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CHAPTER I

POSITION-CLASSIFICATION

Existing personnel management practices in many of our government agencies today are not geared to cope with the complex problems that are developing from the relationship between the employees and the government as their employer. There exist today in many instances personnel practices which are a product of the times when government agencies were small and the administrative heads of the agencies could carry around under their hats all the pertinent information necessary to handle any of the personnel problems that might arise in their organizations. But no longer is this traditional practice conducive to the proper handling of the complex personnel problems which now arise in dealing with thousands of individual employees in an ever-expanding government.

The citizens of this nation have entrusted, more and more, to the government the powers necessary to deal with our social and economic ills with the consequences that the governments in the United States are now the employers of several million individuals. The citizens have the right to expect that these employees will be impartial and efficient in the discharge of their assigned duties. Furthermore, the citizens have a right
to expect their government, as an employer, to maintain personnel practices and policies which will enable the employees to perform their tasks without mental handicaps or reservation.

All government agencies can be divided into two component parts: first, the organizational structure of the agency which is created by an act of the law-making body. The act specifies the duties and responsibilities to be assumed by that agency in performing its assigned task. Second, the personnel structure of the agency which breathes life into the organizational structure and makes that part of the agency a "going concern."

It is not to be debated as to which of these two structures is the more important. Without a good organizational structure, the personnel structure will be handicapped in performing the functions assigned the organization. Without efficient and impartial personnel, regardless of organizational structure, we could not expect any governmental agency to function without justified criticism from the citizens and the lawmakers who created the agency.

With the responsibility thus placed on our government personnel and with the functions of government ever increasing, it has become imperative, if it is our desire to have good government, that at no time should conditions exist which would cause government employees to be forced to organize and to bring pressure against our elected and appointed management to alter or correct some fault in the working conditions.
When our civil employees are forced to organize into pressure groups in order to secure justice, the government as their employer, has failed its responsibility and has made a long step toward losing the loyalty of the employees. These employees will turn to their pressure group, to which they are loyal, to change any situation in their working condition which does not meet with their approval, instead of going to our elected and appointed management. Whenever this situation exists in our government agencies, then we as citizens can not expect to receive impartial and efficient service from our governmental employees.

In the past the elected and appointed managers of our government personnel have, in many cases, lacked foresight and good judgment in dealing with personnel problems. In many instances we must censure, not only, managers, but, also, the system under which they are forced to operate. It is believed by many that one of the primary functions of our personnel managers is to diagnose and protect the mental health of all the employees under their supervision, both as to group relationship and as to individual problems. Although almost everyone in authority considers himself to be an expert in human relations, all too many exercise the kind of leadership which stems from their authority to command and subdue their subordinates rather than to guide them. Authority, honesty
and good intentions are not enough when one is dealing with
government employees. A genuine knowledge of the principle
of human conduct is the big essential in the successful
management of government employees. Employees can and will
cooperate with their managers only after the psychological
requirements for cooperation have been discovered and demon-
strated to produce conditions desired by the employees. The
chief cause of lack of cooperation is the lack of understand-
ing between employees and management, and if we are to have
this understanding, there must be some scientific method in
approaching problems as they relate to the individual employees.

This question is often asked by management of our public
affairs, "What do the employees of government want or expect
to get from their employer?" For the purpose of this study
an attempt has been made to present six "wants" or things de-
sired which most employees of our government feel that they
deserve.

First, most employees, in order to do good work, must
have a sense of security in their positions. When our country
was young, future security was not a part of our ideology, but
as conditions became more stable, men began to think of security
more and more, until it has become a major problem in our per-
sonnel management.

Second, employees must be convinced that their employer
is giving them a fair wage for the services rendered. This factor has become an issue with which both public and private management must cope. With employee unions organized in private industry to prevent exploitation of their labor, there is grave danger that government employees will think that they must take a similar action for protection. Many of our public managers have tended to disregard the welfare of our public employees, believing that they are voicing the opinion of the public when they say that if the employees of government do not like the salary they are getting for the work which they do, then it is their privilege to quit and let one of the many who are willing to work for even less remuneration be placed in the position. This attitude is the height of stupidity. Of course, even though there are thousands clamoring for government positions, without regard to the salaries attached, it would be foolish to make the changes in the personnel on that account. Would these men render the best service to the government if they must look to another source for part of their income or make "shady deals," using the prestige of their government positions as aids? If our management permits the conditions to exist in our government that will force the qualified personnel to leave their positions and seek employment in private industry where they feel a fair return will be given for the work rendered, we as citizens do not deserve any
better government than we shall get under such methods. If our government can not pay a fair return for the performance of the duties and responsibilities associated with a position, then it is better that the position be vacant than filled with an incompetent or dishonest individual. In America we have always assumed that we seldom get more than we are willing to pay for.

Third, employees expect their supervisors and department heads to be qualified for their respective positions and to be fair-minded in their dealing with their subordinates. This factor alone has caused many well-qualified government employees to leave the service and accept employment in private industry. If the supervisors and department heads are not qualified to perform their duties and are not fair-minded in dealing with the subordinate personnel, there will exist in that agency a working environment which will not be conducive to the mental health of the employees.

Fourth, government employees expect a reasonable opportunity for advancement. When the door for further advancement is closed, employees will either lose their initiative if they continue to work for the organization, or they will leave the organization to find employment that offers some inducement to those who are willing to study and work in order to move on to more responsible positions.
Fifth, they expect fair and equitable treatment in relation to other employees. They expect the same compensation for the same amount of work that any other employees in the organization get for that work. It has been said that

Salary inequalities are more potent sources of dissatisfaction than the general level of pay. Such inequalities indicate to the employee the lack of recognition by management of their individual stature and progress. It might be mentioned that dissatisfaction over salary inequalities is not confined to the lower brackets of government employees but that department heads are often disturbed about these matters in their own situation.1

Employees, furthermore, tend to abhor any act of favoritism shown by their supervisors to a special individual or group of individuals.

Sixth, employees expect consideration as individuals. Human beings do not do their best work when they are considered, by their supervisors, to be machines designed to perform a certain task in a routine way. Individual employees resent this attitude on the part of their supervisors. Each considers that he is still an individual different from other individuals and as such should be treated not as a machine but as an individual human being.

Can a personnel system be devised making it possible

---

to handle these perplexing personnel problems to the satisfaction of all concerned? As yet, the personnel experts have not created a system which will satisfactorily answer all the personnel problems which management must solve, but these experts have offered management an administrative tool, namely, Position-Classification, which will enable personnel managers to approach the personnel problems from a scientific and professional angle.

The federal government accepted this administrative tool in 1923 when Congress passed the Classification Act.\(^2\) This Act was so designed that the duties and responsibilities of the positions in the agencies covered, by this legislation, would be classified and fitted into the broad classification plan outlined in the Act. The federal government was not the pioneer in the use of this tool. Chicago devised a classification plan as early as 1911.\(^3\)

In order fully to understand what is meant by position-classification, we must first have a common definition of what the two terms imply. First, let us define the two terms separately. Classification is a term with which most people

---


are familiar. It is man's attempt to bring understanding and order out of chaos by grouping like things together, thus making it possible for him to deal with things in groups instead of individual items. For example, our public libraries must classify their books according to some prearranged plan in order that an efficient service may be rendered the public. The first thing a store manager must do is to sort his stock and put labels and prices on each type of item, then he places all like items in the same shelf or bin. Otherwise, confusion and mistakes are made, and delays in handling orders result. Sorting his stock enables the manager to set a standard price for all items of the same size, kind, and quality. By treating the items of his store as a group rather than as individual items, the manager can make his work easier, give better service to his customers, and save operating costs, besides treating his customers equally. Few of us would continue to do business with a store that placed several different values on the identical product, selling it to us at one price and others at another. We would soon be convinced that a man who handled his business in such a fashion would not deserve our patronage. Yet we in Texas still operate our public personnel business on just such a basis. We still permit all of the positions in our state service to be itemized as individual positions without attempting to group
like positions together in order that they can be treated equitably and, like the store manager who fails to classify his merchandise, we pay a variation of salaries for identical duties (identical as far as position-titles are concerned) performed by the employees of our state government.

Since it is the position that is to be classified in the position-classification plan, it is imperative that we have a clear conception of what is mean by a "position." We should be so certain on this point that we will never be misled into the belief that we are analyzing and classifying a position when actually we are analyzing and classifying something else.

A "position", from the standpoint of every one concerned with a classification plan, is composed of assignments of work and delegations of accompanying responsibilities by competent authority. It may be full time or part time, permanent or temporary, occupied or vacant. It comes into existence through the action of management or other controlling authority and proceeds through supervisory operating officials who formally or informally assign work and delegate responsibility to the individual employee.

At any given time a position is characterized solely by

---

4 For similar definitions, see Committee on Position-Classification and Pay Plans in the Public Service, Position-Classification in the Public Service, p. 36; U.S.Code,Title 5, 1940 Edition, Section 502.
all its duties and responsibilities, as they exist at that
time. So long as these attributes remain the same, the
position itself remains the same, regardless of any other
consideration which might influence the position. This ex-
planation of course is not to say that the duties and respon-
sibilities of positions are fixed and immutable. They may
change from time to time, abruptly or gradually, and this
change may occur for any number of reasons such as a change in
the organizational structure whereby additional duties and
responsibilities may be assigned to the position, or duties
and responsibilities may be taken from the position by the
supervisor or management.

Since a position is characterized by its current duties
and responsibilities, it follows that when these change in
some material respect, the position itself changes. It is
not the same position as it was before these changes were
made. This is true even if it is still called by the same or-
ganizational name and occupies the same place in the organiza-
tional structure of the agency. When the duties and responsi-
bilities of a position are changed, a new position has been
created, different from the old one to the extent of the mate-
rial change made by management or other controlling influences
of the position.

Positions therefore are classified for the same reasons
other things are classified. Classification makes possible the
and regulations under which personnel administration is to be conducted. Granted that position-classification does not give complete freedom of action from legislative control, it does make possible the handling of the personnel problem in an intelligent and business like manner by the legislature. Also, it will tend to prevent a total disruption of a governmental personnel policy by an irate law-making body.

Other misunderstandings are voiced by administrators, supervisors, and employees who have failed to analyze and understand the classification plan. A few of these major misconceptions will be pointed out. First, many supervisors and employees fail to distinguish between the classification of the position and the classification of the incumbent who occupies the position. This misunderstanding can be traced to the failure of properly defining a position as it is used in a duty-classification plan. It was pointed out above that a position could be occupied or vacant and still receive the same class allocation. True, the employee who occupies the position will have an influence on the position, but if these influences materially change the duties and responsibilities of the position, then a new position has been created and it

5 Ismar Baruch, Facts and Fallacies about Position-Classification, 1937.
must be newly classified and allocated to the classification structure. As a rule the duties and responsibilities are not basically changed regardless of the different individuals who might at one time or another occupy the position. But it must be conceded that because of natural differences in human beings it is possible with certain types of positions for an employee to change the character of the position. This change may take the form of diminishing the duties and responsibilities or causing more duties and responsibilities to be assigned to the position. In either case a new position is created and it must be treated as such. So it must be remembered in analyzing a position that at no time should the capacities or deficiencies of the incumbent influence the final allocation.

Another fallacy which confuses many who are subjected to the classification processes is the question of what the salary will be when the position is finally allocated to the class structure. As a general rule a pay plan usually accompanies a position-classification plan. But it must be remembered that there are two separate plans. It is true that a pay plan must use a position-classification plan if it is to make a fair and equal distribution of salaries to be paid employees, but it is entirely possible to have a

Ibid.
position-classification plan without the accompanying pay plan. Usually we find a pay plan accompanying a position-classification plan, but this is not always the case. A pay plan can be changed from time to time, depending on the desires of the legislative body without basically affecting the classification plan. Therefore, if there is a tendency to treat the two plans as one, and let pay influence the final allocation of the position, position-classification ceases to function as a tool in arriving at equal pay for equal work. 7

Many administrators and supervisors object to position-classification because they believe that it places a fence around a position which will tend to limit the authority of management to delegate duties and responsibilities to employees under its supervision. This is a fallacy, because any proper position-classification must be set up to meet changes and requirements of a position. It is not a system to maintain the status quo of the organization, but a system so devised that changes can and should be made as conditions within the organization warrant such changes. Position-classification in no way restricts a position, but is merely a description of the current duties and responsibilities of the position.  

7 Ibid.
Some employees are of the opinion that position-classification restricts their opportunity for advancement by making their positions an independent unit separate and apart from other positions of the organization. This ideology is to be expected from those who fail clearly to understand the full meaning of position-classification. In fact position-classification not only does not restrict the opportunity for advancement, but it makes it possible for an employee to see the opportunities as they exist for promotions and for re-assignments within the agency or for transfers to any other agency covered by the same classification plan.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF POSITION-CLASSIFICATION

When the United States Government hired its second employee in 1789, a personnel problem was created which has not, as yet, been solved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Salary legislation has since 1789 frequently engaged the attention of the chief executive and Congress. During the first session of Congress the pay problem was temporarily set aside by an act to maintain a salary of $500 a year as the maximum rate to be paid clerks of the three existing departments in the executive branch of the government. This act certainly was not a scientific or equitable approach in the establishing of salary legislation, but this system was used until 1795.

In 1795 Congress decided that a better solution to the problem of paying government employees should be devised. After much discussion a bill was finally adopted which authorized the heads of each department to vary salaries "in such a manner as the service to be performed shall in their judgment require." The Act placed a ceiling of $1,000 a year

---

as the highest that could be paid to principal clerks. This authority was granted annually until 1799, when Congress gave it a continuing status which remained in effect until 1818.

In 1818 it was brought to the attention of Congress that the "lump sum" method of appropriation was not the answer to the pay problem. A committee was appointed to study the problem and prepare legislation that would correct the inequalities that existed in government employees' salaries. The legislation which originated from this study was an act to control the salaries for individual positions. This type of legislation became known as the "statutory roll" method of fixing salaries. It is still being used in many of our states, including Texas, and local governments.

When Andrew Jackson became President of the United States, the statutory roll method was abandoned and Congress returned to the lump sum appropriation which, as was pointed out above, gave the heads of the departments the authority to vary salaries according to their own discretion. This method of appropriation was used until 1853, even though it was criticised

and objected to by many employees and administrators.

There was, in 1836, a growing dissatisfaction among the government employees with the method of salary legislation adopted by Congress. Individual employees began to petition Congress for higher and a more equitable distribution of the money appropriated for salaries. There had been a general rise in the cost of living without salary increase to effect these rising demands.

These petitions led to no salary adjustments, but the petitions did tend to direct the attention of Congress to the need of a more scientific method of salary legislation. The Committee on Ways and Means after hearing and studying these petitions said:

In forming an opinion on the duties of clerks, particularly the higher grades, the committee encounters difficulty perhaps common to all arising from the absence of a more significant term descriptive of their distinctive employment. It may be necessary therefore in treating this subject to go somewhat into detail in tracing them and ascertaining their character. 3

After a more comprehensive study of the duties required and the responsibilities borne by the clerks of the various departments, the committee further stated:

In fine, fully considering the whole subject in all its bearings the committee are unanimously of

the opinion that the clerks who labor in the inferior grades are entitled to a decent support from the government; and that for the higher grades such allowances should be established as will, at once, be a fair remuneration for the service required, and furnish the heads of offices with means of filling the situations with the requisite degree of capacity and fidelity.⁴

This statement indicated that Congress was devoting some time and serious thinking to the personnel problems existing in the federal service at that time. Although there was no constructive legislation based upon the above recommendations, it did give the government employees the satisfaction of knowing that their memorials were being considered and that if they continued to make their demands known, eventually appropriate legislation would be passed to correct some of their grievances.

Perhaps one of the factors which caused federal employees to seek salary adjustments other than cost-of-living was that growing out of the fact that the Post Office Department had been returned to the "statutory roll" appropriation. The other departmental employees felt that this method was more just in establishing salaries than leaving it to the discretion of the heads of the departments.

The Senate, recognizing the need for equalization of

⁴ Ibid.
salaries, passed a resolution in 1838 addressed to the heads of the several departments, which required reports showing:

The classification of the clerks as nearly as they may be able, in reference to the character of the labor to be performed, the care and responsibility imposed, the qualification required, and the relative value to the public of the service of each class as compared with the others; and especially whether as the clerks are now paid, there be inequalities of compensation among clerks performing the same class of duties, and whether there be now classes of clerks receiving different rates of compensations where the duties performed are substantially equal in all the considerations which should govern compensation; ... such changes and improvement in the classification of clerks in the respective departments and bureaus in reference to compensation as justice to the clerks and the interest of the public service may seem to require. 7

These reports submitted in response to this Senate resolution revealed a conscientious effort on the part of some department heads to attempt to correct many of the inequalities which existed in their units. Others felt that a differential in pay was as it should be, since they felt that experience and application should receive more weight in determining the salary of a clerk than the duty assigned him.

The Senate Committee was unable to take these reports

---

and work out a scheme of classification whereby gross inequalities could be eliminated. It is to be assumed that the committee felt that the task of coordinating this material was too difficult to undertake at this time.

Congress did try to adjust salary levels by increasing the basic pay rate by a fixed percentage. This method was used during World War I and again in World War II. Its purpose was to give the governmental employees temporary relief from the higher cost of living. It was conceded at this time, as was the case in World War I and II, that the lower salaried employees should receive a larger percentage increase than that received by the employees of the higher salaried brackets.

Congress became economy conscious in 1841. When the salary question of federal employees was brought to the attention of Congress, the change was not to readjust salaries upward, but to scale them down. The Committee on Retrenchment after making a survey of federal salaries reported to the House of Representatives the following:

The salaries of clerks vary generally from $1,000 to $2,000. These seem, with few exceptions, to be arbitrarily arranged without such reference to their respective duties. The committee regard this as a great defect in organization of the Departments. There is necessarily a great difference in the capacity and application requisite for the faithful discharge of the duties of the clerks, and there should be a corresponding difference in compensation. . . .
One reason why it has been found so difficult to apportion the salaries of clerks according to their duties will be found in the want of practical acquaintance on the part not only of heads of bureaus but also on the part of the Secretaries themselves, with the minute details of business in the various subdivisions of the public service.

The duties of the clerks are very unequal, and considerable reduction would be made by a more equal distribution of labor and a more just apportionment of salaries among them.

The employment of clerks in the various departments of Washington, from the number employed, the importance of their duties, and the amount expended in their compensation, is a subject demanding the most careful consideration of Congress.

The Committee would be glad to have it in their power to present some plan for specifying and fixing, with more accuracy, the duties of the several classes of officers, which might not only operate as a useful stimulant to all, but serve to show more satisfactorily the various subdivisions of business, and, by connecting these in their details more directly with the individual employed, to exhibit to the people more clearly the number actually employed on each duty, and the manner in which the public business is distributed and performed. But the present system has been so long established, the officers are so numerous, and their duties are sometimes so fluctuating in character, that it would be impossible, at least in any reasonable time, to devise a general or systematic arrangement that would answer the ends which have been indicated.

In order to accomplish the desired reductions in departmental expenses, Congress presented to the heads of the departments a sketch of a bill to be completed by them as to the number, classification and pay of the clerks and

---

officers in each department. This information was to be used to guide Congress in establishing legislation upon the subject of salary reduction.

The results of this request as completed by the heads of the departments did, in a limited sense, recommend salary equalization across departmental lines. The Congressional Committee considered a classification of positions in the different departments as of primary importance, but it failed to utilize the information obtained in furthering classification of positions in the Federal service. This Congress decided to leave this complex problem to be disposed of by another Congress.

We are able to gather from the above discussion that classification was becoming firmly rooted in the annals of Congress. But it was the general opinion among the legislators that it would be impossible, at least in any reasonable time, to devise a general or systematic arrangement that would satisfactorily answer the questions involved.

There was little or nothing done concerning the salaries of the federal employees for the next eight years, but about 1851 a more or less concerted effort, on the part of the federal employees, began to manifest itself for a general reconsideration of the salary situation in the government service. The general rise in prices coupled with the more or less stationary salaries began to
work a hardship on the government employees. These employees began to flood Congress with petitions for relief. Legislators began to introduce bills trying to obtain the desired equalization and a general raise in salaries.

Mr. Ewing, a member of the House of Representatives, in his discussion for a general salary raise, had this to say:

I admit that you could get clerks at 50 dollars a year and you might get those who would do it for less. But the question is whether you would find competent men to perform these duties at low salaries. You might find men who would undertake to perform the duties of a judge of the Supreme Court for one hundred and fifty dollars a year, but the question is whether you could get competent men for such a salary.\(^7\)

Mr. Davis sponsored a bill in which he pointed out that:

Those who are in the older bureaus have the lowest salaries. Our fathers, being more economical than we are, fixed the salaries of the employees at lower rates than those fixed at the present time, and the consequence is that new appointees receive larger salaries than some who have grown grey in the service. This I propose to correct.\(^8\)

Another member of Congress, Mr. Carter, recognized the inequalities that existed in the salaries of Federal employees. He opposed a proposed change in the War Department by stating:

\(^7\) *Congressional Globe*, XX, 31st. Congress, Second Session, February 18, 1851, p. 584.

This is one of a series of measures presented and to be presented to Congress to raise the salaries of the clerks in the different departments. Now, if the matter comprehended some uniform regulation for the entire Executive Department, there might be some merit in the proposition. If the argument be true as to the necessity of the classification proposed, it must be equally true in regard to the other bureaus; and the provisions of the bill ought to be extended to all clerks in the employment of the government. . . . but if there is to be a reformation in one of the departments, if you propose to raise the salaries of the clerks in one of the departments, you ought to go further and comprehend all the clerks in all the departments of the government, and have a uniform price for all those who perform an equal amount of labor. If you increase the salary of one, you should do the same with them all. If you increase the salaries in one department, you should do the same in all, and go into a general system of equalization, or what is called leveling up.

No, sir, I move to recommit this bill; and if it is necessary to go into equalization of the salaries of the clerks at all, let the committee so provide that all clerks in all the departments shall share equally, and not single out those old rusty clerks in the War Department. Why, I have heard it said that the clerks in that Department were too old to go on crutches.9

Recognizing the fact that bills then being debated in the Senate would not accomplish the desired equalization of salaries with the amount of work performed by the employees throughout the government service, the Senate decided to approach the problem from another angle. The heads of the Departments were to submit reports to the Senate on what was believed to be the proper classification of employees.

---

9 Ibid., February 13, 1851, p. 584.
under their supervision with regard to salaries based on work performed.

After a study of all the reports which conflicted in many respects, depending on the individual views of the heads of the departments, the Senate proposed a measure which it was hoped would furnish a reasonably permanent solution to this complex problem.

Senator Hunt in explaining the measure before the Senate said:

I desire now to offer an amendment which has been unanimously adopted by the Committee on Finance, in regard to the classification and organization of clerks. . . . It is proposed to organize the clerks of the Departments of the Treasury, Interior, War, Navy, and Post Office, leaving out the State Department because at the time this scheme originated, Mr. Webster requested me to leave it out — in four classes: class one to receive $500 per annum; class two, $1200; class three, $1500; and class four, $1800. It allows besides a chief clerk in those bureaus where a chief is now allowed at $2000, and a chief clerk to each Department proper; where they are now allowed, $2200. . . . In addition to this, it is provided that no new clerk shall be appointed until he shall have been examined and qualified by a Board to consist of three persons, one of them to be the head of the bureau into which he is to be appointed, and the others to be appointed by the head of the Department who appoints the clerks. . . .

It arranges the clerks amongst the heads of the bureaus according to the reports which come in, in answer to a resolution which I introduced not more than a year ago. We have reports from the heads of each of the bureaus in regard to the arrangement upon the classification which I then proposed, and a report from the head of each Department. We have arranged the clerks according to these reports into four classes. We have provided, however, in order that it may work well, and that there may be no inconveniences in case we should have made some trifling omission, that the head of the Department may distribute the clerks amongst the
different bureaus as he thinks best, thus leaving the whole control with him. The results of the scheme is that we equalize the salary in each class, we classify all the clerks in each Department, so that we can get rid of the eternal application to increase a clerk's salary in order to bring it up to a sum equal to that of another. We also get rid of the principle of extra allowances and extra emoluments; and I believe we shall thus lay the foundation of what is essential to the safe administration of this government. . . . I believe that no matter who is President, no matter who is head of the Department, we cannot expect that the affairs of Government will be administered safely and efficiently; because, after all, it depends upon the honesty, the skill, and the efficiency of the men that do the work of the Department, to administer them safely and efficiently. 10

This proposed legislation was finally enacted as section three of the Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1854. In response to complaints of inadequacy and inequality of the legislation, section three of the Act was amended the following year. This amendment was intended as a temporary relief until a general bill could be drafted that would be just and equitable. 11

Senator Adams, in presenting the amendment to the Act of March 3, 1853, said:

We find that since the organization and the late law, it has been utterly impossible for Departments to

10 Ibid., XXII, February 28, 1853, p. 396.
so arrange the different classes as to do justice to all those who are engaged; and I find, on examination in most of the Departments, a clerk at $900 per annum, one at $1200, and another at $1500, performing the same kind and the same amount of labor. The expense of living here is so high that if a clerk receiving $900 a year has a wife and one child, and nothing to live on but his salary, if his child should die, he has either to go in debt or other clerks have to subscribe, as they frequently do, to raise money enough to bury the child. . . . Therefore, we propose to provide that all clerks in any Department, performing the same or similar labor to that performed by any of the classes, shall receive the same compensation as the bill gives to that class. . . .

The general bill, however, contemplated as a corrective measure was not presented in the following years. Gradually the classes established by the Act of 1853, as amended in 1854, were extended to most of the clerks in all the offices, and served to define salary levels in estimating for and authorizing appropriations for clerical positions until after the enactment of the Classification Act of 1923.

Congress, in August, 1876, enacted a law which showed that salaries attached to the positions were not indicative of the duties and responsibilities of the position. The law provided:

That whenever, in the judgment of the head of any department, the duties assigned to a clerk of one class can be as well performed by a clerk of a lower class or by a female clerk, it shall be lawful for him to diminish the number of clerks of the higher grade and increase the number of the clerks of the lower grade

---

within the limits of the total appropriation for such clerical service. 13

This statement is interpreted to mean that without any change in pay a clerk receiving $1200 in class one, could be assigned work previously done by a clerk receiving $1800 in class four. We can see that action of this kind would not correct inequalities that might exist. In fact, it gave the heads of the departments an opportunity to further the growth of inequalities existing in our government's personnel practices.

During the Grant administration efforts were made to classify the clerks in the Federal service according to the character of duties each performed. But due to the failure of Congress to provide funds to continue the program, the work was shelved in 1874.

After the Civil Service Act of 1883 was passed, the term classification was given a different meaning. Up to this point it was generally conceded to mean a method of achieving equalization of salaries. Now, according to sections six and seven of the Civil Service Act, the term referred primarily to the placing of positions within the scope of the competitive examination. This terminology is

not to be confused with the definition given classification in the Classification Act of 1923. Under the Civil Service Act, classification is used in the sense of "jurisdictional classification," which has little relationship to "duties classification" used in the later Act.

Since the departments, operating independently, were to determine what positions would be brought into the competitive classified service, there was created diversified interpretation of sections six and seven of the Civil Service Act. To gain uniformity among the several departments, a plan was approved to classify positions according to the salary attached. Ten classes were established and the employees' positions were allocated to the classes according to the salary of the said position.

This type of salary classification was thus made uniform throughout the department service for examination purposes. It is important to point out, however, that while uniformity was secured in this respect, this type of


15 Section six of the Civil Service Act had to do with the classification of position for examination purposes. Section seven made examinations mandatory for appointment and promotion in the Federal service. Civil Service Act and Rules, Statutes, Executive Orders and Regulations, pp. 8-9.
classification was purely on a salary basis. No consideration was given to equalization of pay or the relation of salaries to duties performed.

It was abuses of this nature that caused the House of Representatives to report a bill in 1896 which would provide a Commission to investigate the classification and pay plan of Federal employees in Washington.

Mr. Cox, member of the House of Representatives, who argued favorably for passage of the bill, projected the fundamental basis for a duties-classification when he said:

I believe we shall lay the foundation of what is essential to the safe administration of this government. I mean a civil corps which shall have the experience, efficiency, and ability which shall enable the heads of the Departments to administer their respective Departments safely and efficiently, without which I believe that no matter who is the head of the Department, we cannot expect that the affairs of the Government will be administered safely and efficiently, because after all it depends upon the honesty, skill, and efficiency of the men who do the work of the Department to administer them properly. . . . The proper classification and arrangement of the employees in the Department would be of incalculable advantage to the members of the House in making appropriations. It is a well known fact that with the exception of the Committee on appropriation their reports are sealed books to the members of the House. The amount annually appropriated are so large and so complex to the average Congressman as to preclude an understanding of their details except by the better informed who have had the advantage of hearing the discussion preparatory to presenting the bill for consideration, and the overworked appropriation Committee finds it almost impossible to master the details.
By the proposed classification the appropriations would be made for classes one, two, three, etc., so that any member could understand how many clerks were provided in classes one, two, etc., and approximately know the character of the duties they would be required to perform. Furthermore, it would take away from the heads of the Departments a generous discretion, which in some instances would be abused, and remove temptations to extravagance of favoritism by pointing directly to the specific object of appropriation. If it has been found necessary to classify the service on two occasions when the civil list was comparatively small, most assuredly the reasons are tenfold stronger now, when our population has so increased, our expenses have been so greatly augmented, and the public employees are so numerous at present. At all events, this is simply a proposition for investigation and report. What legislation may follow, if any, is a matter of future determination. Let us at least manifest a disposition to act as any prudent man would in the management of his private affairs. Let us occasionally take stock, examine the debit and credit side and see how matters have been conducted, especially when business has changed hands and charges of favoritism, nepotism, and baneful social influences have been preferred. . . .

I will now invite your attention to abuses which I am reliably informed will be found to exist in consequence of the growth of the Government's business, the expansion of the civil service, and the consequent change of its clerical requirements, all of which has been continually ignored by Congress as it has annually voted so many clerks here and so many there without regard to grade or pay.

That they have been employed without any regard for their grade or pay, Congress has never stopped to inquire. Except in the Patent Office, and more recently in the Pension Office, no attempt is made at grading the work by the pay, and the pay by the work and responsibility, and under the present system it is impossible for Congress to give its time and attention to correcting these abuses. . . .

I find that in the departments in Washington men are today drawing salaries without regard to the class of work or the quality and amount performed. . . . This can be but an abuse of the service, for it is unjust and improper discrimination against the working bees of the hive. Who can deny the necessity for an investigation where all of us have heard so many causes
of complaint even if we cannot remedy them? That there are abuses, very gross abuses, now existing no one can deny. Men are drawing $720 and $840 who are doing the same work as men who get from $1200 to $1600 a year. They are on the rolls as laborers.

... In many offices there are men and women drawing the highest grades of pay who are simply copyists and laborers, while men and women are everywhere employed on the same 'job' at every grade of pay, without regard to the amount or quality of service rendered. ...

What would you think of the business principle of a contractor who would hire a gang of men at four dollars, three dollars, two dollars and one dollar per day and put them doing work indiscriminately on a house, one man carrying a hod and others mixing mortar, and others doing from the highest to the lowest wages, without regard to pay or qualification. This, it appears, is precisely what the Government does.16

Mr. Cox and the Committee failed to produce any further legislation on the projected classification at this time.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who was a former member of the Civil Service Commission, appointed in 1905, upon his own initiative, a committee to investigate the business methods and practices of the executive branch of the government and to construct and submit a plan for its improvement. The Committee, which was known as the Keep's Committee,17 submitted the report to the President in 1907. One section


17 C. H. Keep, Assistant Secretary of Treasury, was Chairman of the Committee.
of the report was the "Classification of Positions and the Gradation of Salaries."

The Committee said in part:

It is a well-known fact that through all the departments, people are sitting side by side doing the same class of work and receiving very different compensation. Some clerks doing the simplest kind of work are, by reason of length of service, receiving high salaries, while young men only recently certified by the Civil Service Commission, whose general intelligence and ability soon causes them to be assigned to the most difficult work in the office, have to wait many years before they receive the recognition in salary that the character of their work justifies. A large proportion of the injustice and favoritism in the Government service springs from this cause . . . .

A reclassification of positions, with readjustment of salaries graded so that the difference in salary shall represent actual difference in character of work and responsibility, has long been needed in the interest of efficient and economical administration. 18

What the Committee actually found was an antiquated system used in handling the complex problem of classification. But this antiquated system is still being used in many of our state and local governments.

The Committee said further:

So far as the reclassification of the entire service and a grading of the salaries in proportion to the work and responsibility are concerned, nothing has

---

been done within a half century.\textsuperscript{19}

To correct these conditions, the Keep's Committee recommended the adoption of a uniform schedule of grades and salaries based on work performed, the classification of positions in accordance with this schedule, and the creation of a coordinating committee for further adjustment and investigation.

Congress failed to favor these recommendations, therefore no corrective legislation was enacted.

In June, 1910, President Taft was authorized by Congress to "inquire into the methods of transacting the public business." This inquiry led to the appointment of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency. But no legislation resulted from their investigation.

After the organization of the Bureau of Efficiency a plan was worked out to correct some of the evils that existed in the federal personnel system by establishing an efficiency rating board, but the board found out after further investigation that some type of position-classification would be necessary before efficiency rating of employees could be made.

The idea of a position-classification system based on

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., p. 33.
the duties and responsibilities of the position began to claim widespread approval during the period from 1911 to 1919. Chicago had worked out the plan in 1911 and its operation had received close observance from far and wide. Due to the efforts of the National Federation of Federal Employees, Congress in 1919 decided that the time was ripe for a thorough study of the salary administration in the Federal Government. A Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries was authorized.

This Commission, during the course of investigation, found injustices in personnel practices existing throughout the service. A system was planned which would remedy these conditions to a certain degree.

The Commission in its recommendations suggested, among other things, that Congress:

1. Adopt the classification and pay plan which it had developed.
2. Authorize an existing agency, "logically and preferably the Civil Service Commission" to make a final allocation of positions to classes.
3. Provide for the future permanent administration of the classification and pay plan by delegating to classification agency the authority to alter and amend the classification plan from time to time, to allocate new and changed positions, and to recommend to Congress revisions of the pay plan, whenever desirable or necessary.

The work of this Commission ultimately led to the

21 Ibid., p. 27.
Classification Act of 1923.

The following illustration, which was prepared by the Personnel Classification Board of the United States Civil Service Commission, gives the important features of the position-classification as developed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

It had been a long and tiring struggle for the personnel reformers of government to get a personnel law enacted which would be a solid foundation upon which to build a personnel system. The Classification Act of 1923 is not a panacea for all the personnel problems in the Federal government. It is only a tool to be used by the personnel administrators in handling the complex personnel problems in the government service. Changes and improvements have been made in the original Act, but from the standpoint of basic structure, the original Act is still the foundation upon which the Federal personnel system operates.

CHAPTER III

USES AND ADVANTAGES OF A POSITION-CLASSIFICATION PLAN

A position-classification plan is the foundation upon which all other personnel processes are based. It is an administrative tool, so designed that when properly used, it will assist the personnel managers in solving many of the complex personnel problems which arise in the operation of a public agency. The final value of the plan is conditioned by the application of the plan, by the administrator, to the personnel needs of the organization. As with all other tools its benefits and uses are dependent upon the abilities or capacities of those who administer the plan. Many of the advantages are incorporated into the plan itself. Other advantages may be considered as by-products which result when personnel transactions are handled according to the position-classification plan.

Uniform Position Terminology

A position-classification plan will establish a common language in personnel administration by giving uniform and descriptive titles to all positions covered by the plan. This function of the plan makes it possible for anyone who
deals with government personnel to talk in terms that are universally defined and accepted by all who participate in the operation of our government agencies. Before a classification plan was adopted in the federal service, position titles gave, in many instances, no indications of the work performed by the individual occupying the position. For example, in the report of the Reclassification Commission, in 1920, a study was made involving 1283 positions officially known by the title of Clerk, Class One. The employees were performing ninety-seven varieties of duties. Sometimes high-sounding titles were given positions whose duties and responsibilities were negligible. This practice misled the taxpayer and the legislature through its attempts to give prestige to an unimportant position. This sort of thing was common practice when the "spoils system" was considered the proper method of employing public personnel. When the Pennsylvania Civil Service Association investigated the personnel practice of the municipal government in the city of Philadelphia, it found many positions carrying misleading or high-sounding titles. In one of its reports the Association said:

---

An ace of spades should be recognizable every time it turns up, and not camouflaged half the time as a trøy of hearts or a deuje of diamonds regardless of who is dealing the hand. 2

After the position-classification plan is well established and the terminology has become the official language used by all concerned with personnel administration, it is possible for the legislature, taxpayer, administrator, employee, and the general public to speak, read, or write about positions by merely referring to the title that has been officially given the position. There is no necessity for giving a detailed description of work involved, because the official title will convey the duties and responsibilities. Another advantage gained in the standardization of terminology is that the positions can be catalogued in such a way that they will be easily accessible to anyone who desires to refer to them.

Pay Plan

As was pointed out in the History of Classification, the motivating force of the groups that led the fight for a position-classification plan, was the desire to establish a basis for a more equitable pay plan based upon equal pay

for equal work and more pay for harder and more exacting work. A position-classification plan, properly administered, will attempt to determine what is meant by "equal" and what is meant by "work" as these terms are associated with the individual positions in the personnel structure. Classes of positions which are established under the plan will determine "more pay for harder and more exacting work."

E. O. Griffenhagen and Associates in recommending a classification and pay plan for Virginia made an interesting comment concerning the relationship of a pay plan to a position-classification plan.

The comment was to the effect that without a position-classification plan to guide the administrative officer in charge of the work to be done by the government agency, such officer would have difficulty indicating readily, to the budgeting authorities, the character or value of the work of the positions needed for the proper functioning of the agency. The administrative officer in charge must call the position by such a title and recommend such a salary as seems to him to be appropriate, usually without much reference to other positions existing in the same government jurisdiction. He, too often, has no general knowledge about these positions. This request for positions and salaries from the administrative officer, is considered by the
budgeting or legislative authorities as to the apparent need for services of the general kind specified, and if the request is approved, the positions are authorized about as requested. Neither the administrative officer nor the authorized agency know exactly what the duties and responsibilities of the positions are or should be. Other individual requests for positions from other appointing officers, expressing their ideas of their requirements, are viewed by the authorizing agency. These requests are acted upon in the same manner as the one described in the example above.

Without a position-classification plan to guide them, the different appointing authorities usually have no common point of view, either as to what the title of the position should be or as to what salary the position will command. The personnel or administrative officers frequently have exaggerated notions of the importance of the duties and responsibilities of individual positions which come under their supervision. On the other hand they often underrate certain positions which they neither understand nor have any interest. For example, the executive who criticises the work of the researcher and the scientists, often fails to see the importance of the layman's activities.

In the absence of a position-classification plan which will make possible an equitable pay plan, it is difficult,
if not impossible, to secure the loyal contented and interested service from the employees that will insure full value for money expended in the operation of our public agencies. When the Commission on Reclassification was investigating the personnel practices in our Federal service, it was not necessary to seek far in order to find instances in which employees, working side by side on the same kind of work, received salaries that were wide apart. In some cases subordinates received more pay than their superiors. There was usually no uniform relation between the importance and value of the work performed and the salary received for such work. Such conditions as existed in the Federal service at this time gave rise among the employees to feelings of injustice and discrimination. It is obvious that under such circumstances there must have been underpayment in some cases and overpayment in others. The latter condition brings out the ethical side of the pay question involved in the consideration of whether the trustees of the public funds have the legal authority to spend these funds except for value received. On the other hand, underpayment is an injustice to public employees and should not be tolerated by the citizens.

---

The results, in any service that has not had its positions carefully analyzed and classified and to which a carefully developed compensation plan has not been applied, is a hodge-podge of positions under an array of meaningless titles, and with all sorts of variations in rates of compensation that have little relation, as between positions, to the relative value of the work.

Budget-Making

A position-classification plan that standardizes and defines the position tremendously simplifies the problem of budget-making. Each responsible administrator in making the budget request, can specify just the positions that he thinks he needs by using the proper titles without further elaboration. The budget and appropriating authorities will be able to understand exactly what kind of positions are being requested, because each title used has been given a definite meaning.

An effective position-classification plan provides a means by which to indicate clearly the character of positions that exist in the government service. It does not say that these positions should exist, but it merely takes the services as it finds them and undertakes to state in definite

\[4\]

Ibid., p. 38.
standard language what the positions are. It provides the means for handling the employment processes involved in such positions as do exist. With this information the budgeting officials and the legislature in the interest of efficiency and economy can determine what positions should exist before approving the budget. To illustrate, let us assume that an administrator desires that all of the employees be qualified stenographers so that he would be able to dictate letters to anyone under his supervision. With this information available to the budgeting authorities, they can determine whether or not the work of the organization would justify all qualified stenographers when in the interest of economy and efficiency the work could be satisfactorily accomplished with fewer stenographers and more clerks.

Recruiting, Testing, Certification

The Civil Service Commission, which is charged with the responsibility of providing the Federal agencies with the best qualified available personnel to fill all positions in the service, would have difficulty in enforcing the merit system if no position-classification plan existed. The Commission recognized this difficulty soon after its organization in 1883, and recommended that a position-classification plan be adopted.
It is the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission to recruit, examine, and certify the names of eligible applicants to the operating departments when requests are made for additional personnel. In performing these operations position-classification plays an important role. To begin with, it serves as a basis for preparing examination announcements and thus enables the recruiting of personnel meeting the specific qualifications of the announcement. It serves as a basis for preparing tests. Since positions in the same class involve work requiring the same basic qualifications, the Commission can design its testing activities, not to individual positions, but to classes of positions. It also enables the Commission to prepare and maintain registers for future certification as requests for personnel are made. It enables the appointing officer, when filing a requisition for personnel, to do so by merely using the class title of the positions to be filled. The Commission will understand the type of position to be filled and can intelligently proceed to supply the desired number of qualified applicants. In other words, it places personnel requisitions in the same category with the requisition of supplies.

Promotion and Transfer

Position-classification makes possible a sound plan for promotion and transfer. A general plan for promotion or
transfer which is not constructed on a foundation of specific and explicit specification of the duties and responsibilities of the positions in their proper sequence is foredoomed to failure. Employees cannot advance from position to position presenting a spiral of duties and responsibilities unless the nature and requirements of the higher positions are definitely known. Likewise, employees cannot transfer from one position to another like position either within or without the agency unless positions have been standardized.⁵

A careful study of jobs not only assures the correct line of advancement but frequently makes possible an escape from blind alley jobs by linking them with positions in the same or different departments, which offer greater opportunity for promotions.

Service Rating

Classification according to the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications of the position is essential to the development of a fair and equitable efficiency rating system.

Section nine of the Classification Act of 1923 states:

That the Board (Personnel Classification Board) shall review and may revise uniform systems of efficiency rating established or to be established for the various grades or classes thereof, which shall set forth the degree of efficiency which shall constitute ground for (a) increase in the rate of compensation for employees who have not attained the maximum rate of the class to which their positions are allocated, (b) continuance of the existing rate of compensation without increase or decrease, (c) decrease in the rate of compensation for employees who at the time are above the minimum rate for the class to which their positions are allocated, and (d) dismissal. 

The Personnel Classification Board which was later transferred to the Civil Service Commission had the responsibility of enforcing the operation of an efficiency rating system in the Federal service. It was necessary that this system function in conjunction with the position-classification plan. An efficiency rating system that gets away from the analysis of the duties and responsibilities of the position gets away from the facts, and the farther it gets away from the facts, the less its value in determining a fair and impartial efficiency rating.

Training Program

The greatest available resource of any government is


7 Sections 505-509, Title V, Part II of the "Economy Act" approved June 30, 1932, p. 47. Statute 416.
the wisdom and integrity of its employees. If this statement is true, then the government should maintain a training program for its employees. But before employees can be trained, the work for which they are to be trained must be described and analyzed. The necessary knowledge and abilities for the satisfactory performance of the work must be established. Finally, a training program must be designed to incorporate these findings so that the results of the training will satisfy the needs of the service.

It is difficult to conceive of a successful training program in the absence of detailed information to the various jobs in the establishment. Positions must be classified, indexed, defined, evaluated, and related, if a systematic program of employee training is to be maintained. Men cannot be prepared intelligently unless the nature, duties, and responsibilities of the job for which they are being trained are definitely described. The content of the training curriculum, length of the training are alike dependent upon adequate study of jobs.

A position-classification plan will furnish the necessary information for the successful operation of an in-service training program. It will also point the way for colleges and universities to train students for future government employment.

Planning and Clarifying the Personnel Structure of the Organization

All federal agencies are set up to achieve some

---

particular objective. Unless such objective exists, there is no need for the agency. Viewed as a whole, the objectives of government are extremely complex, but by isolating the objective of an individual department, commission, or board, the objectives become reasonably specific and in most instances can be reduced to comprehensible terms. These segments of government have many of their objectives set out for them in the form of specific legislation, or through appropriate measures which in turn must be supplemented by administrative or legal interpretations or otherwise translated into particular projects and programs. It is the efforts and capacities of the individual employees working as a team in such a way as to secure the desired objectives for which the agency owes its existence. 9

The study and planning of organization structure can readily be approached through the techniques of personnel administration that are used in the classification of positions. The detailed analysis of positions and their various relationships to one another should be used as the basis upon which to build, revise, and modify the organization structure in which those positions function. The overlapping functions discovered through the classification

approach suggest various revisions of the assignment of
duties and responsibilities. Conflicts and gaps in authori-
ty, if they exist, are almost certain to be revealed by the
classification approach. 10

Employee-Management Relation

In the government service it is good business to take
positive steps to maintain and improve the effectiveness of
the working habits of the employees. A basic policy in this
direction is that all matters pertaining to personnel should
be administered according to sound principles, definite per-
sonnel policies and clear procedures, formulated in advance.
An irritating source of friction among employee-management
relation is that in which management decides personnel mat-
ters in a haphazard way as individual cases arise. If the
morale of the employees is to be maintained for maximum per-
formance, the employees must have an understanding of the
personnel policy of the agency.

In this respect, a position-classification plan has
a definite contribution to make, because it is the founda-
tion for personnel action that provides for broad planning,
and uniformity and equity of action in the personnel policies
of the agency. Positive and impartial personnel policies
are conducive to the improvement of employee-management

10 Ibid.
relation which will, in turn, improve the service rendered by the agency.\(^\text{11}\)

There are two contributions, to name no others, which a position-classification plan can make toward the improvement of employee morale. First, a position-classification plan will clearly define in writing the job to be done by the employee. This will eliminate questioning on the part of the employee as to whether or not he is doing what he is supposed to do. Knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of the job will definitely improve the employee's morale. Second, clarifying and describing in writing the relationship between the specific job under consideration and other related positions or activities in the government service will improve the morale. If this personnel policy is carried through to a conclusion, it will eliminate misunderstanding and jealousy among the employees and between the employees and the supervisors. It will reduce the possibilities of conflicting authority. It outlines the possibilities for progress and educates all the employees as to what others in the organization are doing. It establishes the importance of each individual job regardless of its nature. Such a procedure has a definite effect upon

"zeal, spirit, hope, and confidence of the employees as they perform their assigned duties." 12

Improves Management-Employee Union Relations

A position-classification plan will prove invaluable in making a clarification of employees' problems which might occur. Especially will this be true when dealing with employee unions. As was pointed out in the history of position-classification the Federal Employees' Union advocated and worked for the plan long before it was adopted by Congress. With all the pertinent information available in black and white concerning every position in the organization, a better feeling of confidence in the organization will be created and employee unions will be able to obtain and study this information from the standpoint of improving management-union relations.

Restrains Unfair Competition and Discourages Pirating of Labor Between Government Agencies

With standardized position-classification throughout the government service, it will be possible to eliminate the practice of one supervisor offering an employee more than another supervisor for the same amount of work. A position

classification plan disregards departmental lines and except for slight variations in interpretation which might occur between departments, an individual doing work in one department will receive the same treatment as an individual doing similar work in another department.

Stabilizes the Labor Market

A position-classification plan tends to stabilize the labor market throughout the government service. By giving all the facts about the positions as they exist, the employee has an opportunity to know where he stands without having to "shop around."

Delegation of Work

A supervisor can use the position-classification plan in delegating work to the employee under his supervision. It, also, enables the supervisor to advise the employee concerning the possibilities of advancement in the government service.

Impartial Personnel Transactions

A position-classification plan will not prevent partisan and highly personal administrators from grossly abusing their power in handling personnel transactions, but it does place a ceiling on the amount of favoritism that can be shown to favored employees. Strict enforcement of the
classification plan will prevent supervisors from obviously abusing his supervisory powers.  

Basis for Constructive Criticism

The Constitution of the United States gives each citizen the right to criticize the policies and actions of government. A position-classification plan furnishes a sound and logical basis for constructive criticism by individuals interested in improving the character of personnel policies, and it is the tool which management can use for utilizing that criticism in progressive advancement of the greatest purposes of classification. That is good government.  

---

13 Lewis Meriam, Public Personnel Problems, p. 33.

14 Ibid.
CHAPTER IV

POSITION ANALYSIS

The analyzing of the individual position is the most important and exacting function performed in the operation of a position-classification plan. If the position is properly analyzed and allocated to the classification pattern, the position-classification plan will function according to the desires of those who created it.

Because of the exactness required in fitting the individual positions into the broad services and grades as established by law, a classification analyst must be able to recognize and define the essential differentiating factors found in various positions. An analysis of these positions requires understanding of the entire classification plan as it applies to all government agencies. The analyst must understand the structure and operations of the organizations involved; have a comprehension of the nature, difficulties and responsibilities inherent in each position; make an interpretation of the exact work-relation of each position to other positions; and have an appreciation of the demands which administrative officials make upon these positions and their incumbents. Such a study involves digging into the
facts, because casual observation of positions is not a foundation for good classification work. Adequate analytical ability is therefore a prerequisite. The classification analyst must be able to recognize the pertinent and salient facts and to isolate them from the immaterial. He must be able to relate the facts one to another. He must be able to interview effectively without friction. He must be able to express himself clearly in speech and in writing. These are a few of the qualification requirements for a successful classification analyst.¹

As was pointed out in the History of Position-Classification when Congress established the classification plan in 1923, provisions were made to divide the positions into five services,² depending upon the duties and responsibilities of the position and the qualification or training required of the incumbent.³ These major categories or services were


² United States Code, Title 5, Section 673.

³ "The professional and scientific service shall include all classes of positions the duties of which are to perform routine, advisory, administrative, or research work which is based upon the established principles of a profession or science, and which requires professional, scientific, or technical training equivalent to that represented by graduation from a college or university of recognized standing." Ibid.
divided into zones of difficulty and responsibilities called "grades." The lowest grade of the service would contain the simplest, the easiest, the most routine and least responsible positions in the service. The highest grade would contain the most responsible and most exacting positions in the service. Congress, also defined, in broad general terms, the characteristics of each grade. For example, grade one of the Professional and Scientific Service is described as follows:

Grade one in this service, which may be referred to as the junior professional grade, shall include all classes of positions, the duties of which are to perform, under immediate supervision, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific skill as herein specified, but little or no experience.

It is the duty and responsibility of the classifying agency to analyze the positions in the government service and to fit them into their proper sequence in the classification pattern.

To facilitate this operation the Personnel Classification Board and later the Civil Service Commission had the authority granted by the Classification Act to establish finer subdivisions of the service and grade arrangement appearing in the statute. These finer subdivisions, as

---

4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., Section 663.
7 Ibid.
established by the Commission are called "classes of positions." A class of positions is composed of all individual positions that are sufficiently alike to warrant like treatment in recruiting, testing, transferring, promoting, and fixing pay for employees occupying such positions, and in carrying out other usual personnel processes pertaining to the position. The class of positions is the final break down in classification arrangement. Their bounds are described in formal statements known as "class specifications." Each of these contains the duties and responsibilities of the position, the title, the minimum qualifications required for the satisfactory performance of such duties and responsibilities and an illustration of typical duties and responsibilities.

Analyzing the position is, in brief, an appraisal of the duties and responsibilities of the position according to the general standards established by Congress in the form of services and grades described in the Classification statutes and as established by the Civil Service Commission in the form of classes described in the class specifications. In analyzing the duties and responsibilities of a position and in classifying it in accordance with the rules

---

8 Ibid., Section 662. 9 Ibid., Section 663.
established by Congress and the Commission, it is necessary for the classifier to know the exact functions of the position. The one who makes the classification must ascertain not only the kind of work but the procedure followed in doing the job.

With reference to a given position, we may better understand the duties and responsibilities of the position by breaking down the work done by the employee into its separate functions. This process will usually indicate clearly the mental processes or the manual operations involved in performing the work of the position. Therefore, a breakdown of the work and the procedure involved in performing the work of the position will be the factors weighed in the final classification analysis.

The duties and responsibilities of a position can be factually set forth, studied, and analyzed according to certain basic elements which are referred to as the ultimate classification factors. Ismar Baruch in his mimeographed manual, "Position Analysis," considers these factors as (1) subject matter, function, profession, or occupation represented by the position; (2) supervision over employee's work; (3) connection with work assignment of other employees in the organization; (4) guide lines and other controls; (5) originality; (6) methods of work; (7) variety and scope;
(8) authority to make decisions and commitments; (9) personal work contacts; (10) review of work of others; (11) supervision of work of others; (12) qualification requirements of the position.

One or all of these factors are important in determining why one position will be similar to, different from, or less or more difficult or responsible than another position.

The following explanation of the significance of these factors in determining the allocation of positions to the classification pattern are taken from Baruch's Position Analysis.

**Subject Matter, Function, Profession or Occupation**

Allocation of a position or work assignment according to the subject matter, function, profession, or occupation involved is a classification by kind of work and is the first and the least difficult of the various conclusions that have to be drawn in the process of allocating a position. To distinguish between typing and filing, or between a metallurgist and a veterinarian requires little discrimination. To be sure, there are some problems, under this factor, which will tax the analytical ability of the classifier. The classifier will find twilight zones among some of the positions within the same service. Also, the
variety of work of some positions will present the perplexing problem of allocating the position to the proper service and occupational group. For example, it is frequently difficult to determine whether a given position should be classified in the Sub-professional Service or in the Professional or Scientific Service; or in the Clerical, Administrative and Fiscal Service as distinguished from the Professional and Scientific Service. On the whole, however, the determination of the kind or work involved in a position for the purpose of deciding in which service and occupational group it belongs, is the least difficult decision involved in determining its classification.

Supervision over Employee's Work

This factor involves the instruction or advice regularly given by the supervisor and received by the employees before or during his performance of his work-assignment. The classification analyst will consider the degree of detail, explicitness, and scope of such instruction or advice. Consideration must also be given to when and under what circumstances the supervisor expects the employee to refer matters to him or ask him for instruction or advice. The degree to which the supervisor regularly reviews or checks the employee's work, and the purpose, extent, and degree of authority of such review or check is important.
It might be added that there are few if any employees in the public service that escape supervision of their work assignment.

Connection with the Work-Assignment of Other Employees

The elements considered under this factor are: (a) the relation of the employee's duties and responsibilities of other employees dealing with the same task, case or problems, either earlier or later in the sequence of events as the flow of work travels through the organization; (b) what has been done by other employees in the performance of their own duties that affect the form or nature of the task, case, or problem when the employee first tackles it; (c) the extent to which the supervisor has arranged for the employee to seek advice and counsel from other employees whose own duties and responsibilities call for the giving of such advice and counsel; when and under what circumstance does the supervisor expect or require the employee to seek such advice and counsel as a part of the duties of the position? (d) the extent to which the supervisor has designated as the duties and responsibilities of another employee to serve as a reviewer of the work of the employee. Is the purpose, extent and authority of such review a limiting factor on the duties and responsibilities of the position?
Guidelines and Other Controls

The regulations, policies, oral or written instructions, work methods, procedures, precedents, laws, professional standards, sources of information, or any other guide lines which the employee is required to observe in performing the duties and responsibilities of the positions are pertinent factors in analyzing positions for classification purposes. How specific these guide lines are and to what extent there is room for judgment and interpretation on the part of the employee must also be considered.

Originality

The parts of the employee's duties and responsibilities that are novel or unusual, or the parts not covered by guide lines, presenting an opportunity for original judgment, discretion, and independent thought which the employee is expected to exercise, or the parts of the duties and responsibilities the employee is expected to operate entirely on his own initiative without control by others must be considered by the classification analyst.

This factor deals with the processes which the employee is expected to perform in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the position, such as the sequence of steps and how each step is performed.
Variety and Scope

The variety of tasks and the scope of processes or the problems dealt with by the employee are to be considered in determining the degree of difficulty in performing the work of the position. Some of the questions which the classification analyst must answer in deciding this factor are:

(a) Do the problems or tasks vary materially in character? If so, do they vary also in difficulties of each item making up the variety? Are there one or more outstanding tasks involved among a number of relatively simple duties; if so, what proportion of the time is spent upon them? Does the work consist of a mass of detailed tasks complex in the sense that many different actions have to be taken by the employee, but not complex as to any one item?

(b) To what extent and with what frequency do the problems or tasks of varying types occur (occasionally, intermittently, repetitively, periodically, frequently, rarely, etc.)? Is the position constituted of a recurring series of varied tasks, or does it involve a non-repetitive series of new demands to be met, new tasks to be performed, new problems to be solved?

(c) From a functional or subject-matter standpoint, how distinctive are the various tasks and problems? Are they intimately related to, or part of, the same occupation, function, or field of work, or are they mutually distinct? What is the total scope of the various tasks and problems? What is the scope and comprehensiveness of qualifications needed to perform such tasks and solve such problems?

Authority to Make Decisions and Commitments

In analyzing a position, the authority and responsibilities delegated to the employee occupying the position

---

to make decisions and to commit the agency to an action or a course of action, must be considered.

To analyze these decisions or commitments, the classification analyst must know under what circumstances and on what matters the employee makes decisions or commitments which are not subject to further review or approval. He must know what the results will be if the decisions or commitments are wrong, and what subject matter or problems are involved in the recommendations. He must know to whom such recommendations or commitments are made and what is the nature of the action taken on these decisions or commitments.

Personal Work-Contacts

Under this factor the elements to be considered are the kinds of personal contacts made by the employee in the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the position. This includes such elements as the purpose of the contact, or the officer, organization, or persons with whom such contacts are made. Also we must consider the element of when and under what circumstances the employee is required to arrange for such contacts to be made by higher or other officials, rather than for the employee to make these contacts himself.

Review of the Work of Others

The pertinent elements involved in these factors are
the purpose and extent of the review, and the degree of authority the employee has in approving, rejecting, altering, or recommitting the work of other employees.

Supervision of the Work of Others

The elements to look for in determining this factor are the authority and responsibility delegated by the supervisor to the employee for the supervision of other employees. It is necessary to know of what this supervision actually consists, and the degree to which it extends beyond review or inspection of work or the answering of technical questions. The classification analyst must know the extent to which the employee's duties and responsibilities include the true function of planning and supervision. This would include such functions as organizing work, establishing clear work-assignments, instructing and training employees, developing employees to carry responsibilities, actually delegating responsibility, effective use of efficiency ratings, position-classification, and recruiting and placement plans in the daily problems of supervision. Other functions to be considered by the classifier are the degree of control over policies, objectives, production and the results of the work being done by the organization. Consideration must also be given to the difficulty, variety, and complexity of the work supervised.
Qualification Requirements of the Position

The qualifications necessary for the proper and efficient performance of the work involved in the position must be given important consideration before the final allocation of the position. The following questions concerning the position will assist in determining the weight to be given this factor.

1. What must the employee know? Of what subjects, processes, principles of applications of principles, laws, rules, regulations, etc., is knowledge necessary? To what extent are familiarity, general or working knowledge, or thorough and detailed knowledge requisite?

2. What particular skills, abilities or proficiencies (physical, manual, or mental) does the work demand?

3. To what extent and along what lines of study is formal educational training a necessity?

4. To what extent and along what lines is previous experience a prerequisite? Is a training period on the job necessary and, if so, to what extent?

5. To what extent and for what purpose does the work require contact with the public or with other employees in the same or different organizations? To what extent is social intelligence necessary?

6. Is the work usually arduous, hazardous, or physically disagreeable? 12

The above elements and factors are designed to cover in a broad and general fashion the important functions to be considered by the classification analyst in analyzing the positions.

Briefly stated: to classify or analyze a position requires an intimate understanding of the duties and responsibilities of each position. The classifier must know the

---

12 Ibid., p. 40.
position's relationship to other positions within the organization, and its organizational or functional placement from the standpoint of prior or subsequent review of the work performed, as well as the quantity and quality of supervision in the performance of the work. The classifier must know the classification value of the position in the light of comparable positions both within and without the department or agency involved. He must assume the final responsibility of determining the class and grade of the position, which in turn determine the rate of pay of the individual occupying the position.

Position analysis can only approach perfection. Because of the imperfections of man, errors will be made in the analyzing of positions. The author, while working for the United States Civil Service Commission, investigated complaints that positions had not been properly analyzed, causing the position to be classified too low. Many of these complaints were made by employees sincere in the belief that their work assignment should command a higher classification. Other complaints were made by disgruntled employees who had observed the work assignment of a fellow-employee with a higher classification and were convinced that the duties and responsibilities of their positions were identical, or perhaps, more
difficult and more responsible than the higher classed position. The fallacy of many of these complaints were that the complaining employees failed to consider all aspects of the position, either their own or that of their fellow-employee. That is, they failed to consider both the tangible and intangible functions of the position.

The most interesting observation the author made while working for the Commission was that of never receiving a complaint from an employee who felt that his position had been classified too high. This would lead one to believe that the only error which a classification analyst makes is that of classifying positions too low.
CHAPTER V
CLASS SPECIFICATIONS

A class specification is a word picture or description of a class of positions. Technically, a class specification is a formal statement of the duties and responsibilities of the positions in one class as distinguished from other classes, and of the qualification requirements of the positions in the class.

A systematic approach to the solution of problems of compensation and the recruiting of personnel demands that the same scale of pay and the same qualification requirements shall apply for positions involving the same duties and responsibilities. Differences in duties and responsibilities shall be reflected by differences in the pay scale or qualification requirements or both. Before such a policy can be applied to the individual position, standards of references must be available for use against which individual positions can be compared.

The Classification act of 1923 made the preparation of statements to be used as standard references in classifying individual positions mandatory. Section 663 of the Act provides that:
Its (Personnel Classification Board) regulations shall provide for ascertaining and recording the duties of positions and the qualifications required of incumbents, and it shall prepare and publish an adequate statement giving (1) the duties and responsibilities involved in the classes to be established with the several grades, illustrated where necessary by examples of typical tasks, (2) the minimum qualifications required for the satisfactory performance of such duties and tasks, and (3) the titles given to said classes.\footnote{United States Code, \textit{op. cit.}, Section 663.}

The principal objectives of class specifications may be set forth as follows:

1. Class specifications will define the boundaries of the respective classes. It will differentiate them so as to distinguish each class from every other class, not only in terms of general character or kind of work but, also, in terms of difficulty and responsibility involved in performing the work. The qualifications required for the satisfactory performance of such work will, also, be stated.

2. Class specification serves as guides for everyone concerned in the allocation of individual positions to classes.

3. Class specification defines and standardizes the various class titles, which are to have the meaning and only that meaning, given to them by the class specification.
4. Class specification serves collectively as a dictionary of class titles and serves specifically as a convenient, currently maintained written record, identifying the basic characteristic of any class for any purpose.

Content of the Class Specification

At the present time each class specification is usually composed of five elements, which are as follows:

Title.--The class title is a definite, descriptive title or name applied to a class and to each position in the class. It is defined by the specification as a whole and it is always to be used and understood in that sense, even though it may in other connections have a broader, narrower, or different meaning. It is the official designation of the class and each position in it and is intended for use in all official records, vouchers, communication, and other personnel transactions.

The title of the classes should indicate both the kind of work and the rank of the class with relation to other classes. Descriptiveness is the most important requirement of a good title. To illustrate: Junior Civil Engineer is a

---


3 Ibid., p. 214.
good class title. The "Junior" indicates the rank or degree of responsibility involved; "Civil" indicates the kind of specialization, and "Engineer" indicates the general kind of work of the class.

There should be consistency with the titles of other classes in the position-classification plan. Titles of equivalent rank in different fields of work that are closely related in the position-classification plan should ordinarily have the same prefixes, such as Junior Chemist, Junior Engineer, and Junior Entomologist.

Class titles should be brief in order that they can be easily remembered by all who must use them as a part of the official language in personnel transaction. Also the title should carry as much prestige as the position will allow.

The general statement.--The general statement in a class specification is a brief over-all definition or description of the kind and level of work characteristic of positions in the class. In very general terms it describes the kind of work involved, the degree of supervision received and exercised by incumbents of positions in the class, and any other pertinent information indicative of the degree of difficulty and level of responsibility normally found in the work of the class.

\(^4\)Ibid.
The general statement is usually written in general terms employing descriptive adjectives to indicate the extent of importance, difficulty or responsibility of the position in the class. For example, the general statement for Under Storekeeper, (C & F I), is as follows:

Under immediate supervision, with little or no opportunity for the exercise of discretion or judgment in the performance of assigned tasks, in a stock room, warehouse, or commissary performs the simplest clerical and incidental manual tasks involved in the physical receipt, storage, custody, maintenance, issue, and shipment of supplies, material, and equipment, the requisitioning of stock for replenishment, and the care and preservation of the quarters occupied; and performs other work incidentally as assigned.

The distinguishing features of the work.—The statement of distinguishing features of work describes the important characteristic work elements of the class that distinguish it from other classes, particularly those positions next above and the positions next below in the same series. It must be specific enough to establish the boundaries of the class. In general, this statement undertakes to present the essential differentiating factors which serve as a criterion for the allocation of positions to the class.

---


7 Committee on Classification and Pay Plans in the Public Service, *op. cit.*, p. 257.
The distinguishing feature of work for a Senior Stenographer, (C A F 3) is stated as follows:

Dictation taken by a Senior Stenographer involves matter in professional, scientific, or highly specialized subject matter fields where frequent use is made of technical, scientific, or unusual words that are not within the range of vocabulary ordinarily possessed at the time of graduation from high school. Dictation in more than one technical field does not take a position out of this class unless a considerable number of unrelated technical fields are involved. Dictation in this class may involve familiar words usually arranged or combined with technical words so that the transcribed text is not readily comprehended by the stenographer. Also, it may include complicated tabular material.

In addition to stenographic work, a Senior Stenographer frequently does typing of Principal, Senior, or Junior Typist level, and / or, for a minor portion of the time, not in excess of twenty-five per cent, performs clerical work of Assistant Clerk level or lower. Positions involving a combination of stenographic and clerical work where the latter occupies more than twenty-five per cent of the time are included in the Clerk-Stenographer Series (C A F - 310-0).5

Illustrative example of work.—This section of the class specification contains selected illustrations of the tasks performed or responsibilities exercised, or positions which indicate the "range" or "breadth" of the class described and which may be considered as typical of the work embraced in the class. Illustrative example of work should be selected and described with considerable care because of the frequency with which it will be used in personnel processes.9


9Committee on Classification and Pay Plans in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 259.
The illustrative example of work performed by a Senior Motion-Picture Projectionist is as follows:

Serves as motion-picture projectionist with responsibility for the operation, maintenance, and repair of a complete stationary sound motion-picture theater installation in a departmental auditorium; operates two 35 mm. sound projectors equipped with high intensity arc lamps, dissolving stereoptican, spot light with color wheel, double electrical transcription playbacks, motor generator for operation of the projection arcs, special 35 mm. projectors for separate picture and sound track preview, and a public address system with three-microphone mixing input, radio tuner, and single transcription playback; installs and operates complete sound equipment for shows outside the department; projects film for purposes of editing as well as for regular showings; obtains film from vaults, inspects its fitness for use, and threads machine with film; rewinds, inspects, and stores film. 10

The qualification statement.—The qualification statement is intended to make the class specification of maximum usefulness as a guide to operating officials and recruiting specialist in recruiting, testing, and selecting qualified candidates for appointment, transfer, promotion, or reinstatement. A statement of qualification should cover knowledge, abilities and other qualities; experience, training, and education; physical standards; and other qualification requirements, such as, licenses or other certificates of

10 "Class Specification, Motion-Picture Projection Series, C A F - 1270-0, Prepared by the Personnel Classification Division," United States Civil Service Commission, September 26, 1942, p. 3.
qualification required. 11

The qualification statement for Principal Typist,
(C A F 3), is illustrated in the following statement:

(a) Knowledge, abilities, and other qualities:
Thorough knowledge of the care and operation of
a typewriter; as required, sufficient familiarity with
foreign language to syllabify foreign words; as re-
quired, ability to type rapidly and accurately in final
form, statistical charts requiring the selection and
coordination of data from several different sources and
necessitating sound judgment and a good working knowl-
edge of the organizational structure of the agency con-
cerned; ability to type accurately and with satis-
factory speed from copy of an uncommonly difficult
nature.

(b) Experience, training, and education:
(to be supplied)

(c) Physical standards:
(to be supplied)

(d) Other qualification requirements:
(to be supplied if applicable) 12

Uses of Class Specifications13

Class specifications are of definite use and benefit in
carrying out personnel programs. In this respect they fur-
nish a written record of previous classification decisions

11 Committee on Classification and Pay Plans in the
Public Service, op. cit., p. 264.

12 "Classification Specification, Typist Series C A F -
375-0, Prepared by the Personnel Classification Division,"
United States Civil Service Commission, May 15, 1942,
p. 8.

13 "Explanation, Interpretation, and Uses of Class
Specification, Prepared by the Personnel Classification
Division," United States Civil Service Commission, July 1, 1942.
on the type of positions with which they are concerned, and supply specific illustrations of such positions. Class specifications provide a way of determining the relative worth of an individual job, in comparison with neighboring positions. They furnish written examples to guide classification analysts in evaluating new positions of the same type described. They help to expedite and clarify the allocation of positions to service, grade, and classes. They provide information for recruiting and placement purposes.

Class specifications are of continuing use in day-to-day administration, since they make available in each department in concise written form, current information for consideration by administrators concerned with reorganizing lines of responsibility or the flow of work. Supervisors may use them in checking an assignment of duties to members of their staff. Employees who wish to satisfy themselves as to whether their duties and assignments fall within the scope of their present grade and class may do so by checking the class specifications.

Interpretation of Class Specifications

Class specifications are word pictures of positions as

Ibid.
they exist in the service. They indicate the kinds of positions which are allocated to the various classes as determined by duties and responsibilities. Class specifications are not intended to create and do not create a rigid system of classes which cannot be changed. Their function is to reflect allocation standards based upon present assignments. They do not restrict the lawful authority which administrative officers possess over assigning duties and delegating responsibilities or the direction and supervision of work. Of course, this exercise of authority may change the allocation of the individual position affected, and it may lead to changes in the class specifications themselves.

Each specification must be interpreted in its entirety and in its proper relation to other specifications. The presence of some phrase, clause, or adjective or the mere absence of some item is not to be highlighted in interpretation to the exclusion of the remainder of the text. The illustrative example of work does not constitute the whole specification, nor are those cited in the specification complete and exhaustive of the work-assignment for the position.

The fact that the actual tasks performed in a single position are not listed in the example which illustrates a class of positions does not mean that the position is
necessarily excluded from the class provided the tasks constituting the main work are covered by the general statement and the distinguishing feature statement. Similarly, any single example of work is not to be construed as determining whether a position should be included within a class, when taken without relation to the general statement of duties, other examples of work, and all other parts of the specification.

Each class specification must be construed in relationship to other specifications, particularly those in the same series. If there is doubt as to the proper class of a position, a comparative study should be made of the specifications of related classes.

A class specification should not be copied either wholly or in part, in preparing a description of duties and responsibilities required to be submitted on a classification sheet at the time of a position-classification audit. Employees who fear that the present duties and responsibilities of the position will not command the same or higher class allocation, have a tendency to copy the class specification and substitute it for a position-description.
CHAPTER VI

SETTING UP A POSITION-CLASSIFICATION PLAN

The development of a position-classification plan is a project in an administrative setting. An ultimate objective of this project is to enhance the value and efficiency of the whole personnel program as an aid toward good government. Since the value of a position-classification plan is in proportion to the extent with which it is integrated with the whole personnel program, the classification staff should represent a reservoir of broad knowledge of public personnel policies and practices, acquired through work-training and experience.

Before any public agency can adopt and administer a position-classification project, a number of preliminary steps are necessary. The character of these preliminary steps will depend upon a number of factors which relate to the size and type of jurisdiction; for example, whether the proposed classification plan will deal with municipal, with state, or with federal positions. There must also be an express legal basis for the operation of the plan. This basic law may be written into the constitution, as in the state of California, or it

\[1\text{Article XXIV, Constitution of the State of California.}\]
may be a classification law which must be constitutional and
free from defects of drafting as in the Federal Classification
Act of 1923.

Regardless of whether it be a part of the constitution
or a classification statute, the law must be sufficiently
definite to avoid ambiguous interpretation. The basic
authority should be written in such terms that it will in-
clude all positions except those that are listed as defi-
nitely excluded.  

The satisfactory administration of a classifica-
tion and compensation law, like the administration of
any other statute, depends in part upon how distinctly
the statute defines the things which are to be included
within and excluded from its operation. One of the
essentials of a classification and compensation statute
is that it shall enable one to make clean-cut decisions
as to whether or not the act applies to particular posi-
tions or groups of positions. . . . The boundaries of
the scope of a classification and compensation statute
should never be so vague that interpretation of the ap-
plicability of the statute may be made to depend upon
expediency or the resultant advantage or disadvantage
in each individual case. Nor should the authority for
making decisions or to the boundaries of the statute be
so decentralized as to permit inconsistent action re-
garding like positions in organizations within the
scope of the act. It is necessary accordingly to de-
fine explicitly in the proposed statute the kind or
groups of positions which are to be subject to the act
and those which are not, or to set up administrative
machinery for the making of such definitions, with the
final authority necessary for consistency and coordina-
tion, centralized in one agency. . . .

There are four ways of defining exclusion from the
position-content of a classification and compensation

statute. These are: (1) Naming entire organization units, all positions within which, of whatever character, are to be excluded; (2) Naming certain kinds, classes or groups of positions which are excluded under all circumstances; (3) Naming certain circumstances or conditions under which all positions are to be excluded; and (4) Naming certain kinds, classes, or groups of positions which are to be excluded under certain designated circumstances or conditions. 3

Any statutes favoring a position-classification plan should set forth the general principles, relating to its administration and should not prescribe detailed machinery. Wide administrative latitude should be allowed in creating, abolishing, merging, or altering positions. It is an essential purpose of a position-classification plan to avoid a rigid statutory system that will tend to delay or hinder the amendments that sometimes become necessary to keep pace with the service.

The general type of legislation is necessary when applicable to a position-classification plan. For the simple reason that position-classification is still young. As it grows and matures there is every likelihood that better means will be developed in dealing with personnel. Laws can be changed, but the time and difficulty involved in changing a detailed personnel procedure which might seem

---

advanced today but obsolete for good administration five or ten years hence would be a deterrent to the functioning of a position-classification plan. In other words, the basic legal authority for a position-classification plan should be flexible and changes should be accomplished by rules or regulations rather than by amendments of the basic legal authority.

The basic law should designate the personnel agency that is to be responsible for the operation of the position-classification plan, and should give that agency the authority it needs to exercise the function imposed upon it.

The fundamental principles of a position-classification plan must be based upon facts about the positions as they exist in the operating departments. In a service such as

---


5 United States Code, *op. cit.*, Section 663.

the Federal Government, these facts are many and varied, and there is no "cut and dried" method as to their collection, analysis, and evaluation. Where no position-classification plan has been in existence, titles of position will not reliably indicate their duties, and the salaries are not necessarily indicative of the responsibilities of the positions involved. Too many times administrations, operating without a position-classification plan, attach meaningless titles and exorbitant salaries to positions, and by doing so create false impressions concerning the positions. The duty and responsibility of the classifier is to break through this false front and to analyze the position according to the facts pertaining to the duties and responsibilities as they actually exist.  

Foundation for Procedure

The Classification Act of 1923 as amended supplied the

---

7 Mr. Landon, who was a member of Congress, said: "Wages are not fixed by any scientific rule or any moral code. In industry wages are governed by the merciless law of supply and demand, and in Government employment, they are decided by politicians, and politicians do not follow any rule of reason or of science. They follow only expediency." Congressional Record, LXII, Part 1, 67th Congress, Second Session, 273, December 12, 1921.


following foundation for operation and effective enforcement of the spirit and purpose of the Act.

The Civil Service Commission is designated as the central classifying agency. It is charged with the duty of finally allocating positions to the service, grades, and classes, and of keeping such allocations up to date as the positions change in their duties and responsibilities. It is also authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Classification Act which, when issued, form a part of the position-classification plan itself.

All positions covered by the Classification Act, as amended, are to be allocated to services, grades, and classes on the basis of their occupational field, the degree of difficulty of the duties, the level of responsibilities, and the qualification requirements of the position.

"No agency, other than Congress, is authorized to change the definition or salary ranges contained in the legislative schedule of the five services and their respective grades."

10 United States Code, op. cit., Section 663.

11 Ibid., Section 672.
For positions, however, not "fairly and reasonably" allocable under the schedules of the Classification plan, the President may by Executive Order and on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, establish additional classification services and grades.

The Civil Service Commission is authorized by Section Three of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended to merge, divide, amend or abolish all existing class titles, class specifications, occupational groups and series of classes. Departmental heads, under this section, are charged with the responsibility of promptly reporting the duties and responsibilities of new positions to the Civil Service Commission.

A request for review of the current allocation of a position by the United States Civil Service Commission to determine its correctness may be initiated by a department,

---

12 Ibid., Section 664.
13 Executive Order No. 5473, October 30, 1930.
by an employee, or by the Civil Service Commission on its own initiative.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} "Departmental Circular, No. 103, Prepared by the United States Civil Service Commission," United States Civil Service Commission, October 21, 1932.
CHAPTER VII

CONTINUOUS ADMINISTRATION OF THE POSITION-
CLASSIFICATION PLAN

The function of continued administration of a position-
classification plan means the maintenance of the plan itself
and its continued application to positions in the govern-
ment service, after the plan has been developed.

The position content of an installation as large as
the Federal Government and the duties and responsibilities,
which are the determining factor in classifications of po-
sitions, are always in a fluid state. Reorganization, ini-
tiation of new activities, revision of methods and processes,
discontinuing or diminishing of existing activities are con-
tinually recurring. New kinds of positions are created.
Existing positions are abolished, merged, subdivided or
materially altered in their characteristics.

Positions may also change informally due to the in-
fluence of capable or incapable employees. Furthermore,

1 I s m a r  B e r u c h ,  T h e  A d m i n i s t r a t i o n  o f  t h e  C l a s s i f i c a-
    t i o n  P l a n  T h r o u g h  P e r i o d i c  A u d i t s ,  p .  2 .
the position may change because of the selfish interests of subordinate officials. These officials may change the duties and responsibilities of a position regardless of whether such changes are at the expense of impartial and efficient service, for the purpose of making some personal gain, or to give a favored employee an opportunity to receive greater compensation without too much change in the duties and responsibilities of the position.

It is obvious that if the prime requirements of uniformity and relative equity in the pay for service are to be secured, some central independent agency must have the authority -- the final authority in every case and in all departments -- as to the proper classification of each position. It must ascertain, as the impartial appraiser for the Government and the taxpayer, what the duties of each position are, what responsibilities are involved, what qualifications are required, and into what class and compensation schedule it falls.2

The whole process of keeping a classification plan attuned to the positions as they exist is one of recognizing development and change in the position. From the standpoint of uniformity and equity, it is necessary that the central classifying agency be responsible for equitable appraisal, classification, and salary allocation of the position.

Congress recognized the need for this factor and included in the Classification Act of 1923 the creation of a central agency to perform the function of enforcing the position-classification plan. In other words, Congress recognized personnel administration as an institutional function rather than a line function.

No position-classification plan is at all times a perfect counterpart of the service it is intended to cover. As painstakingly as it may be prepared, its administration will disclose errors requiring correction. This fact is obvious if we examine, for example, the Classification Act of 1923 as passed by Congress, and then examine the several amendments to the Act. For example, section thirteen has been revised no less than five times in the course of twenty-two years.

---

3 Section 13 establishes the compensation schedules for the services and grades. United States Code, op. cit., Section 673.

Other sections of the Act have been altered as the need for such changes occurred. A notable example in this basic need for change was the transfer of the Personnel Classification Board to the Civil Service Commission.\(^5\)

Since the important factor to be considered in a position-classification plan is the position, it is imperative for effective operation of the plan to know the duties and responsibilities of the position at all times.\(^6\)

It was assumed by the Personnel Classification Board, during the first two years of classification administration, that department heads would report any material changes which occurred in the duties and responsibilities of positions under their supervision. Section three of the Classification Act of 1923 states that Department heads "shall promptly report the duties and responsibilities of any new position"\(^7\) to the Personnel Classification Board. The Board, also, expected that employees would report and request a review of any material change in

\(^5\) Section 505-509, Title V, Part II of the "Economy Act," June 30, 1932, 42 Statutes, Chapter 416.

\(^6\) Ismar Baruch, The Administration of the Classification Plan Through Periodic Audits, p. 3.

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 5.
their position in order that they might advance their own fortune or prevent unjust discriminations.

But it soon became evident that these two assumptions were based on false premises. It soon became evident that many changes in the duties and responsibilities were being accomplished without the necessary reports being submitted to the Board. About the only positions that were brought to the attention of the Board were those presented for higher classification on the ground of increased duties and responsibilities. The position from which these duties and responsibilities had been taken were carefully ignored by the employees and the department head.

Whenever an appeal for a review of a position was made by the employee, the Board soon discovered that it would be necessary to make a full investigation of these "appeals." The employee and the witnesses always came prepared to convince the hearing examiner with a definite proposition.

Seeing the futility of depending on these methods for keeping the position current with the classification plan, the Board adopted the policy of making classification audits of all positions in a given bureau or division in order to determine the facts concerning positions and to make the necessary classification adjustments.
This method of keeping positions current with the position-classification plan had been very satisfactory. It is accomplishing the most important function of position-classification and that is the continuation of the classification plan after its initial adoption.

\[ \text{Ibid., p. 5.} \]
CHAPTER VIII

POSITION-CLASSIFICATION IN TEXAS GOVERNMENT

Perhaps the greatest contribution that a position-classification plan has to offer the science of personnel administration is that of making possible more equitable and impartial personnel transactions. It tends to institutionalize the personnel administration of our public service by formulating the character of the personnel policies as they function in the line agencies of our government. The position-classification plan does not attempt to determine a just compensation for a given amount of work, but it does attempt to classify and standardize positions according to their duties and responsibilities and to allocate the positions to a pre-determined plan. The compensation which these classified and standardized duties and responsibilities will command depends on the generosity, fairness, or miserliness of our elected representatives.

Traditions or customs are the controlling factors of the present day personnel administration in the State of Texas. It is the policies originated by our forefathers and we have accepted these policies as the best method of handling present day personnel administration of our state
employees. If the traditions or customs controlling our personnel administration were rigidly scrutinized by the most brilliant and penetrating intellects of the present day, and such policies as would be deemed obsolete for present administration were rejected, there would be a revolution in the state personnel administration. If the citizens of Texas were as reluctant to accept scientific and mechanical progress as they are to accept innovations in government policies, our mode of transportation would still be the horse and buggy.

There exist today in our state government more than sixty independently administered funds from which the employees of the state are paid. No attempt has been made to establish a centralized authority to coordinate and administer these various funds. The citizens of the state have not been convinced that the pay and personnel policies, for the sake of fair and equitable treatment of all state employees, should be institutionalized. This is to imply that all major personnel and pay policies should be administered by a centralized personnel agency. As long as the administrative heads or boards of directors of our state agencies

1 Charles N. Fortenberry, "Proposed Position-Classification and Pay Plans for the State of Texas." (Unpublished study made under the auspices of the North Texas State Teachers College.) (Typewritten).
are given discretionary power of administering personnel policies, and the compensation of employees is conditioned by the policies of the administrators of the various funds established to pay state employees, the adage of "equal pay for equal work, and more pay for harder work" cannot be effective in the pay policies of the employees of our state.

The compensation of the employees of an institution of higher learning in the State of Texas is paid from the General Revenue Fund, and since the author is analyzing the personnel and pay policies of an institution of higher learning, this will be the only fund considered in this study.

The General Revenue Fund is administered by the Governor, the State Board of Control and the Legislature with the Governor and the State Board of Control forming the budgeting machinery for the Fund.

Fortenberry, in his "Proposed Position-Classification and Pay Plans for the State of Texas," traced the request for positions and salaries from its origin in the agency to its final enactment into law as follows:

The Board of Control receives and coordinates requests from the heads of departments and governing boards of institutions, conducts investigations and hearings, and submits the recommended budget, with itemized salaries and expenses to the governor. The proposed budget also lists the itemized amounts requested of the Board of Control, the itemized amounts expended for the preceding biennium and the amounts appropriated for the three years preceding the effective date of the budget. The Governor may conduct additional hearings and recommend the reduction or elimination of items after which
the budget is returned to the Board of Control for printing and distribution to members of the Legislature. Later, the Governor submits to the Legislature five itemized appropriation bills covering the provisions of the budget with recommendations. The bills are referred to the Appropriations Committees of the Legislature from where they are recommended to the legislative bodies and enacted into itemized appropriation laws. The salaries appropriated thus have to run the gauntlet of the head of the department or governing board of the institution, the Board of Control, the Governor, the legislative committees, and the plenary sessions of the House and the Senate.

Naturally, the enacted budget shows the effects of this perilous journey. The salary figures reveal the lack of planned compensation and the inequities of this hit-or-miss method of compensating employees. Some salaries are in excess of that recommended by the budget agency, even higher than that requested by the department concerned. Many are lower than that appropriated for the preceding biennium. The discrepancies between positions and compensation are obvious.  

The statutory roll, as this method of salary legislation is called, has been conducive to the growth of two factors which have tended to influence the salaries of state employees. First, it has permitted the salaries of state employees to be determined, not by any moral or ethical code, but by the extent to which the employees' resistance can be destroyed by the authorities controlling the General Revenue Fund. Second, it has allowed the pay policies of the State of Texas to become one of pressure politics. The state agencies, in order to render the service for which they were created, have been forced to maintain lobbyists in the

2 Ibid.
attempt to secure salary appropriations sufficient to retain efficient and honest personnel in the agency.

Government agencies exist or should exist only because they render a definite service to the public. Good government does not sanction the operation of an agency for the benefit of the employees employed in that agency, but only because these employees contribute to the objectives of the agency.

Assuming that the agencies of government in the State of Texas are rendering a definite service to the general public, then it must be conceded that individual employees performing like duties and responsibilities in the different agencies or within the same agency should command like compensation.

It is the purpose of the author to criticise the methods of salary appropriations for the state employees, and not to criticise the amount of compensation which the positions in our state government command. The statutory roll in present day administration is nothing more than a hodge-podge of meaningless titles to which the legislature has attempted to analyze, evaluate, and assign what is considered to be a just salary.

It is only necessary to study the Appropriation Act of 1945 to be convinced that the positions' titles are meaningless with reference to the salaries they
To illustrate: The title of Associate Professor in one of the state's institutions of higher learning commands a low salary of $2,420 and a high of $3,150. This is an indication that salary differentials are caused by unknown factors. What are the factors that would cause one individual occupying the position of Associate Professor to receive only $2,420 and another individual occupying a position of the same title to receive $3,150? It will be assumed that the state's money is not being fraudulently spent and the reasons for the variations of salaries are contributed to the differences in the duties and responsibilities, the efficiency or other personal attributes of the individuals occupying the positions, or because of the long and faithful service of the employee occupying the higher paid position. On the other hand, the duties and responsibilities of the lower salaried position might be equally as deserving as those of the higher salaried position.

Since the individual members of the legislature must vote on salary appropriations for some 12,000 state positions, to be paid from the General Revenue Fund, time would not permit a detailed analysis and evaluation of each position. Thus as the individual members vote on the

---

3 General and Special Law of Texas, 49th Legislature, Regular Session, 1945, pp. 781-86.
4 Charles N. Fortenberry, op. cit.
salary appropriations for the various positions, they cannot be sure whether the state is getting a fair return for the money expended, or whether the state is exploiting the labor of the state employees.

A prominent state citizen, in advocating a change in the method of appropriating money to be paid as salaries of the state employees, said that the legislature was not cognizant of the worth of many of the positions in the state service. He cited as his example the position of a college professor. This citizen believed that the state legislature should adopt lump sum appropriations for state colleges to be administered by the governing board and administrative heads of the colleges. Will the lump sum method of appropriating money to be used to pay state employees solve the inequities and inequalities that now exist in salary administration of the state? The writer is inclined to believe that the lump sum method will not be the answer to a salary administration in the State of Texas. The lump sum appropriation was used by the United States Government and failed miserably in correcting the evils that existed in the personnel transactions of the government.

---


The writer, while working as an employee of the United States Civil Service Commission, was convinced that some form of position-classification and pay plan is the most desirable means of solving the complex problem of personnel administration in the public service.

Would a position-classification be applicable to the teaching profession? This question can be answered in the affirmative. Position-classification has been adopted by Indiana University. A letter to the writer from the University stated, in part, that

the Position-Classification Plan of Indiana University is in force and has been in force since the year of 1942. .. Classes of positions have two or three levels, and individuals are usually employed at the lower level of each class and then promoted. Salary ranges are established for each type of positions and salary advancements are made within grade.

Fortenberry, in his proposed "Classification and Pay Plans for the State of Texas," advocated the division of the positions of the state service into five major services — Agriculture, Crafts, Custodial, Construction and Maintenance Service — subdivided into nine grades; Stenographic, Clerical, Administrative and Fiscal Service, subdivided into fifteen grades; Inspectional, Investigational and Police Service, subdivided into seven grades; Professional, Scientific, and Technical Service, subdivided into nine grades; and Sub-Professional Service, subdivided into eight grades. The proposed pay plan to accompany the position
classification plan is shown in Table 1.

In determining the compensation for the various grades and services, Fortenberry used three basic factors. These factors were: (1) minimum living wage; (2) prevailing rates for similar work, which is obviously the principal basis of a compensation policy; and (3) the state's financial condition and policies.

Assuming that these proposed plans were adopted by the State of Texas, what effect, for example, would they have on the existing classification and pay of positions at North Texas State College? To answer this question the author will attempt to allocate the positions. In allocating the positions at North Texas State College, the author is accepting, in the absence of position descriptions of each position and class specifications for the classes of positions, the position titles as being indicative of the true duties and responsibilities of the positions and the salaries as being indicative of the grades.

3 General and Special Laws of Texas, op. cit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Agriculture, crafts, custodial, construction, &amp; maintenance service</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Inspectional and police service</th>
<th>Professional, scientific, &amp; technical service</th>
<th>Sub-professional service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>$1200-$1440</td>
<td>$1360-$1620</td>
<td>$1200-$1600</td>
<td>$2100-$2700</td>
<td>$1200-$1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>$1440-$1680</td>
<td>$1620-$1860</td>
<td>$1600-$2000</td>
<td>$2700-$3500</td>
<td>$1440-$1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>$1680-$1920</td>
<td>$1860-$2100</td>
<td>$2000-$2400</td>
<td>$3300-$3900</td>
<td>$1680-$1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual increment $60</td>
<td>Annual increment $60</td>
<td>Annual increment $100</td>
<td>Annual increment $150</td>
<td>Annual increment $60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>$1920-$2280</td>
<td>$2100-$2340</td>
<td>$2400-$3000</td>
<td>$3900-$4900</td>
<td>$1920-$2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>$2280-$2640</td>
<td>$2340-$2580</td>
<td>$2500-$2600</td>
<td>$4900-$5900</td>
<td>$2160-$2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>$2640-$3000</td>
<td>$2580-$2820</td>
<td>$3600-$4200</td>
<td>$5900-$6900</td>
<td>$2400-$2640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial increment $180</td>
<td>Biennial increment $120</td>
<td>Biennial increment $200</td>
<td>Biennial increment $200</td>
<td>Biennial increment $120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>$3000-$3600</td>
<td>$2900-$3200</td>
<td>$4200-$5100</td>
<td>$6900-$7800</td>
<td>$2640-$3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>$3600-$4200</td>
<td>$3200-$3600</td>
<td>$4700-$5100</td>
<td>$7800-$9000</td>
<td>$3000-$3360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>$4200-$45100</td>
<td>$3600-$4000</td>
<td>$4700-$5100</td>
<td>$9000-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triennial increment $300</td>
<td>Triennial increment $200</td>
<td>Triennial increment $300</td>
<td>Triennial increment $300</td>
<td>Triennial increment $180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>$400-$4600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>$4600-$5200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>$5200-$5600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 13</td>
<td>$6190-$7000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 14</td>
<td>$7000-$7300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 15</td>
<td>$8000-$8200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triennial increment $300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Portenberry, op. cit.*
### TABLE 2
ALLOCATION OF POSITIONS AT NORTH TEXAS STATE COLLEGE TO THE APPROPRIATE GRADE AND SERVICES OF THE PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION AND PAY PLANS FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position Titles</th>
<th>Proposed Compensation</th>
<th>Present Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Custodians</td>
<td>$1200–$1440</td>
<td>$1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yardmen-custodians</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck driver</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant night watchman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>$1680–$1920</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>$1920–$2280</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night watchman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds</td>
<td>$2280–$2640</td>
<td>2626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerical, Stenographic, Administrative, and Fiscal Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Secretary, Music Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Secretary to Dean of Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Professional Service**

|       | Assistant Music Librarian | $1200-$1440 | $1380 |
|       | Assistant Textbook Custodian | $1680-$1920 | $1725 |
|       | Order Librarian          | $1920-$2160  | $1980 |
|       | Reserve Desk Librarian   | "           | "     |
|       | Bindery Librarian        | "           | "     |
| 5     | Loan Desk Librarian      | $2160-$2400  | $2420 |
|       | Periodical Librarian     | "           | "     |
|       | Assistant Reference Librarian | $2160-$2400 | $2200 |
|       | Demonstration School Librarian | " | " |
|       | Reserve Librarian        | "           | "     |
| 6     | Reference Librarian      | $2400-$2640  | $2420 |
|       | Music Librarian          | "           | "     |
TABLE 2.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position Titles</th>
<th>Proposed Compensation</th>
<th>Present Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cataloguer</td>
<td>$2400-$2640</td>
<td>$2640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Textbook Custodian</td>
<td>$2640-$33000</td>
<td>$2640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Added by the author.

Because the compensation of the positions that would be allocated to the Professional, Scientific and Technical Service at North Texas State College fall below the proposed compensation standards of the Professional Service, the allocation of these positions will not be attempted in this study. The present compensation of the professional positions is not indicative of the grade to which the position would be allocated under the proposed plan. To illustrate: the position of Assistant Professor would be allocated to Grade 3 of the Professional Service. Positions allocated to Grade 3 of this service would command a salary of $3300 to $3900 per annum. The position of Assistant Professor at North Texas State College commands a salary of $2310 to $2640 per annum.

One of the major personnel problems facing the state government at the present time is that of securing high grade employees to fill existing vacancies and of retaining
experienced employees who, in the face of the rising cost of living, are being forced to leave the service and seek employment in more lucrative fields. What action the state takes in solving this perplexing problem remains to be seen.
APPENDIX

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SERVICES AND GRADES

Agriculture, Crafts, Custodial, Construction
and Maintenance Service

This service includes all classes of positions the
duties of which are to perform or to supervise manual
labor involved in the custody, maintenance, construction
or protection of public farms, buildings, premises and
equipment, or the custody or care of inmates or patients,
or the transportation of public officers, employees or
property, including all manual labor whether unskilled,
semi-skilled, or skilled, for any purpose, and the supervi-
sion thereof which does not require professional back-
ground.

Grade 1.—All classes of positions the duties of which
are to perform, under close supervision, the simplest kind
of manual work.

Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which
are to perform, under supervision, unskilled manual labor in-
cident to routine maintenance and custody of state property

1 Charles H. Fortenberry, op. cit.
and wards, to minor skills, or to routine supervision of such labor.

**Grade 3.**—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under supervision, fairly responsible custodial services, or to perform minor skilled or semi-skilled work, or to supervise small groups engaged in this work.

**Grade 4.**—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under supervision, skilled labor to perform custodial work of some responsibility, or to perform manual labor requiring some specialized knowledge, and in general to perform semi-skilled labor incidental to maintenance or agriculture.

**Grade 5.**—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, specialized skilled labor or highly responsible custodial work, or to supervise maintenance and minor construction or agricultural work in smaller institutions or divisions, or to supervise specialized labor.

**Grade 6.**—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, specialized skilled labor, or supervisory custodial work, or to supervise maintenance, minor construction or agricultural work in intermediate institutions or divisions.

**Grade 7.**—All classes of positions the duties of which
are to perform, under general supervision, planning work incident to maintenance, construction or agricultural work in small institutions or departments or to act as assistant in this work in large institutions or departments, or to supervise, highly skilled workmen in maintenance or construction.

Grade 3.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, highly specialized work, higher than skilled labor and less than professional service in maintenance, construction or agriculture, to superintend large groups of workmen engaged in large-scale maintenance, construction or agriculture, or to act as labor foreman for a labor service engaged in some special activity.

Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to supervise with wide latitude for independent judgment, large-scale maintenance, construction or agricultural work, or special trade services requiring extensive experience, administrative and practical ability but not the degree of education essential to professional capacity in this kind of work.

Clerical, Stenographic, Administrative, and Fiscal Service

This service includes all classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, clerical, stenographic, etc.

---

This description of the clerical, stenographic, administrative and fiscal service is based on the U.S. Classification Act of 1923, as amended, U.S.C. 1940 Ed., Title 5, Section 673.
secretarial, administrative, or accounting work, or any other work commonly associated with office, business or fiscal administration.

Grade 1.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under close supervision, the simplest routine office work.

Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate supervision, assigned office work requiring training or experience.

Grade 3.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate or general supervision, assigned office work requiring training and experience and knowledge of a specialized subject matter or to supervise a small section performing simple clerical work.

Grade 4.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate or general supervision, responsible office work requiring training and experience, or knowledge of a specialized subject matter, and an acquaintance with office procedure and practice, or to supervise a small stenographic section or a small section performing clerical tasks of corresponding difficulty.

Grade 5.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, difficult and responsible office work requiring considerable training and experience, the exercise of independent judgment or knowledge
of a specialized subject matter, or both, and a thorough knowledge of office procedure and practice, or to supervise a large stenographic section or any large section performing simple clerical tasks or to supervise a small section engaged in difficult but routine office work.

*Grade 6.*—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, particularly difficult and responsible office work requiring extended training and experience, the exercise of independent judgment or knowledge of a specialized and complex subject matter, or both, and a thorough knowledge of office procedure and practice, or to service as the recognized authority or advisor in matters requiring long experience and an exceptional knowledge of the most difficult and complicated procedure or of a very difficult and complex subject, or to supervise a large or important office organization engaged in difficult or varied work.

*Grade 7.*—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, responsible office work requiring specialized training and experience and the exercise of independent judgment, or as chief clerk to supervise the general business operations of a small, independent organization or a minor bureau or division of a state department, or to supervise a large or important office organization engaged in difficult and specialized work.
Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, difficult and responsible office work along specialized and technical lines requiring specialized training and experience and the exercise of independent judgment, or to supervise a large or important office organization engaged in work involving specialized training on the part of the employees.

Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, exceptionally difficult and responsible office work along specialized and technical lines, requiring considerable specialized training and experience and the exercise of independent judgment, or as chief clerk, to supervise the general business operations of a major bureau or division of a state department, or to supervise a large or important office organization engaged in work involving technical training on the part of the employees.

Grade 10.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, the most difficult and responsible office work along specialized and technical lines, requiring extended training, considerable experience, and the exercise of independent judgment, or to supervise a large or important office organization engaged in work involving considerable technical training and
state department, in case professional or scientific training is not required, or to perform work of similar importance, difficulty, and responsibility.

**Grade 15.**—All classes of positions, the duties of which are to act as the head of one of the largest and most important state departments, in case professional or scientific training is not required, or to perform work of similar importance, difficulty, and responsibility, at salaries which may be appropriated in excess of $3,000.

**Inspectional, Investigational and Police Service**

This service includes all classes of positions the duties of which are to police, investigate or inspect for the purpose of enforcing state laws or departmental functions.

**Grade 1.**—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate supervision, miscellaneous field duties requiring little education or experience.

**Grade 2.**—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate supervision, field duties incident to special work of divisions or departments and requiring some experience, or to perform more responsible duties in a division where the work is not so extensive.
Grade 1.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform field investigations or inspections or to enforce law in work of a junior grade but of increasing difficulty and requiring more experience than the positions described in Grade 2.

Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate or general supervision, important investigations or tasks of law enforcement in general of senior rank, requiring two years of college training, or the equivalent thereto, and considerable experience in the special field of inspection, investigation, or law enforcement.

Grade 3.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to act under general supervision as head or supervisor of an important inspectional, investigational, or police service or to perform investigational, inspectional, or law enforcement services of a particularly difficult and important character, requiring two years of college training or its equivalent and wide experience or training in the special field.

Grade 4.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to act, under general supervision, as head of the most difficult and important of the state inspectional, investigational, or law enforcement services, requiring two years of college training or its equivalent and highly
specialized knowledge, administrative ability and extensive experience.

**Grade 2**—All positions the duties of which are to act as chief of the very highest investigational, inspectional, or law enforcement services, requiring two years of college training or its equivalent, highly specialized knowledge, extensive experience and high administrative ability.

Professional, Scientific and Technical Service

This service includes all classes of positions the duties of which are to perform advisory, administrative, educational or research work which is based upon the established principles of a profession or science and which requires professional, scientific, or technical training equivalent to that represented by graduation from a college or university of recognized standing, and such additional specialized training as the particular grade may require.

**Grade 1**—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under close supervision, simple

---

3 The descriptions of the lower grades of this service are based on the U.S. Classification Act of 1923, as amended, U.S.C., 1940 Ed., Title 5, Section 673.
work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training but little or no experience.

Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate or general supervision, individually or with a small number of subordinates, work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training, previous experience, and a limited exercise of independent judgment.

Grade 3.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, individually or with a small number of trained assistants, under general supervision but with considerable latitude for the exercise of independent judgment, responsible work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training equivalent to three years of specialized study beyond the college degree, or beyond the second year of college, and previous experience.

Grade 4.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, difficult and responsible work requiring considerable professional, scientific, or technical training, experience, and the exercise of independent judgment. The training is the same for this as for Grade 3.

Grade 5.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general administrative supervision, important specialized work requiring extended
professional, scientific, or technical training, experience, the exercise of independent judgment, and the assumption of responsibility for results, or for the administration of a small educational, scientific, or technical organization. The training is the same as for Grade 3.

Grade 6.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to act as assistant head of a major professional, educational, or scientific organization, or to act as administrative head of a major subdivision of such an organization, or to serve as consulting specialist, or independently to plan, organize, and conduct investigations in original research or development work in a professional, educational, scientific, or technical field. The training required is the same as for Grade 3.

Grade 7.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to act as assistant head of one of the largest and most important professional, educational, or scientific institutions or organization, or as a member of the lower state judiciary, or to act as the scientific and administrative head of a major professional, educational, or scientific organization or institution, or to perform professional, educational, or scientific work of equal importance, difficulty, and responsibility. The training required is the same as for Grade 3.
Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to act as the administrative head of one of the largest and most important professional or scientific organizations, or as president of a major institution of higher learning, or member of the intermediate judicial body, or to perform professional, educational or scientific work of equal importance, difficulty, and responsibility. The training required is the same as for Grade 3.

Grade 2.—All positions such as president of a major institution of higher learning, or member of the highest judicial body, which are or may be specifically authorized or appropriated for at annual rates of compensation in excess of $9,000. The training is the same as that required for Grade 3.

Sub-Professional Service

This service included all classes of positions, the duties of which are to perform work which is professional, scientific, or technical, and which requires or involves professional, scientific, or technical training of any degree inferior to that required for the professional, scientific and technical service.

4. This description of the sub-professional service is based on the U.S. Classification Act of 1923, as amended, U.S.C., 1940 Ed., Title 5, Section 673.
Grade 1.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under close supervision, the simplest routine work in a professional, scientific, or technical organization.

Grade 2.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate supervision, assigned subordinate work of a professional, scientific, or technical nature requiring limited training or experience, but not the exercise of independent judgment.

Grade 3.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under supervision, subordinate work of a professional, scientific, or technical character, requiring considerable training or experience, but not the exercise of independent judgment.

Grade 4.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under supervision, subordinate work of a professional, scientific, or technical character, requiring considerable training or experience, and a limited exercise of independent judgment.

Grade 5.—All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate or general supervision, subordinate work of a professional, scientific, or technical character requiring a thorough knowledge of a limited field of professional, scientific, or technical work, and
the exercise of independent judgment, or to supervise the work of a small number of employees performing duties of an inferior grade in the sub-professional service.

Grade 5.--All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under immediate or general supervision, subordinate but important and responsible work of a professional, scientific, or technical character, requiring a thorough knowledge of a limited field of professional, scientific, or technical work, and the exercise of independent judgment, or to supervise the work of a small number of employees holding positions in Grade 5 of this service.

Grade 6.--All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, subordinate but responsible work of a professional, scientific, or technical character requiring working knowledge of the principles of the profession, or science involved, and the exercise of independent judgment, or to supervise the work of a small number of employees holding positions in Grade 6 of this service.

Grade 8.--All classes of positions the duties of which are to perform, under general supervision, subordinate but difficult and responsible work of a professional, scientific, or technical character, requiring a thorough working knowledge of the principles
of the profession, art, or science involved, and the exercise of independent judgment, or to supervise the work of a small number of employees holding positions in Grade 7 of this service.
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