Ctr.	2934	NA	27,192
	Public Health	NE Clinical Prog. I	2246	25	29,652
	Public Health	Emergency Services	2132	123	29,076
	Public Health	LH: Asst. Dir. Nur. (5)	2366	NA	27,192
	Public Health	SFGH: Asst. Dir. Nur. (7)	2368	NA	27,852
	Public Health	SFGH: Education	2352	7	25,944
	Public Health	SFGH: Opr. Rm. Nursing	2344	53	25,320
	Public Health	Chemistry Lab.	2490	11	26,052
	Coroner	Admin. Coroner	2581	17	31,404
<u>LEVEL III</u>	Public Health	Jail Medical Services	2248	53	36,720
	Public Health	Jail Medical Services	2232	NA	41,652
	Public Health	Ctr. for Spec. Probs.	2248	45	36,720
	Public Health	Juv. Hall Med. Clinic	2232	13	41,652
	Public Health	Mat. & Child. Health	2232	21	41,652
	Public Health	SE Geriatrics	2248	10	36,720
	Public Health	Mission Outpt: Team II	2232	15	41,652
	Public Health	Mission Outpt: Crisis	2232	14	41,652
	Public Health	NE Clinical Svc. II	2248	62	36,720
	Public Health	Dis. V Child Day Treat.	2248	28	36,720
	Public Health	LH: Medical Svcs.	2171	51	38,916
	Public Health	SFGH: Nursing Svcs.	2370	810	32,448
	Public Health	SFGH: Pharmacy	2452	43	31,236
	Public Health	Public Health Labs. (2)	2492	32, 21	33,384
	Public Health	LH: Nursing Services	2369	640	30,924

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.
NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>POLICY DEVELOPMENT</u>					
<u>LEVEL I</u>	Mayor	Legislative Advocate	PSC	NA	NA
	Mayor	Special Projects	9740	1	20,488
	Mayor	Citizen Asst. Ctr.	NA	4	NA
	Mayor	Personal Secretary	1849*	4	27,463
	Mayor	Program Staff (5)	1849*	NA	27,463
	Community Development	Program Monitoring	9405	4	26,052
	Relocation Appeals Bd.	Director	9740	2	20,488
	Comm./Status Women	Coordinator	1186*	NA	24,542
	Economic Opp. Council	Director	PSC	NA	NA
<u>LEVEL II</u>	Community Development	Special Assistant	5404	21	33,769
	Economic Development	Asst. Deputy for Dir.	5109	NA	31,680
	Criminal Justice Coun.	Planning & Operations	NA	8	NA
	Bd. of Permit Appeals	Exec. Director	1575*	2	29,520
	Emergency Svc.	Director	8246	6	28,392
	PUC	MUNI-Elderly & Hdc.	9746	NA	31,356
<u>LEVEL III</u>	Mayor - FIRM Project	FIRM Director	9750	10	37,986
	Mayor	Budget Director	NA	2	NA
	Community Development	Director	5402	22	38,028
	Criminal Just. Council	Executive Director	8195	12	35,592
	Planning Commission	Asst. Dir. Pl. & Prog.	5113	NA	38,544
	Planning Commission	Asst. Dir. Pl. & Impl.	5112	NA	38,544
	PUC	Bu. of Perf. Monitor.	New	NA	NA
	PUC	MUNI - Planning Div.	9189	NA	36,048
	Airport	Asst. GM: Plant Dev.	9260	NA	36,384

* Charter Exempt Position

Notes: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.

PSC: Personal Services Contract

NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>PERSONNEL & GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</u>					
<u>LEVEL I</u>					
	Comm. Development	Administration	1847	3	22,704
	Mayor	Office Mgt.	1846	3	25,080
	PUC	Bureau of Admin.	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Personnel	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Training	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Comm. Partic.	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Security	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Affirm. Action	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Claims	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Purchasing	New	NA	NA
	PUC	Admin.: Agency Liaison	New	NA	NA
	Rec. & Park	Exec. Secretary	3110*	1	21,876
	Rec. & Park	Personnel Director	1270	12	23,808
	Social Services	Social Services	1270	26	23,808
	Public Health	Central Office	1270	10	23,808
	Ag./Wgts. & Measures	Deputy Agric. Comm.	3452	NA	20,484
	Recorder	Deputy Recorder	1129	NA	24,012
	Registrar	Deputy Registrar	1129	NA	24,012
	Public Health	Laguna Honda Hospital	1270	8	23,808
	Public Health	CMHS Administration	1270	5	23,808
	Library	Library Main	1270	6	23,808
	Airport	Administration	1270	NA	23,808
	PUC	MUNI	1270	NA	23,808
	War Memorial	Asst. Managing Dir.	4120*	48	23,904
	Real Estate	Agriculture & Land	4143	7	28,944
	Real Estate	Airport	4143	6	28,944
	Real Estate	Right-of-Way	4143	16	28,944
	Public Administrator	Field Operations	1131	8	23,256
	Public Administrator	Field Operations	1131	7	23,256
	Tax Collector	Real Estate Div.	4349	13	25,320
	Public Health	SFGH: Ctr. Prac. Dis.	2394	60	19,992
	Civil Service	Asst. Secretary	1284	41	23,568
	Emp. Retirement System	Admin. Services	1110	4	25,680
	Public Health	SFGH: Sec./Pharm.	2129	76	20,676
	MOET	Employ. Prog. (3)	9706	NA	23,568
	Assessor	Technical Services	4266	NA	23,904
	Port	Traffic	9387	2	23,148
	Port	Operations	9357	9	25,944
	Airport	Sec.-Airports Comm.	9276	NA	24,144

* Charter Exempt Position

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.

NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
PERSONNEL & GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (Cont'd)					
<u>LEVEL II</u>	MOET	Planning, Evaluation	9744	27	27,248
	MOET	Employability Prog.	9708	43	27,852
	Civil Service	S&W Asst. Div. Mgr.	1248	9	32,448
	Civil Service	Classification	1248	13	32,448
	Civil Service	Infor. Ctr. Admin.	1248	14	32,448
	Civil Service	Testing Admin.	1248	28	32,448
	Civil Service	Special	1248	14	32,448
	War Memorial	Managing Director	4122*	NA	33,228
	Public Health	Personnel	1276	11	31,680
	Public Health	LH: Asst. Admin.	2158	142	29,784
	Port	Special Projects	9390	NA	28,944
	Rec. & Park	Executive Asst.	3115	4	31,524
	Public Health	LH: Asst. Admin.	2142	185	33,228
	Public Health	SFGH: Asst. Adm. (2)	2142	66, 37	33,228
	Public Health	SFGH: Med. Records	2118	87	27,720
	Public Health	SFGH: Personnel	1276	24	32,448
	Public Health	SFGH: Admissions	2142	90	33,228
	Public Works	Bureau Pers. Admin.	1272	18	31,680
	PUC	MUNI Personnel Admin.	1272	NA	31,680
	Public Health	SFGH: Personnel Admin.	1272	23	31,680
	Emp. Retirement Sys.	Workers' Comp. Div.	8166	34	28,812
	MOET	Program Audit	9708	NA	27,852
	Port	Commercial Property	9396	25	25,452
	Port	Marketing	9393	2	25,944
	Social Services	Personnel	1273	37	31,680
<u>LEVEL III</u>	MOET	Director	PSC	186	NA
	Civil Service	Salaries & Wages	1278	24	35,700
	Civil Service	Examinations	1278	59	35,700
	Airport	Asst. Dir. - Public Svcs.	New	NA	NA
	Airport	Dir.-Planning & Ctl.	New	NA	NA
	Airport	Dep. Dir. - Strat. Plng.	New	NA	NA
	Airport	Dep. Dir. - Mgmt. Assist.	New	NA	NA
	Airport	Comm. Affairs	New	NA	NA

* Charter Exempt Position

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.

PSC: Personal Services Contract

NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>PERSONNEL & GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</u> (Cont'd)					
<u>LEVEL III</u>					
	Social Services	AFDC	2971	210	34,032
	Social Services	Food Stamps	2969	110	30,636
	Social Services	Medi-Cal	2969	194	30,636
	Social Services	Adult Services	2969	110	30,636
	Social Services	Family Services	2969	190	30,636
	Social Services	General Assistance	2969	80	30,636
	Social Services	Audit	2969	20	30,636
	Public Health	SFGH: Deputy Director	A140	1500	41,286
	Public Works	Admin., Director - BBI	5179	30	34,872
	Health Serv. Systems	Executive Director	1108*	24	33,696
	Registrar	Registrar	1128	20	36,048
	Recorder	Recorder	1128	18	36,048
	Ag./Wgts. & Measures	Agricul. Comm.	3456	16	35,364
	Tax Collector	Dep. Admin.	4373	123	35,892
	Purchasing	Asst. Director	1160	200	30,636
	Public Administrator	Public Guardian	1126	24	34,032
	Social Services	Admin. Serv.	2970	190	32,160
	PUC - Hetch Hetchy	Hetch Hetchy Admin.	5140	NA	34,536
	Fine Arts Museum	Adm. & Develop.	3587	93	34,032
<u>HUMAN SERVICES</u>					
<u>LEVEL I</u>					
	Art Commission	Asst. Director	A101	129	22,944
	Juvenile Probation	Juvenile Hall	8340	99	23,904
	Juvenile Probation	Intake	8415	47	25,080
	Juvenile Probation	Placement	8415	51	25,080
	Juvenile Probation	Log Cabin Ranch	8330	20	26,568
	Law Library	Chief Asst. Librarian	0170	NA	21,216
	Public Health	Environmental Health	6124	25	23,700
	Social Services	AFDC (4)	2946	28, 44, 28, 30	20,880
	Social Services	Food Stamps (2)	2946	50, 63	20,880
	Social Services	Medi-Cal (2)	2946	45, 51	20,880
	Social Services	Admin. Svcs. (2)	2946	68, NA	20,880
	Social Services	BHI	2946	25	20,880

* Charter Exempt Position

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.

NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>HUMAN SERVICES</u> (Cont'd)					
<u>LEVEL II</u>					
	Library Commission	Sec., Library Comm.	NA	49	NA
	Library Commission	Chief Lib. - Main Br.	3638	128	25,812
	Library Commission	Chief Lib. - Branches	3638	129	25,812
	Library Commission	Tech. Services	3638	41	25,812
	Library Commission	Adult Services	3642	23	25,812
	Library Commission	Children's Services	3640	5	25,812
	Social Services	AFDC	2948	35	26,568
	Social Services	General Assistance (2)	2948	28, 38	26,568
	Social Services	Medi-Cal (2)	2948	52, 46	26,568
	Social Services	Family Services (3)	2948	40, 55, 65	26,568
	Social Services	Adult Services (2)	2948	45, 34	26,568
	Social Services	Admin. Services	2948	NA	26,568
	Social Services	AFDC (3)	2950	40, 75, 92	28,524
	Social Services	Adult Services (2)	2950	10, 85	28,524
	Social Services	General Assistance	2950	68	28,524
	Social Services	Family Services	2950	NA	28,524
	Social Services	Staff Development	2950	10	28,524
	Social Services	Audit	2950	NA	28,524
	Social Services	Community Svcs.	2951	16	27,852
	Social Services	AFDC	2958	17	26,544
	Rec. & Park	Golf Director	3230	55	29,652
	Rec. & Park	Recreation Div. (3)	3292	104, 242, 57	29,784
	Rec. & Park	Zoo Director	3340*	46	31,236
	Public Health	Env. Health - Asst. Dir.	6127	89	26,304
	Public Health	Child Health & Dis.	2593	26	26,052
	Adult Probation	Community Svcs.	8435	48	26,304
	Adult Probation	Investigation	8435	34	26,304
	Juvenile Probation	Institutions	8344	121	30,636
	Juvenile Probation	Probation Services	8416	126	29,332
	Law Library	Law Librarian	0180	15	28,834
	Comm. on Aging	Director	2988	NA	31,876

* Charter Exempt Position

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.

NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>HUMAN SERVICES</u>					
<u>(Cont'd)</u>					
<u>LEVEL III</u>	Art Commission	Director	PSC	130	NA
	Asian Art Museum	Director	3530*	16	NA
	Fine Arts Museum	Educ. & Exhibits	3585	53	33,072
	Human Rights Comm.	Director	2986*	33	34,344
	Housing Authority	Director	NA	NA	NA
	Rec. & Park	Park Division	3350*	665	34,536
	Rec. & Park	Rec. Division	3294*	406	38,544
	Public Health	Family Planning	PSC	NA	NA
	Public Health	Envir. Health	6126	100	29,634
	Public Works	Property Conser.	5178	103	33,384
	Adult Probation	Chief Adult P. O.	8436*	166	33,696
	Juvenile Probation	Chief P. O.	8418*	303	40,848
<u>ENGINEERING & FACILITY MANAGEMENT</u>					
<u>LEVEL I</u>	Public Health	LH: Food Services (2)	2618	NA	24,852
	Public Health	SFGH: Food Services	2618	NA	24,852
	Public Health	SFGH: Dietary, Linen	New	165	NA
	Public Health	SFGH: Admin. Chef	2660	109	25,680
	Public Health	LH: Admin. Chef	2660	123	25,680
	Parking Authority	Director	1104*	3	26,568
	Purchasing	Stores & Equip.	1940	54	21,564
	Port	Electrical - Asst. Sup.	9361	24	24,144
	Port	Superstructure	9362	25	26,676
	Port	Piers & Roadways	9363	59	24,852
	MUNI	Tracks	7283	NA	20,172
	Airport	Custodial Ser. Sup.	9230	NA	19,188
	Public Health	LH: General Services	2786	129	20,772
	Public Health	SFGH: Gen. Services	2786	29	20,772
	Electricity	Mech./Pkg. Meter	7132	32	21,580
	Airport	Mech. Nite Sup.	9232	NA	20,228
	Airport	Commun. Sections Sup.	9204	NA	19,080

* Charter Exempt Position

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.

PSC: Personal Services Contract

NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>ENGINEERING & FACILITY MANAGEMENT (Cont'd)</u>					
<u>LEVEL II</u>	Port	Facilities Maint.	9364	111	28,128
	DPW	Tree Planting Div.	3440	94	25,680
	Public Health	SFGH: Bldg. & Grds. Maint.	7120	41	30,228
	MUNI	Auto Division	7212	NA	26,052
	MUNI	Electrical Div.	7214	NA	26,052
	PUC - Hetch Hetchy	Mech. Shop & Equip.	M270		26,808
	Real Estate	Facility Manager	4132	19	31,524
	Water Department	City Dis., Asst. Mgr.	5158	NA	32,604
	PUC - Hetch Hetchy	Gen. Opr. & Maint.	7124	NA	28,140
	PUC - Hetch Hetchy	Elec. Opr. & Maint.	7125	NA	27,324
	DPW	Treatment & Pumping	5134	137	33,384
	Water	Peninsula Dis. Div.	5154	NA	29,784
	Water	Alameda Dis. Div.	5150	NA	25,812
	MUNI	Transit Power Div.	7130	NA	31,848
	Airport	Operations Supt.	9226	NA	32,004
	Airport	Utilities Sup.	New	NA	NA
	Airport	Asst. Gen. Mgr. (5)	New	NA	NA
	Airport	Airfield Oper.	9222	NA	28,392
	Airport	Maintenance	5130	NA	31,848
	PUC - Water	Water Purification	5161	NA	29,874
	PUC - Water	Water Treatment	5149	NA	28,140
	DPW	Treatment & Pumping	5130	NA	31,848
	DPW	Engineering	5174	NA	31,080
	PUC - Hetch Hetchy	Light Heat & Power	5240	NA	28,944
	Rec. & Park	Parks, Squares, Fac.	3466	234	26,676
	Rec. & Park	Structural Maint.	7202	102	28,008
	Rec. & Park	GG Park	3466	209	26,676
	Airport	Airport Maint. Supt.	9252	NA	27,060
	Public Works	Bureau Street Clean.	5173	414	26,436
	Public Works	Bureau Street Repair	5171	174	26,436
	Public Works	Bureau Bldg. Repair	5102	366	28,944
	Public Works	Sewer Repair	7280	110	30,360
	Electricity	City Radio System	5246	15	29,232
	Electricity	Fire & Police Com.	7131	62	27,588

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.
NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>ENGINEERING & FACILITY MANAGEMENT (Cont'd)</u>					
<u>LEVEL III</u>					
	Water	Suburban Div.	5156	NA	35,208
	Water	City Dis. Div.	5160	NA	35,208
	Public Works	Bureau Water Pol. Cont.	5132	264	36,564
	PUC - Water	Water Quality Div.	5162	NA	34,536
	PUC - Hetch Hetchy	Project Operations	5138	NA	32,916
	Public Works	Asst. City Architect	5122	NA	38,364
	Public Works	BBI - Engineering	5183	19	38,184
	Port	Engineering	9379	37	39,876
	Purchasing	Central Shops	7150	102	32,160
	MUNI	Transit Equip.	7152	NA	32,160
	Public Works	Bur. Street Cng. Supt.	5170	415	30,360
	Public Works	Bur. Street Rep. Supt.	5172	175	30,360
	Public Works	Bur. Bldg. Rep. Supt.	5104	367	31,848
	Airport	Asst. GM - Ops. & Maint.	9256	NA	36,384
	Airport	Asst. Dep. Dir. - Maint.	A106	NA	31,564
	Electricity	General Manager	1150	113	34,032
<u>LEVEL TO BE DETERMINED</u>					
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Dep. Gm - Engr. & Constr.	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Chief Proj. Mgr. - E&C	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Project Mgrs. (4)	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Chief Mechanical Engr.	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Chief Elec. Engr. - Power Gen.	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Chief Elec. Engr. - Transit Power	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Chief Elec. Engr. - Facilities	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Chief Elec. Engr. - Signal & Comm.	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Mgr. Project Planning	New	NA	NA
	PUC - Engr. & Constr.	Mgr. Contract Admin.	New	NA	NA
	PUC - MUNI	Dep. GM - Operations	New	NA	NA
	PUC - MUNI	Division Supt. (6)	New	NA	NA
	PUC - MUNI	Scheduling Mgr.	New	NA	NA
	PUC - MUNI	Mgr. Operator Training	New	NA	NA
	PUC - MUNI	Dep. GM-Eq. Maint.	New	NA	NA

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.
NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>ENGINEERING & FACILITY MANAGEMENT (Cont'd)</u>					
<u>LEVEL IV</u>					
	Public Health	Health Center I	2234	57	44,736
	Public Health	Health Center II	2234	33	44,736
	Public Health	Health Center III	2234	44	44,736
	Public Health	Health Center IV	2234	77	44,736
	Public Health	Health Center V	2234	91	44,736
	Mayor	Press Secretary	1857*	3	33,540
	Port	Maritime Division	9383	15	43,068
	Port	Administrator	9384	2	41,844
	Treasurer	Treasurer	4390*	NA	36,883
	Public Health	Adult Services	A103	465	43,364
	PUC - MUNI	Deputy Gen. Manager	9181	NA	38,916
	Economic Development	President	5111*	NA	42,000
	Planning Commission	Deputy Director	5115	NA	42,276
	Airport	Dept. Dir. Png. & Dev.	9274*	NA	49,560
	Public Health	Program Planning	A106	23	48,178
	Civil Srvce	Asst. Gen. Mgr.	1288	127	41,244
	Emp. Retirement Sys.	General Manager	1112	101	43,272
	Public Health	SFGH Administrator	1164	1880	51,610
	Tax Collector	Tax Administrator	4374	124	37,476
	Rec. & Park	General Manager	3140*	1163	47,892
	Social Services	Asst. General Manager	2973	1527	38,028
	Public Works	Bur. Bldg. Inspection	5184	209	43,488
	Fine Arts Museum	Director	3570	172	42,444
	MUNI	Dept. GM Operations	9191	NA	38,916
	DPW	Deputy Dir. - Operations	New	NA	NA
	DPW	Dep. Dir. - Fin. & Adm.	New	NA	NA
	Airport	Dep. Dir. Ops. & Maint.	9272*	NA	49,560
	Assessor	Chief Asst. Assessor	4282*	NA	40,452
	CAO	Executive Assistant	1180	7	39,312
	Real Estate	Director	4150	61	41,844
	DPW	Bureau of Eng.	New	NA	NA
	DPW	Asst. to Director	New	NA	NA
	DPW	Sanitary Engineering	5181	NA	43,272
	Airport	Terminal Const.	New	NA	NA

* Charter Exempt Position

Note: Number following the organizational unit (e.g., (2)) indicates that more than one position in that class exists in the same unit and department.

NA: Not Available

NEW CLASSIFICATION	DEPARTMENT NAME	ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT	OLD CLASSIFICATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER EMPLOYEES SUP.	FY 78-79 SALARY
<u>ENGINEERING & FACILITY MANAGEMENT (Cont'd)</u>					
<u>LEVEL V</u>	Controller	Controller	1682*	426	55,510
	Public Health	Hospital Services	2892*	3021	47,448
	Public Health	Public Health Pgms.	2889	599	49,332
	Coroner's Office	Chief Medical Examiner	2584	32	52,044
	Mayor	Executive Deputy	1580	26	46,272
	Mayor	Executive Deputy	1898	21	46,272
	Planning Commission	Director	5116*	NA	51,552
	Civil Service	General Manager	1292*	128	48,828
	Assessor	Assessor	4290*	258	50,127
	Social Services	General Manager	2974*	1528	46,512
	Public Health	Mental Health Director	2887	558	47,892
	Port	Director	9399*	225	48,279
	Water	General Manager	5166*	NA	49,560
	MUNI	General Manager	9186*	NA	46,068
	Hetch Hetchy	General Manager	5144*	NA	46,068
	Public Works	Director	5190*	NA	54,132
	Airport	Director	9278*	1846	55,200
	Public Health	Director	1168*	NA	58,776
	PUC	General Manager	1172*	4308	57,972
<u>LEVEL VI</u>	Mayor	Mayor	1590*	NA	55,496
	CAO	CAO	1182*	NA	59,352

* Charter Exempt Position
NA: Not Available

APPENDIX VIII

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITION B)

CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.661 by adding subsection (d) thereto, relating to the establishment of a Senior Executive Service in the civil service system of the city and county.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1979, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.661 by adding subsection (d) thereto, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by
bold-face type; deletions are indicated by
(double parentheses)).

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(d) The civil service commission shall establish a Senior Executive Service for the purpose of providing the flexibility needed by departments to recruit and retain highly competent and qualified managers to provide more effective management of departments and their functions and more expeditious administration of the public business of the city and county.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the retirement system and health service system provisions of the charter and those provisions which exempt positions from the civil service provisions of the charter, the civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to implement and administer said Senior Executive Service including but not limited to the designation and inclusion of positions in the Service, provided however that not more than 750 positions shall be so designated, eligibility, selection, performance evaluation, compensation, promotion, demotion, suspension and dismissal provided however that the salaries, wages and rates of compensation of every kind and nature for the classifications within the Senior Executive Service shall be recommended by the civil service commission subject to the approval or rejection of the Board of Supervisors. on or before April 1 of each year.

No elected official shall interfere in the appointment, promotion, demotion, suspension or dismissal by a department head of any employee of the Service.

APPENDIX IX

BALLOT ARGUMENTS ON PROPOSITION B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Senior Executive Service is a new system of Civil Service rules and classifications for San Francisco's top management positions. Proposition B will authorize the Civil Service Commission to adopt rules and procedures that will:

- Require open competition for all management positions
- Tie compensation and promotions for managers directly to performance
- Enhance flexibility in the selection, transfer, promotion, compensation and termination of management personnel
- Streamline existing classifications for senior executive positions
- Encourage the decentralization of personnel decisions affecting management personnel

Total spending for management salaries will not go up as a result of the SES program. Rather, the Senior Executive Service will change how salary increases are distributed so that superior managers are paid more than mediocre ones.

Superior performance will lead to rapid advancement under the Senior Executive Service, allowing the City to recruit and retain experienced, qualified managers. SES employees who fail to meet minimum performance standards will be demoted or dismissed.

This proposal will bring accountability to City government. Department heads will have the flexibility to build effective management teams under the Senior Executive Service. It will no longer be possible to blame the civil service system for ineffective management of City programs.

The Senior Executive Service will strengthen the merit system. The Civil Service Commission will continue to supervise the selection of management employees, and elected officials will be prohibited from interfering in the personnel decisions of the Commission or a Department head.

Adopt this amendment for more effective and efficient management of City government.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Submitted by:

Supervisor Louise H. Renne

Endorsed by:

Supervisor Don Horanzy

Supervisor John L. Molinari

Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Supervisor Ronald Pelosi

Wilson Chang

Pat Schultz

Supervisor Gordon J. Lau

Supervisor Ella Hill Hutch

Roberta Borgonova, President, S.F. League of Women Voters

George Newkirk

Debbie Petrie, National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B.

The Senior Executive Service (SES) encourages good management. It contains provisions for very strict controls over both salaries and selection of Senior Executive Service employees.

Some city bureaucrats oppose it. They believe it will jeopardize their right to top jobs in the City.

They argue it will mean political partonage, cost more money, and open the floodgates to destroy civil service. Nothing can be further from the truth.

The fact is that the Board of Supervisors would continue to set limits on management salaries. Boards, commissions, the Mayor, and department heads could not pay excessive salaries to Senior Executive Service employees. SES will not increase the number of management employees, or the total cost of management employees.

Selection of SES employees will be rigidly controlled through competitive examinations and performance evaluations. To argue that "as many as 750 top jobs" would become "patronage positions" without salary controls, is nonsense. It is untrue.

The City Charter says elected officials are prohibited from interfering with the appointment, demotion, suspension, or dismissal of any SES employees.

Proposition B makes it mandatory for the Civil Service Commission to adopt the rules necessary to implement the Senior Executive Service. It is designed to encourage public involvement.

Anybody in private industry will affirm that a prime problem of the City's bureaucracy is the lack of discretion in hiring the best qualified people for top jobs. People who can get these jobs done. Proposition B is an opportunity for excellence in management. It means the City can run its business on a businesslike basis.

Vote Yes on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

John H. Jacobs

Roger Boas
Chief Administrative Officer

Leonard H. Kingsley
President, SPUR

Allen Haile
Commissioner
Civil Service Commission

Richard Sklar
General Manager
Public Utilities Commission

Gregory P. Hurst
Chamber of Commerce

Dennis P. Bouey
Business Manager
Professional & Technical Employees
Local #21

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition "B".

Proposition "B" is badly needed to help bring modern management to San Francisco city government at the senior executive levels. This measure is long overdue, and should have been submitted to the voters long ago.

The 1980's will be troubled times for San Francisco. A budget deficit of \$117,000,000 has been projected for the coming fiscal year.

Curtailement of many City services may become a reality, following the obscene tax reduction that large downtown property owners received following the passage of Proposition 12 in June, 1978.

The Senior Executive Service will help solve these problems.

DAVID SCOTT

Mayoral Candidate

(Former President of San Francisco Board of Permit Appeals)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Proposition B should be defeated for the following reasons:

1. It asks the voters to approve a program which has yet to be designed.
2. It asks the voters to sign a blank check for executive salaries.
3. It asks the voters to approve a program developed in haste without public hearings or input of any kind.

A new executive service is vitally needed, but the voters should be assured of the details of the program and should have a chance to study and comment upon it before they vote on it. If and when the public has the details of the program, this measure can again be returned to the ballot.

This ballot argument is presented by the Municipal Executives Association of the City and County of San Francisco, founded in 1943, to foster professionalism among the City's top management.

MUNICIPAL EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION

Rino Bei, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Theoretically, under this amendment, the Commissioners of the Civil Service Commission could award the Manager of the Street Cleaning Department a \$100,000 salary as a reward for the immaculate condition of the streets.

And the voters could do nothing about it.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B

Although well intended, this hastily drafted measure grants to the Commissioners of the Civil Service Commission a virtual blank check. It would allow future Commissioners to convert as many as 750 top jobs into pure patronage positions, if they so wished. It would permit the payment of uncontrolled executive salaries to City employees far exceeding prevailing rates in private industry. And it could expose the management positions of the Police Department and the Fire Department to future political influences.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B

Most senior management positions are already exempt from the civil service provisions of the Charter. The effect of this measure would be to expand those exemptions massively to 750 additional jobs.

It is not wise to confer such powers upon part-time commissioners who cannot be removed by the voters. A carefully constructed Senior Executive Service is indeed in the public interest. But such a plan should be spelled out fully and presented for voter approval, so that taxpayers can know the costs and the electorate can weigh the relative risks involved to the preservation of the merit system.

DARRELL J. SALOMON
President
Civil Service Commission

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "B"

Proposition "B" is designed to open loopholes for certain high salaries City employees to obtain even higher salaries, and for members of the Board of Supervisors--indirectly--to interfere in promotions and similar benefits for pet executives.

The City Attorney has stated this is an unnecessary Charter amendment because a Senior Executive Service classification can be established by an ordinary Civil Service Commission rule for top management positions. This proposal, however, goes much farther, which is why they put it on the ballot.

According to the Mayor's Deputy for Budget Affairs, in a statement before the Board of Supervisors on August 13, 1979, the Board of Supervisors will be able to decide whether a City department has met its "goals and objectives." That means Board of Supervisors' interference in who gets promoted or a higher salary.

Total spending for fat in the City budget will rise if this amendment is passed because salaries for this new class will be set differently than for other City employees, and Board of Supervisors' opinions will indirectly be used in promotions and pay raises for certain selected individuals.

That is unfair. That will be costly. It will result in dictating by the Board of Supervisors on promotions and compensation for top management positions. The Civil Service Commission could establish this or any other new class without this amendment, but any new class would be subject to the same Charter provisions and Civil Service regulations governing all other City employees.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "B"

The real intent of this proposal is to take the fat cat "senior executives" out of the salary limits for other City employees and to get the Board of Supervisors into promotion and compensation procedures. It would do by indirection what our Charter has prohibited for over 45 years. We need less fat cats, not more.

Submitted by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:

Supervisor Lee S. Dolson

Supervisor Robert E. Gonzales