

**Washington Management Service
Administrative Process Team**

Final Recommendations

February 12, 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction	<u>3</u>
Considerations and Recommendations	<u>5</u>
WAC Rule Draft	<u>7</u>
Sample Procedure	<u>9</u>
Forms	<u>13</u>
Best Practices	<u>14</u>
Job Value Assessment Tool Considerations	<u>16</u>
Evaluation Committee Member Competencies	<u>18</u>
Implementation Sequence	<u>19</u>
Appendices	<u>21</u>

Introduction

In December 2009, Eva Santos, Director of the Department of Personnel, brought together a team of human resource professionals and managers from 12 state agencies and charged them with the following task:

To develop and recommend a uniform, enterprise-wide process for the inclusion and band placement of Washington Management Service (WMS) positions. The process will be employed by all agencies utilizing WMS positions and will be in accordance with RCW 41.06.020 and 41.06.500. The ultimate goal is to improve accountability, transparency, and consistency of the WMS as a whole.

The team began its work on December 30, 2009, with a due date for final recommendations of February 12, 2010. This report and its recommendations have the unanimous support of all team members. The full charter for the team can be found in Appendix 1.

Washington Management Service (WMS) employees are a key part of an agency's leadership in policy development and implementation, business process administration, and accomplishment of tactical and strategic objectives. Although individual roles vary, these positions exercise leadership and influence agency policies and strategic actions by:

- managing programs and staff
- providing specialized expertise and problem-solving resources
- coordinating and directing critical functions that affect broad agency operations
- representing the agency in interactions with external stakeholders on policy matters

Collectively, these positions bring a level of understanding of the overall business that helps the agency adapt to changing business needs. In this same way, they provide a core pool of talent for succession to other critical leadership roles within the agency.

Because the WMS fulfills an essential leadership role, each agency has a stake in ensuring that the service is administered not only in a way that meets its specific or unique business needs but also in a consistent and transparent manner. At the same time, the role of WMS positions in agency leadership also means that effective administration of the WMS is important to broader state government.

In developing recommendations for WMS administration, the team had two broad goals. The first was to provide consistent statewide coordination that encourages and maintains

best practices across all agencies. The second goal was to design a process and tools that allow the agencies to ensure consistent and transparent administration of the program in making decisions tailored to their unique needs.

To accomplish these goals, the administrative process should provide:

- **Transparency** – *clarity as to who makes key decisions as well as where and when such decisions are made*
- **Rationality** – *decisions that are logical, fair and consistent, and easily explained*
- **Accountability** – *mechanisms for reviewing actions and decisions, and making improvements when needed*
- **Consistency** – *uniform implementation by all agencies with appropriate guidelines, procedures, and training*
- **Simplicity** – *a process that is as simple and flexible as possible while meeting the above values*

To address these requirements, the committee identified the following success criteria:

- Able to respond quickly to business needs
- Defensible both internally and externally
- Can be applied consistently across all agencies
- Clear and understandable to all audiences
- Provides documentation and transparency at all levels as to who makes decisions and how
- Provides tools to support consistent application across all agencies
- Includes a regular, consistent reporting mechanism both inside agencies and for external audiences
- Includes the provision of ongoing training for all agencies
- Includes a regular audit/review process

[Back to top](#)

Considerations and Recommendations

Considerations

The team considered several options before reaching our final recommendations. The primary task was to determine the basic framework of the process we would develop. Once we determined the “who” and the “where” of the process, the “how” and the “what” became easier to define. The following describes the options the team considered.

Centralization – The team discussed whether WMS inclusion and evaluation activities should be performed for all agencies at the Department of Personnel. While a centralized process would improve transparency, the team felt there would be a steep learning curve for DOP staff to understand the specialized business needs and competing market of each agency, the agencies’ missions as a whole, and how the positions fit within each agency’s structure.

A centralized process would create more administration rather than less, as agencies would be required to complete additional paperwork and process to educate the evaluators. A centralized structure by nature would be very process driven, and as such, “sluggish” in terms of timeliness. Agencies often have to move quickly to meet a legislative or other mandate. A centralized process would cause undue delay in the ability of agencies to make timely classification decisions and to recruit and fill positions. And, while centralization can often result in process efficiencies, the committee determined that in this instance the number of staff required to centralize the process and still be effective would be prohibitive, particularly in light of the state’s current economic situation.

Inter-Agency Evaluation Committee – The team also discussed the possibility of a committee of human resource experts and/or agency managers from across state government who would come together periodically to determine inclusion and evaluate WMS positions. Again, while an inter-agency team might help with external transparency, the same barriers exist as explained above regarding DOP centralization. Moreover, decisions might be less defensible with agencies and it would be difficult to hold an ad hoc committee “accountable” for its decisions.

The team discussed the difficulty of bringing such a team together regularly, and how consistency would likely suffer given changing membership and fluid attendance. Also, given the number of agencies participating in the WMS, the sheer volume of work seemed daunting for any current HR professional or manager to absorb in addition to his/her own workload.

Structured Evaluation Committees within Agencies – As part of our process, we asked agencies to provide us a copy of their current WMS policies and procedures. After reviewing this material, we realized the current problem was not caused by a *lack* of process. On the contrary, the problem is that there is no process *consistency* between agencies and little or no process *transparency* within the agencies. Therefore, the team sought to bring

consistency and transparency to existing best practices. In other words, every state agency could and should use the same process regardless of agency size, mission, or status. Thus, we began to flesh out what that process would look like and how we would ensure accountability, consistency, and transparency while meeting agency needs.

Recommendations

This report includes several recommendations on how to accomplish this seemingly impossible goal of bringing more than 100 agencies' systems into a single consistent and effective process. These recommendations include various forms, reports, procedures and best practices – all of which are necessary to bring consistency and accountability to any process. However, fundamental to our recommendation is that the process be codified in the Washington Administrative Code. By committing key elements to rule, we are providing the necessary structure to bring consistency to the process while maintaining enough flexibility to serve agencies ranging in size from 20 to 20,000 employees.

In addition to a draft WAC **rule**, this report also contains the following recommendations and sample tools:

- A **sample procedure** that illustrates how the draft rule could be implemented
- Sample **forms** that would be standardized by the Department of Personnel and used by all agencies to provide consistency of process (Appendix 2)
- A list of **best practices** currently in use within agencies
- A discussion and set of recommendations regarding the current **Job Value Assessment Chart (JVAC)** and how it helps and hinders consistency
- A set of **competencies** for agencies to consider when appointing evaluation committee members
- An **implementation** sequence

It is important to note that this team assumes that all recommendations would be implemented prospectively, as positions were newly included or re-evaluated. Further, we recommend accelerating full implementation by requiring all vacant WMS positions to be re-evaluated through the new process before they are filled, regardless of whether the duties have changed substantially.

[Back to top](#)

WAC Rule Draft

WAC 357-58-???

What is the process for including and evaluating WMS positions within agencies?

- (1) Each agency must develop a WMS inclusion and evaluation procedure consistent with this chapter and guidelines established by the department for WMS positions.
- (2) The procedure must be pre-approved by the department.
- (3) The procedure must include processes for requesting and determining inclusion, evaluating and re-evaluating positions for placement within management bands, and reporting WMS activities. The procedure must include, at a minimum, the following elements:
 - (a) Appointment of a human resources staff member as the agency's WMS Coordinator who serves as the single point of contact for the department regarding WMS issues.
 - (b) A requirement that the form prescribed by the director or an alternate form approved by the director be used for requests to establish and/or re-evaluate WMS positions.
 - (c) A requirement that these requests be initiated only by an agency's Appointing Authority or designee.
 - (d) A description of the job duties of the WMS position on a form prescribed by the director or an alternate form approved by the director.
 - (e) A requirement that inclusion determination and position evaluation be performed by a group of three or more people, which must include:
 - i. a human resource professional from the agency's human resources office;
 - ii. an agency manager who has comprehensive knowledge of the agency's business; and
 - iii. a management representative or human resource professional from another agency.
 - (f) A requirement that inclusion determination and position evaluation for agencies that are supported by the department's Small Agency Assistance (SAA) section be performed by a representative group from those agencies, led by the SAA Manager or designee, and a provision that small agencies with an HR Manager will conduct their own inclusion and evaluation committees with assistance provided by SAA.

- (g) A requirement that only agency staff who have successfully completed WMS Administrative Process Training as regularly provided by the department may participate in the process, and a provision that approved training provided within the agency by an authorized trainer shall be deemed equivalent.
- (h) A requirement that agencies report WMS activities as provided in WAC 357-58-???

WAC 357-58-???

What mechanism must be used to report WMS activities?

- (1) Agencies must submit their WMS activity reports to the department twice a year on the form prescribed by the Director.
- (2) A roll-up of all agencies' WMS activities will be provided to agencies twice a year.

WAC 357-58-???

Will agencies' WMS procedures be audited?

- (1) The department shall be responsible to ensure that periodic audit and review of agencies' WMS procedures are conducted.
- (2) Audits will be based in part on the WMS activities reported by the agency.
- (3) As available, audit results will be submitted in an agency's Human Resource Management Report.

[Back to top](#)

Sample Procedure

I. Purpose

This procedure outlines the framework by which Washington Management Service (WMS) positions are included, evaluated, and re-evaluated within the Department of Widgets (DOW). The administrative processes in this framework are to be used in conjunction with the agency's WMS policies to administer the WMS system within the DOW.

II. Glossary

Appointing Authority - An individual lawfully authorized to appoint, transfer, layoff, reduce, dismiss, suspend, or demote employees.

JVAC (Job Value Assessment Chart) - The tool used to evaluate WMS positions, assign evaluation points, and place positions in the appropriate management band.

Management Band - A series of management levels included in the Washington Management Service. Placement in a band reflects the nature of management, decision-making environment and policy impact, and scope of management accountability and control assigned to the position.

Point Value - The points resulting from an evaluation of a position using the managerial Job Value Assessment Chart (JVAC).

Position Description - The form used to document job duties and responsibilities for WMS positions.

Washington Management Service (WMS) - The system of personnel administration that applies to classified managerial employees or positions under the jurisdiction of RCW 41.06.022 and 41.06.500 and those chapters of Title 357-58 WAC adopted by the Director of the Department of Personnel.

WMS Coordinator – An employee of the agency's Human Resources Office assigned to administer the WMS process within the agency, who serves as the single point of contact between the agency and the Department of Personnel for all WMS issues.

WMS Evaluation Committee – Staff members assigned and formally trained to determine inclusion of WMS positions and evaluate those positions using the JVAC tool. In the Department of Widgets, this committee consists of the WMS Coordinator, at least one manager from the agency's operating divisions, and a Human Resource Consultant from the Department of Whoosits. The WMS Coordinator convenes and chairs the committee.

III. Procedure

Placeholder Pending Inclusion Team Product

Criteria to Include a Position in the WMS

For a position to be included in WMS, the duties and responsibilities assigned to it must meet at least one element of a five-part definition as stated in WAC 357-58-035. The five parts are as follows:

- a) Formulates statewide policy or directs the work of an agency or an agency subdivision.
- b) Administers one or more statewide policies or programs of the agency or agency subdivision.
- c) Manages, administers, and controls a local branch office of an agency or agency subdivision, including physical, financial, or personnel resources.
- d) Has substantial responsibility in personnel administration, legislative relations, public information or the preparation and administration of budgets.
- e) Functions above the first level of supervision **and** exercises authority that is not merely routine or clerical in nature **and** requires the consistent use of independent judgment.

IV. Process to Include and Evaluate a Position in the WMS

1. The position's supervisor completes a WMS Position Description form and identifies competencies needed according to program and business needs. If the position is filled, the supervisor will collaborate with the incumbent to complete the WMS Position Description form, ensuring assigned duties and responsibilities as well as competencies are accurately reflected.
2. The supervisor completes a WMS Inclusion Form for the position, attaches the completed Position Description along with an organization chart, and then forwards it to the Appointing Authority or designee. The appointing authority will review the request. If the request is upheld, the Appointing Authority will forward it to the agency's Human Resources Office.
3. The WMS Coordinator reviews the information for completeness and convenes a meeting of the WMS Evaluation Committee.
4. Using the WMS Inclusion Guidelines, the agency's WMS Evaluation Committee reviews the position for inclusion. If it determines the position meets the criteria for inclusion, it then uses the JVAC tool and WMS Evaluation Guidelines to evaluate the position for management band placement. The Committee may also use internal and/or external benchmark positions to help determine appropriate band placement.

5. The WMS Coordinator completes the WMS Evaluation Summary form and notifies the Appointing Authority and the incumbent (if applicable) of the committee's decisions regarding inclusion and band placement.
6. If the Appointing Authority or incumbent (if applicable) disagrees with the decision, he or she may request a review consistent with the procedures outlined in the "Reconsideration of Agency Action" section of the agency's WMS Guidelines.

V. Process to Review and/or Re-evaluate an Existing WMS Position

1. When duties of an existing WMS position change, the supervisor of the position completes a WMS Position Description and identifies competencies needed according to program and business needs. If filled, the supervisor will collaborate with the incumbent to complete the WMS Position Description ensuring that assigned duties and responsibilities, as well as competencies, are accurately reflected.
2. The supervisor completes a WMS Inclusion Form for the position, attaches the completed Position Description along with an organization chart, and forwards it to the Appointing Authority or designee. The Appointing Authority reviews the request. If upheld, he or she forwards it to the agency's Human Resources Office.
3. The WMS Coordinator reviews the information for completeness and determines whether the changes to position duties warrant continued inclusion and/or re-evaluation. If the position has not changed significantly since its last review, the WMS Coordinator documents the reasons, files the Position Description as an update, and notifies the Appointing Authority and the incumbent (if applicable).
4. If the position's job responsibilities have changed significantly, the WMS Coordinator reviews the information for completeness and convenes a meeting of the WMS Evaluation Committee.
5. Utilizing the WMS Inclusion Guidelines, the agency's WMS Evaluation Committee reviews the position for inclusion. If the committee determines that the position still meets the criteria for inclusion, it is then re-evaluated for management band placement. The Committee will use the JVAC tool and WMS Evaluation Guidelines to evaluate the position. In addition, the committee may use internal and/or external benchmark positions to help determine appropriate band placement.
6. Once the position has been reviewed, the WMS Coordinator is responsible to complete the WMS Evaluation Summary form and inform the Appointing

Authority and the incumbent (if applicable) of the committee's decisions regarding inclusion and band placement.

7. If the Appointing Authority or incumbent does not agree with the decision, they may request a review in accordance with the procedures outlined in the "Reconsideration of Agency Action" section of the agency's WMS Guidelines.

VI. Reporting WMS Activities

At a minimum, the WMS Coordinator will complete a WMS Activities Report form for the agency and submit it to the department twice annually, according to the department's schedule. The report will also be posted on the agency's intranet website.

[Back to top](#)

Forms

The team reviewed WMS forms submitted by numerous state agencies and selected several models currently used in the inclusion and banding processes. We identified three types of forms we believe will increase consistency, transparency, and accountability as well as be simple to use.

Not only will use of these forms ensure that agencies maintain adequate written documentation of their decision-making process, but their use will also provide simplified identification of information for review during audits of WMS documents. The forms we recommend are described below and can be found at Appendix 2a, 2b, and 2c.

WMS Inclusion Form

This form is intended to be used by the manager to document the initial inclusion of a position within WMS or for re-evaluation of an existing position. It ensures the agency's justification is documented thoroughly, and it facilitates the audit process by providing information in a consistent format.

WMS Position Evaluation Summary

This form provides a standard document for summarizing WMS Evaluation Committee decisions. Use of a standard form ensures all agencies are documenting the same type of information for audit purposes and quick reference.

WMS Activity Roll-Up Report

The Activity Roll-Up Report lists all WMS positions within an agency and includes information such as band, working title, inclusion criteria, market segment, and salary. This report would provide a "quick glance" summary of each agency's use of WMS positions.

Each agency would post this report on its intranet site, and the department would make available an enterprise-wide version to all agencies' HR Offices. Having a central location for these reports provides transparency, accountability, and allows an agency to view other agencies' banding and working titles for possible matches to their own positions. If a match is found, the HR professional could easily compare both PDFs, possibly improving banding consistency enterprise-wide.

The Activity Roll-Up Report also includes a column to record the date of the most current WMS Position Description. Since the new rule will be applied prospectively, this information could be used to determine when an audit would be useful.

[Back to top](#)

Best Practices

As the team worked toward our goal of developing our recommendations, we gathered input from agencies on their practices, policies, forms and other information. A quick review of the materials confirmed that many agencies are already engaged in excellent processes. Some of those “best practices” warrant sharing, and follow:

1. Develop a checklist of materials for banding/evaluation.

Some agencies have more WMS banding/inclusion activity than others. Using a checklist of materials needed (forms, JVAC chart, etc.) is helpful because it lists the information needed and prevents others from having to “reinvent the wheel.”

2. Distribute the materials/instructions several days in advance of the WMS Evaluation Committee meeting.

Getting the material out in advance provides the committee the opportunity to review them so they will be “ready to go” when the group meets.

3. Before the WMS Evaluation committee meets, have HR work with the Appointing Authority to make a preliminary recommendation on inclusion and/or banding.

In most cases, Appointing Authorities consult with HR on classification issues as a matter of course because HR staff are the classification experts. They know the agency history on WMS positions, General Service classification options, and have the best understanding of the JVAC. If HR reviews the materials in advance, many problems can be resolved prior to the committee meeting.

4. As part of the banding/inclusion process, review the position for internal and external alignment (if appropriate).

For consistency, agencies should conduct a review of the alignment of other similar positions within their agency. If similar positions exist outside of their agency, they should also conduct a review of the alignment of those positions. As noted above, we recommend an enterprise-wide report for inclusion and evaluation of WMS positions, which, if adopted, could be a tool for reviewing external alignment of similar positions.

5. Rotate members/staff involved in banding/inclusion decisions.

Rotating committee membership provides a broader perspective to the banding/inclusion process. Consider having members with potential conflicts of interest recuse themselves for decisions that affect them.

- 6. Provide the supervisor and/or Appointing Authority of the position an opportunity to make a brief presentation to the banding committee.**
Not only does this augment the paperwork submitted, but it gives the presenter the opportunity to answer any questions the committee may have. Based on the discussion, if appropriate, the Position Description can then be updated.
- 7. The agency procedure should have a timeline, including notifying interested parties of banding/inclusion results.**
Having a timeline included in the process helps ensure that requests move forward quickly. However, also include a provision for exceptions to the timeline.
- 8. Develop a glossary for those doing the banding/inclusion process.**
Terms familiar to HR professionals are often foreign to others. Providing a glossary ensures that everyone has a common understanding of terms.
- 9. Outline the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the banding/inclusion process.**
By having the roles and responsibilities clearly defined, all those involved are aware of the part they play in the process and what is expected of them.
- 10. Include a philosophy statement at the beginning of the agency procedure.**
This is a good opportunity to remind readers of the purpose of the WMS inclusion/banding process.
- 11. For consistency in salary setting, develop a salary setting and adjustment decision matrix.**
Agencies have found that having an internal guideline for salary setting and adjustments helps to ensure consistent salary setting within the agency.

[Back to top](#)

Job Value Assessment Tool Considerations

In considering our focus on an enterprise-wide, consistent approach to the WMS process, our team gathered feedback from agencies regarding the functionality of the Job Value Assessment Chart (JVAC). While in general agencies reported the JVAC tool provides a common framework for banding individual positions, they also said the tool poses some challenges. These challenges include:

- The tool's subjectivity causes difficulty in making specific assessments.
- The tool's subjectivity may be a barrier to its consistent use enterprise-wide.
- The tool is outdated. The nature of the work of management positions has changed substantially since the program began in 1993 and calls for updated language in the JVAC to appropriately assess positions.
- The tool lacks clear definitions and concrete examples for assessment.
- The statutory definition of manager includes policy, consultant and manager. The focus of the tool is on the manager designation and lacks specificity for the policy and consultant roles.
- The "Scope of Management Accountability and Control" relies heavily on the scope of program and size of budget, which makes it difficult to distinguish between the different levels.

Recommendations

After reviewing agency feedback and other compensation point models (e.g. Hay), the team recommends retaining the JVAC with the following modifications:

- Provide concrete examples that articulate the work at each level to support an enterprise-wide approach.
- Develop clear definitions of the terms used for each level.
- Consider development of an individual JVAC chart for each band in WMS with more concrete examples and updated language to support the state's goal of consistent application of the tool across agencies.

- Include types of jobs that most closely fit the different definitions of manager.
- Include “freedom to act” and “impact of error” as primary factors in the “Scope of Management Accountability and Control” section. Although freedom to act is mentioned in the WMS handbook in the “Scope of Management Accountability and Control” section, the examples and descriptors of each level focus primarily on the scope of program and size of budget. More emphasis on freedom to act and impact of error, coupled with the size and nature of impact, would help agencies clarify the difference between W, X, Y and Z ratings.
- When looking at the nature of management, the current tool focuses on “span of control.” Instead, it should consider “span of influence” rather than the traditional management concept of “span of control” to provide more consistency in evaluation between managers, consultants and policy positions.
- Utilize the current JVAC (or a simplified version) for positions classified as management, and a new JVAC tool with different descriptors for those categorized as consultant or policy. Both tools should use the same rating systems, so equal ratings (B2W, C3X) could have different descriptions. This would allow agencies to focus in on management elements performed by each type of position.
- Require each agency (or agencies over a certain size) to develop benchmarks for each relevant rating so anyone within the agency can review the ratings and see similarities (old “anchor position” system).
- Break down the JVAC into five separate documents (one for each band and a separate document for the medical band) that focus on characteristics of the specific band. Allow space for including examples of work and information from the DOP guidance manual.

We also recommend the WMS Handbook be plain-talked and updated to reflect current work activities.

[Back to top](#)

Evaluation Committee Member Competencies

Appointing the right mix of WMS Inclusion/Evaluation Committee members is critical to the success and sustainability of WMS. Committee members must balance the flexibility inherent in WMS with maintaining the integrity of the service through consistency, transparency, and accountability.

At a minimum, agencies should select committee members who demonstrate the following competencies:

- **Understanding of the agency** – an individual who understands the business of the agency and how positions support that mission.
- **Integrity** – an ethical individual known for fair and equitable decisions and treatment of others.
- **Decision maker** – an individual who is able to make an informed decision and stand by it.
- **Analytical skills** – an individual that can weigh all sides and determine the best fit for positions.
- **Objective** – an unbiased individual who can concentrate on the work at hand: whether a particular position should be included and how it should be evaluated.
- **Critical Thinker** – an individual who can strategically think about the consequences of correct/incorrect inclusion and evaluation.
- **Willing to voice an opinion** – an individual who is able and willing to articulate his/her opinion, even when he/she may be in the minority.
- **Willing to ask questions** – an individual who will ask the tough questions and engage in the discussion.
- **Commitment** – an individual committed to attending the WMS Inclusion/Evaluation meetings and doing the work involved in the process.

In addition, all committee members should be provided with consistent training on both inclusion and evaluation to assist them in making informed inclusion decisions and proper evaluations of positions.

[Back to top](#)

Implementation Sequence

The following outlines the recommended implementation sequence for the new rules and procedures related to the WMS to ensure consistency, accountability, and transparency.

1. Integrate the Inclusion Team's Work Product

This team was one of two assigned to recommend changes reforming the WMS system. Because the Inclusion Criteria Team's product is not due until mid-April, it is entirely possible that their product will impact recommendations made by this team. Therefore, it will be important for that information to be integrated into this report when available. However, that does not preclude this implementation sequence from moving forward at this time.

2. Develop Training

Due to the recommended changes in policy and procedures, required training will need to be provided to the agency WMS Coordinators, who will in turn provide the training to the agency WMS Evaluator Committee members. This training will address all aspects of WMS. This team would like to be allowed to move forward with developing the training curriculum and tools, as we have the knowledge of our intent for the recommended procedures.

3. Redesign WMS Position Description Form

The position description form should be revised to better address inclusion criteria as well as the various aspects required to determine appropriate banding.

4. Adopt Rule Change by Early Spring

DOP should take appropriate steps to ensure an early spring adoption date. The rule should include an initial implementation date of July 1, 2010, which allows two to three months for agencies to develop and forward to DOP for approval their WMS procedures as will be required. DOP should designate another appropriate date in the rule (perhaps August 1, 2010) by which WMS Coordinators and Evaluator Committee members must be trained to ensure complete implementation.

5. Train the Trainers

As noted in number 2 above, it is recommended that the training developed be first provided to the agencies' WMS Coordinators who will in turn provide the training to the agency WMS Evaluator Teams. This will alleviate some of the training burden.

6. Develop FAQs for Agencies

DOP or a designee (perhaps this team) should develop FAQ's to be utilized as part of the communication plan.

7. Communicate Plan to Agency Heads

Director Santos should distribute a communication to agency heads indicating the changes and effective date for said changes prior to their becoming effective.

8. Finalize and Post Forms

DOP will finalize the recommended forms and post them on their website for use by agencies.

9. Train Agency Evaluator Committees

The WMS Coordinators previously trained as noted in number five above, will train the WMS Evaluator Committees prior to any reviews/decisions being made after the effective date of the new rule.

While the above is occurring at the DOP level, agencies will be responsible for developing their procedure for DOP approval, updating their guidelines to match the new procedures, assigning their agency WMS Coordinator, and determining who the external member will be for their Evaluator Committee.

If changes are made to the JVAC, those changes are not critical for initial implementation, but should be completed as quickly as possible so that training can be updated and Evaluation Committees can begin working with a more effective tool as soon as possible.

[Back to top](#)

Appendices

CHARTER

Washington Management Service

Administrative Process Cross-Agency Work Team

Purpose

The team will develop and recommend a uniform, enterprise-wide process for the inclusion and band placement of Washington Management Service (WMS) positions. The process will be employed by all agencies utilizing WMS positions and will be in accordance with RCW 41.06.020 and 41.06.500. The ultimate goal is to improve accountability, transparency, and consistency of the WMS as a whole.

Membership

Executive Sponsor: Sandi Stewart, Department of Personnel

Team Lead: Jan Smallwood, Department of Licensing

Team Membership:

Jan Bacon, Health Care Authority

Pam Skinner – Attorney General

Pat Hazzard – Revenue

Sandra Turner – Secretary of State

Art Irving – Fish & Wildlife

Tina VanderWal – DOP-Small agency assistance

Caroline Lacey – Commerce

Terry Wilson – General Administration

Rose Mattison – Agriculture

Polly Zehm – Ecology

Niki Pavlicek – Transportation

Focus

Using the theme of Consistency, Transparency, and Accountability as a guide prospectively:

- Develop a process by which WMS position inclusion criteria will be applied
- Develop a process by which WMS positions will be evaluated and placed in bands
- Develop a high-level implementation plan for the recommended processes

Participant Role(s)

- Personally attend and actively engage at meetings
- Identify options and draft recommendations for enterprise-wide process
- The Team Lead, with team membership assistance, will present recommendations to the HR Advisory Group, HR Managers Group, Director of Department of Personnel, and Deputies HR Management Group
- Be a point of contact to share information and gather feedback from agencies not represented on the work team to ensure perspectives and concerns are shared

Schedule

Final recommendations are due on Friday, February 12, 2010. To meet this deadline, weekly meetings have been scheduled:

- Wednesday, December 30, 2009 (Kickoff Meeting) 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- Thursday, January 7, 2010 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- Thursday, January 14, 2010 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- Thursday, January 21, 2010 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- Thursday, January 28, 2010 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- Thursday, February 4, 2010 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- Thursday, February 11, 2010 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Jan Bacon
Jan Bacon, Health Care Authority

12/30/09
Date

Pat Hazzard
Pat Hazzard, Revenue

12/30/09
Date

Art Irving
Art Irving, Fish & Wildlife

12/30/09
Date

Caroline Lacey
Caroline Lacey, Commerce

12/30/09
Date

Rose Mattison
Rose Mattison, Agriculture

12/30/09
Date

Niki Pavlicek
Niki Pavlicek, Transportation

12-30-09
Date

Pam Skinner
Pam Skinner, Attorney General

12-30-09
Date

Jan Smallwood
Jan Smallwood, Licensing

12/30/2009
Date

Sandra Turner
Sandra Turner, Secretary of State

11/28/2010
Date

Tina VanderWal
Tina VanderWal, Small Agency Assistance

12/30/09
Date

Terry Wilson
Terry Wilson, General Administration

12/30/09
Date

Polly Zehm
Polly Zehm, Ecology

12/30/09
Date



WASHINGTON MANAGEMENT SERVICE INCLUSION FORM

Position Number:	Division/Program/Region:
Current Class Title/WMS Band:	Proposed Working Title/WMS Band:
Position Action (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of new position <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of existing WGS position <input type="checkbox"/> Re-evaluation of existing WMS position	Position is currently: <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant <input type="checkbox"/> Filled - Incumbent's Name:

How does this position meet the definition of manager stated in WAC 357-58-035? Check all that apply:

- Formulates statewide policy or directs the work of an agency or agency subdivision.
- Administers one or more statewide policies or programs of an agency or agency subdivision.
- Manages, administers, and controls a local branch office of an agency or an agency subdivision, including the physical, financial, or personnel resources.
- Has substantial responsibility in personnel administration, legislative relations, public information, or the preparation and administration of budgets.
- Functions above the first level of supervision and exercises authority that is not merely routine or clerical in nature and requires the consistent use of independent judgment.

Explain how this position meets the above definition(s) you checked. Provide examples:

Attachment Checklist: <input type="checkbox"/> Completed Position Description Form/Job Analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Current organizational chart reflecting the proposed position	Submitted By:
--	---------------

APPOINTING AUTHORITY USE ONLY

Appointing Authority Signature:	Date:
---------------------------------	-------

cc: Position File



WASHINGTON MANAGEMENT SERVICE POSITION EVALUATION SUMMARY

Date Received	Division/Program/Region	Position Number
Date of Inclusion Determination <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	Date Evaluated	Incumbent
Position Description Form Submitted For: <input type="checkbox"/> Establishment <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of existing WGS position <input type="checkbox"/> Re-evaluation of existing WMS position	Former Working Title	New Working Title
	Rating Points Band	Rating Points Band
Work Period Designation	Management Type	Market Segment
Pay Standard (if applicable)	Range of Consideration (if applicable)	Review Period <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months <input type="checkbox"/> 18 months

Evaluation Summary Information

If inclusion denied provide reason:

If inclusion approved, criteria applicable to this position: 1-Administer statewide policy 2-Administer statewide program
 3-Manage branch office 4-HR/Leg/PIO/Budget 5a- Functional level position 5b-Second-line supervisor

Explain how the assigned tasks meet the approved rating criteria elements:

1. Nature of Management – Briefly describe the management scope of the position. Provide examples of how the position utilizes management principles at the level commensurate with the rating:

2. Decision-Making Environment and Policy Impact – What is the scope and nature of the position's policy-making authority? Provide examples of decision-making authority and the thinking environment that support the position's rating:

3. Scope of Management Accountability and Control – Provide examples of the resources and/or policies that are controlled or influenced that support the position's rating. Briefly describe the scope of accountability. What is the impact of error?

Comments:

Form completed by (HR representative):

Date:

cc: Position File

