



Kathleen K. Walsh, Commissioner
Thomas L. Colaluca, Commissioner
Robert M. Wolff, Commissioner

May 19, 2014

Director of Human Resources &
Employment Counsel Elise Hara
Sterling Building, 3rd Floor
1255 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dear Director Hara,

The PRC staff has completed its partial audit of the employee information maintained in SAP. This endeavor was undertaken in part to ensure the accuracy of information necessary for the PRC's upcoming pay equity project, and in part to fulfill the PRC's responsibility for administration of compliance with federal and state laws regarding personnel matters.

In particular, the focus of this audit was to review the accuracy of the following information:

Job/classification titles assigned to employees
Civil Service status of employees (classified or unclassified)
Bargaining status of positions

The attached report reveals a number of important findings regarding this information. The accuracy of this information is critical to the PRC's compliance responsibilities and to the pay equity project, which the PRC intends to begin by mid-late June. Please plan to attend the June 4, 2014 PRC meeting, so we can discuss your plan to address and resolve these issues. The PRC appreciates the cooperation of the HR Department in this audit process.

Kathleen Walsh,
Chairwoman

Thomas L. Colaluca,
Commissioner

Robert M. Wolff,
Commissioner

Attachment

cc: County Executive Ed FitzGerald
Council President C. Ellen Connally
Councilwoman Yvonne Conwell

KW:rk

Cuyahoga County Personnel Review Commission
323 W. Lakeside Avenue, Suite 400 • Cleveland, Ohio 44113 • (216) 443-5675 • Fax (216) 443-3694
www.prc.cuyahogacounty.us



SAP AUDIT

2014

Cuyahoga County

Personnel Review Commission

Background

Section 9.02 of the Cuyahoga County Charter gives the Personnel Review Commission (PRC) the responsibility for the administration of countywide compliance with federal and state laws, including the state's Civil Service laws. Additionally, Charter § 9.03 assigns the PRC with responsibility for administering a clear, countywide classification and salary administration system.

The accuracy of the data within the County's Human Resources Information System is paramount to the PRC's ability to perform its Charter mandated duties.

Summary of Objective, Scope and Methodology

The objective of this audit was to determine the accuracy and reliability of certain information contained in the County's Human Resources Information System which is necessary to support the PRC's 2014 pay equity study, the implementation of civil service testing operations, and to fulfill the PRC's Charter obligations.

The PRC was provided with SAP spreadsheets containing the following data fields:

- Personnel Number, First and Last Name
- Job Title
- Civil Service Status (classified or unclassified)
- Department
- Appointing Authority
- Bargaining Status
- Exempt Status

This audit included a review of the provided SAP data, classification specifications, the County Class Plan and unclassified job descriptions. Specifically, the PRC reviewed the SAP data of the employees within the County Executive's organization ("Appointing Authority" as it is identified in the SAP data) to determine the accuracy of job titles, civil service status (classified and unclassified), and bargaining status.

Conclusion

As more fully discussed below, the audit has determined that a number of errors exist in the SAP data. To remediate these issues, the HR Department must correct the erroneous data, provide training to SAP data entry employees, establish procedures to ensure the accuracy of the data in the future, and report to the PRC regarding progress on addressing these matters.

AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CIVIL SERVICE STATUS

1. Anomalies

A number of inconsistencies were identified in the designations of “classified” or “unclassified” status within the same job title.

For example, within the Legal Clerk 1 classification most employees are designated as “classified;” however, one is “unclassified.” Similarly, there are nineteen Account Clerks assigned to the Fiscal Office, eighteen are “classified” and one is “unclassified.” This type of anomaly was observed in the following additional classifications: Account Clerk, Network Manager, Secretary, Senior Clerk Fiscal Office, Fiscal Office Inquiries Assistant, Forensic Chemist, Forensic Scientist, Forensic DNA Analysis, Pathologist, Accountant 2, Parking Facility Attendant, Fiscal Officer 1, Network Support Technician, Records Management Supervisor, Senior Account Clerk and Senior Administrative Officer.

There are also inconsistencies in the Deputy Clerk Fiscal Office and Investigator Assistant positions. These job titles are not found in the Class Plan. Some employees in these positions are designated as “classified” while others are “unclassified.”

Finally, several positions that are “unclassified” pursuant to the Revised Code were designated as “classified.” Specifically, the County Sheriff is designated as “classified;” as are a two of the Assistant Law Directors.

The correct designation of civil service status is paramount to the County’s compliance with civil service statutes and ordinances. Indeed, civil service status determines an employee’s right to challenge employment actions through an appeal to the PRC, as well as, the applicability of certain County ordinances. Furthermore, employees who are hired into ‘unclassified’ positions are treated as at-will employees in the state of Ohio, as opposed to employees in classified positions which enjoy certain protections regarding their employment.

RECOMMENDATION:

HR must conduct a review of the civil service status of each job title to ensure the correct designation has been made.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE:

The HR Department plans to enter classification numbers for all positions in the County’s Class Plan into SAP which should correct many of the observed anomalies; measures should also be taken to address the remaining anomalies in classified/unclassified status.

2. Positions Missing From Classification Plan

Job titles designated as “classified” were missing from the Class Plan. Some of the missing classification specifications are: Director Of Corrections, Nurse Supervisor, Nurse Director, Parking Facility Manager, Chaplain, Deputy Clerk Fiscal, Officer, and Investigator Assistant.

Additionally, nearly all of the job titles in the Medical Examiner’s Office and many of the job titles in the Department of Information Technology are missing from the Class Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

The HR Department’s plan to enter classification numbers for all positions in the County’s Class Plan into SAP will likely address many of these issues; however, in addition to that review, the HR Department must ensure that all job titles designated as “classified” are in fact part of the County’s Class Plan.

With regard to the Medical Examiner’s Office and Department of Information Technology, the new classification specifications are currently in the approval process. The Department of Information Technology classifications are pending with the County Council and the Medical Examiner’s classifications are pending before the PRC. Once approved and passed by County Council the classification specifications will be included in the County’s Class Plan and should address the issue of missing classifications for those departments.

3. Variations in Job Titles

Many of the job titles in SAP have been abbreviated or vary from the job title in the class plan making it difficult to determine which position an employee is actually assigned to. For example, Engineer PW is the job title for several employees; however, that job title does not exist in the Class Plan. The significance of this error is that an employee’s FLSA status is determined, in this case, by whether they are an Engineer 1, 2, 3, or 4.

In addition, many job titles are missing a numerical designation (e.g. “Fiscal Officer” rather than Fiscal Officer 1, 2 or 3).

RECOMMENDATION:

HR Department must review each job title in SAP and make the appropriate changes to ensure the SAP job title matches the employee’s assigned classification or unclassified job title.

4. Classification Specification Limited to Particular Departments

There are a number of classification specifications that limit the position to particular County departments; however, employees from other departments are assigned to the classification. For example, Fiscal Officer 1 and 2 are limited to Human Services, yet several employees outside of Human Services are assigned to the Fiscal Officer positions. Similarly, employees outside the departments listed in the Senior Administrative Secretary classification are assigned to the classification.

RECOMMENDATION:

The PRC should discuss the value and legality of the County's practice of limiting classifications to specific County Departments. Under the County's own policies, an employee's assignment to a classification must be determined by whether the employee is performing the job duties of the classification, not whether the classification exists in the department.

If the PRC decides to endorse the practice of limiting classifications to specific departments, at a minimum, employees in other departments should not be assigned to such classifications or the classification should be amended to include the other departments.

5. Job Descriptions for Unclassified Positions

Many of the job descriptions for the positions identified in the SAP Report as unclassified are missing or were not provided as part of this audit.

RECOMMENDATION:

Job descriptions for all unclassified positions must be created and centrally maintained. In addition, because the PRC has appellate jurisdiction to determine whether a position is appropriately classified; as well as, the responsibility of ensuring legal compliance, the PRC should be provided with copies of all unclassified job descriptions.

6. Unclassified Designation

A number of employees were designated as "unclassified" without an apparent exemption pursuant to the Revised Code or the Charter. The lack of job descriptions for the "unclassified" positions contributed to the inability to determine the basis for the exemption from the classified civil service.

RECOMMENDATION:

The HR Department must conduct a review of all positions designated as "unclassified" and provide the PRC with a list that identifies the job title, department, applicable Revised Code or Charter section, and a description of the reasons the position meets the exemption described in the applicable Revised Code section.

Also, unclassified job descriptions should contain the specific Revised Code or Charter provision that permits the position's exemption from the classified civil service.

7. Provision and Certified Designations

The "classified" positions are designated either "certified" or "provisional." These designations serve no purpose after the statutory amendments in 2007.

RECOMMENDATION:

Remove the "certified" and "provisional" designations from SAP.

BARGAINING STATUS

1. Anomalies

A number of inconsistencies were identified in the designations of "bargaining" or "non-bargaining" status within the same job title/department. For example, Parking Facility Attendant, Employment & Family Service Supervisor, and Radio Dispatcher.

RECOMMENDATION:

The HR Department should conduct a review of the bargaining status designations in SAP and make the appropriate corrections to the data.

JOB DESCRIPTIONS AND CLASSIFICATION SPECIFICATIONS

1. Contents of Job Descriptions and Classification Specifications

Some job descriptions and classification specifications do not contain the FLSA status or the civil service status of the position.

RECOMMENDATION:

Job descriptions and classification specifications should uniformly contain the FLSA status and a designation of "classified" or "unclassified" status. If the position is unclassified, the Revised Code or Charter provision authorizing the exemption must be cited.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Training for SAP Data Entry Employees

Additional training must be provided to all employees entering data into SAP and those involved in the administration of SAP to ensure they understand the relevance

and compliance implications of the data they are entering into SAP, to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the data and to fully appreciate the compliance issues related to maintenance of this information.

2. Follow-up Audits

The PRC should conduct a follow-up audit in six months to confirm the remediation of the issues discussed herein.

3. Management Response Required

Within thirty days of receipt of this audit report, the HR Department shall provide the PRC with its written response to each of the recommendations in this report. The response must include a narrative response, an estimated completion date, and identify the party responsible for fulfilling each of the PRC's recommendations.



TO: Rebecca Kopcienski, PRC Administrator

FROM: Sara E. DeCaro, PRC Staff Attorney

DATE: January 15, 2015

RE: 2014 SAP Audit Follow-Up

As a follow-up to the SAP Audit conducted in 2014 I performed a spot check of the SAP data to determine whether the recommendations in the Audit have been implemented.

The documents I reviewed were: the 2014 SAP Audit report, the June 27, 2014 PRC Audit Response from former Director Elise Hara and the SAP report file name prc20141101.xls.

The data revealed the following:

- Two employees still have the title “Engineer PW” – which as I explained in the Audit Report is problematic because FLSA status is determined by whether someone is an Engineer 1, 2, 3, or 4. Employee last names – Vigh and Miller.
- Civil Service status for the following employees (by last name) remains incorrect:
 - Senior Clerk Fiscal Office – Hanna
 - Forensic Scientist – Kaspar
 - Pathologist – Keep
 - Network Support Technician – Lingertat
 - Records Management Supervisor – Kost
 - Senior Administrative Officer – Smotek
 - Assistant Law Director – Averyhart, Boatwright

- Position missing from class plan:
 - Nurse Director – Bragg
 - PT/Chaplain- Walters, Givens, Aitken, Thiel
 - Investigator Assistant (HR) - Leslie

- Variations in Job Title – Ms. Hara indicated that a review of all current employee classification titles and civil service status was going to be completed within 60 days. We have not received any indication as to whether this review was performed as pledged.

- Unclassified Positions Job Descriptions – we still have not been provided all job descriptions.