SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Interim Study of Span of Control

Report #99-28

Prepared by
Office of the Inspector General

Allen Vann, Inspector General
JoAnne Greiser, Lead Program Evaluator
Doris DeMaio, Sr. Administrative Resource Associate
December 21, 1999

Audit Committee Members:
Mr. Mr. Mitchell W. Berger, Chairman
Mr. Michael D. Minton, Member
Mr. Gerardo B. Fernandez, Member
Mr. Patrick J. Gleason, Member
Mr. Nicolas J. Gutierrez, Jr., Member
Mr. Harkley R. Thornton, Member
Mrs. Trudi K. Williams, Member
Mr. John Fumero, Ex Officio
Mr. Joe Moore, Ex Officio

Re: Interim Study of Span of Control -- Report #99-28

This study was performed pursuant to the Inspectors General’s authority set forth in Chapter 20.055, F.S. The study focused on the District’s organization and management structure in 1997 and 1999. The analyses and literature reviews were conducted intermittently between November 1998 and December 1999.

Sincerely,

Allen Vann
Inspector General

AV/jag
Enclosure

c: Frank Finch     Joe Schweigart
    James Blount    Mike Slayton
    Bill Malone     Sandra Turnquest
    John Merriam    Chuck Huntress
Table of Contents

Study Purpose and Scope .............................................................................................................. 1

Background ........................................................................................................................................ 1

Methodology .......................................................................................................................................... 3

Findings ................................................................................................................................................ 4

No District Targets For Span Of Control ......................................................................................... 4

Overall Span Of Control Unchanged From 1997 To 1999 ................................................................. 4

Span Of Control Varies Widely in Departments .................................................................................. 5

Layers of Management/Supervision
Decreased from 1997 to 1999 ............................................................................................................. 5

Conclusions and Recommendations ................................................................................................. 7

Overall Span Of Control Ratio Significantly Lower Than Recommended ............................................. 7

Wide Variation In Division Spans Of Control Indicates Potential Problems And/Or Opportunities ................................................................................................................................................. 9

Number Of Manager/Supervisor Layers Is Higher Than Recommended ...................................................... 11

Organization Structure Not Actively Managed ..................................................................................... 13

Responsibility Has Not Been Assigned For Managing Organization Structure ...................................... 16

The District Should Be Guided By Lessons Learned By Others ......................................................... 17

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 – Inspector General Analysis of Major Organizational Changes
Exhibit 2 – Distribution of Division Spans of Control
Exhibit 3 – District-wide 1997 Span of Control & Levels of Management
Exhibit 4 – District-wide 1999 Span of Control & Levels of Management
Exhibit 5 – Division-level Example of Span of Control & Levels of Mgmt.
Exhibit 6 – Worksheet for Estimating Optimum Span of Control
Exhibit 7 – Guidelines for Defining Managers and Supervisors, State of Texas Auditor’s Office
STUDY PURPOSE AND SCOPE

In FY98, the District contracted for a management assessment of the then-Department of Management Services. That assessment indicated that the Department's span of control was significantly lower and layers of management were significantly higher than all benchmarks. The consultant recommended implementing a customer-driven organizational structure to reduce layers of management and provide maximum flexibility to empower individuals and teams to improve quality, productivity and customer satisfaction. The consultant also recommended that the organizational assessment be extended to other functional areas of the District.

The purpose of this study is to develop agency-wide information on layers of management and span of control that would be advisory to District management in considering the staffing and organizational structure. Specifically, our objectives were to:

1. Document spans of control and levels of management for the entire District.

2. Assess recent trends and evaluate District ratios against benchmarks and current practices.

3. Recommend strategies for improvement.

This interim study does not take into account recent efforts by the current administration to improve the organization’s structure. In addition there have been significant changes in names of organizational units.

BACKGROUND

The span of control and the layers of management in an organization determine the way the organization delegates tasks to organizational units and sub-units. Classical management theory (pre-1950) held that supervisors needed to maintain close control over their subordinates. Six subordinates were considered to be the maximum that one person could supervise effectively\(^1\) -- a relatively low span of control. Organizations structured in accordance with this theory are called "command and control" organizations. They have a relatively high percentage of managers and supervisors and many layers resulting in "tall" organization.

Contemporary management theory holds that "command and control" organizations are inefficient and inappropriate to today's workplace. In 1988, Peter Drucker predicted that in 20 years, large businesses would be knowledge-based and therefore composed largely of people who direct and control their own performance through information obtained from peers, customers and, on occasion, higher management.\textsuperscript{2} Organizations, he said, will shift from manual and clerical workers to knowledgeable specialists who will resist the traditional command and control model. Current writers and executives support this thinking. Empowered employees, larger spans of control, and flatter organizational structures are current indicators of the more efficient and effective organizations.\textsuperscript{3}

A consensus on the ideal ratio for span of control has not been reached, however. Management expert Tom Peters recommended in 1988 that well-performing organizations should operate in a range of 25 to 75 workers for every one supervisor.\textsuperscript{4} In this study, the District's span of control was found to be 4.25 with a maximum of seven reporting layers beginning with the front line supervisor. In 1993, the National Performance Review spearheaded by Vice President Al Gore called for broadening the span of control in the federal government from the average of 7 per supervisor to 15 per supervisor by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{3} George P. Hattrup and Brian H. Kleiner, How to establish the proper span of control for managers, \textit{Industrial Management} (Nov/Dec 1993), pp28-29.
\end{itemize}
1999. For the 27 largest agencies, the average ratio had increased to 8.5 in FY1996 and the average ratio planned for FY1999 was 11.0.

City- and county-level spans of control are reported in studies performed from 1994 to 1997 for Seattle, WA; Kings County, WA; and Portland, OR with workforces numbering 9,734, 6,768 and 4,953 respectively. The ratios

---

9 Audit Services Division, Span of Control Study, City of Portland, Oregon, (1994).
reported for these three entities were 5.9, 8.9 and 6.0 respectively. In a 1998 report for the District, Johnson & Johnson Associates, Inc. cited 13.0 as the benchmark ratio for span of control in the public sector\textsuperscript{10}.

A 1993 Conference Board study referenced in the Seattle audit reported a median span of control in private companies of 8.8. Spans of control for the studied companies ranged from 2.3 to 83.4 with clusters around 5-6, 10-12 and the mid-20’s.

Span of control has a direct bearing on the number of layers in an organization, which is a measure of the length of an organization’s lines of communications. These two measures are indicators of the efficiency and effectiveness of an agency. Tom Peters suggests that most organizations should need only three layers: first line supervisors, division heads and unit manager (plant, operations or distribution manager). He suggests five layers are the maximum needed for any organization from top to bottom, with the maximum reserved only for very complex organizations such as multi-dimensional firms\textsuperscript{11}. Most authorities agree with these recommendations.

**METHODOLOGY**

Two points in time were selected for calculation of span of control ratios: January 1997 and January 1999. In order to achieve our objectives we:

- Obtained organization charts for the two time periods and calculated span of control ratios and levels of management/supervision by division, department and agency-wide.
- Reviewed current management literature on organizational theory and practices.
- Compared District ratios to benchmarks and practices reported in the literature.
- Developed a tool to assist management in setting targets for improvement.


\textsuperscript{11} Peters, p.359.
Span of control is defined as the number of employees supervised by one manager or supervisor. The span of control ratio is calculated by dividing the total non-managerial/supervisory positions by the total supervisory/managerial positions. For this study, a management position was defined as any position in the District's management job family that also is shown on the organization chart with at least one direct report. A supervisory position was defined as any position other than management that is shown on the organization chart with at least one direct report. Layers of management and supervision were counted from the bottom up beginning with the lowest position having at least one direct report.

Service centers were grouped according to their responsibilities in order to compare them with other District offices and departments. Service centers with regulatory responsibilities include Ft. Myers, Okeechobee and Orlando. Only the Big Cypress Basin has responsibility for operations and maintenance of structures and canals. Service centers with neither regulatory nor operation and maintenance responsibilities include Keys, Broward, Miami-Dade and Martin/St. Lucie.

FINDINGS

No District Targets For Span of Control

Agency targets have not been set for levels of management or span of control. In 1993 and 1998, Human Resources managers directed staff to calculate department-level spans of control; however, no evidence was found during the current study that the information was used by management to set targets or standards for organization structure. Human Resources currently is responsible for maintaining and updating organization charts; however, no responsibility has been assigned for approving or in any way controlling the content of the charts which are submitted by department staff.

Overall Span of Control Unchanged From 1997 To 1999

During the 24-month period from January 1997 to January 1999, agency-wide span of control was essentially unchanged at 4.2 employees per manager/supervisor position. The number of District manager and supervisor positions and total non-supervisory positions also were essentially unchanged. The number of offices and departments remained constant at 16; however, functions were moved among departments, primarily among Budget and Procurement, Management Services and Enterprise Engineering which
became Financial Management, Business Resources and Information Technology in 1999. Exhibit 1 illustrates the major divisions created and divisions moved among departments from 1995 to 1997 to 1999.

No trends were identified that warranted further comparative analysis. Agency statistics for the two points in time are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Managers &amp; Supervisors</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>349.5</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-supervisory Positions</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>1486.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-wide Span of Control</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Span of Control Varies
Widely in Departments

In January 1999, spans of control for nine departments and service center groups having 90 or more employees ranged from 3.35 to 6.15. The median of the ratios was 4.48. Department size ranged from 93 to 527.5 positions; however, no correlation was found between size and span of control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments/Groups with &gt;90 positions</th>
<th>REG SCs ITD OBR REG PLN ERD CLM WRE OMD District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Positions</td>
<td>93 94 104 131 137 153 156 251 528 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of Control Ratio</td>
<td>6.15 5.27 3.73 4.02 4.48 3.94 3.22 4.70 4.61 4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In January 1999, organization charts were produced for 91 divisions. Spans of control for those divisions ranged from 0.3 to 19.0, but the majority (84%) is at or below 6.0. The average ratio for all divisions is 4.2. The distribution of division ratios is presented in Exhibit 2.

Layers of Management/Supervision
Decreased From 1997 to 1999

Layers of management and supervision were counted from the bottom up, starting with the first employee having one or more direct report. The maximum layers dropped from 8 to 7 between January 1997 and January 1999. This was due to elimination of one layer (6 to 5) in the Operations and Maintenance Department. Executive management (Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director positions) accounted for two layers in both time periods. Four of the nine department units with 90 or more employees had a maximum of 5 reporting layers in 1999.
Department data that were compiled to calculate span of control and levels of management/supervision are presented for 1999 and 1997 in Exhibit 3 and 4. Division level charts are available upon request; for 1999 these charts also list the titles of all positions that were counted as management or supervision in each layer. An example is provided in Exhibit 5.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall Span of Control Ratio
Significantly Lower Than Recommended

The current District average span of control ratio of 4.25 is significantly lower than practices and benchmarks cited in current literature. The relative position of the District is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: District Span of Control compared with current practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Kings County WA ’96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle ’97; Portland ’94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Baseline ’93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ratio, Projected ’99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice, Public Sector ’98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal NPR Target ’99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the disadvantages associated with low spans of control are\(^\text{12}\):

- Superiors tend to get too involved in subordinate's work,
- Personnel costs tend to be higher due to many levels of management,
- Overhead costs tend to be higher due to the additional support personnel and office space associated with more managers, and
- Communications become distorted due to a larger number of management layers.

The District may be missing some opportunities associated with larger spans of control. They include:

- improved communications,
- greater flexibility,
- reduced personnel and overhead cost,

\(^{12}\) Hattrup and Kleiner, p.28.
- increased delegation by supervisors,
- improved employee morale due to less detailed supervision,
- increased job satisfaction because subordinate jobs are more fulfilling due to increased responsibility,
- more subordinate growth opportunity, and
- increased reliance and trust from supervisors.

The Workplace Environment Survey\textsuperscript{13} conducted for the District in December 1998 identified a desire on the part of employees to realize some of these advantages. Specifically, employees identified a desire to decrease managerial control and be more innovative.

No attempt has been made in this study to determine the appropriate span of control for the District as a whole. This is Management's prerogative based upon overall organizational objectives. Span of control targets should be set for the agency and for individual departments. The underlying rationale for these targets and for changing the status quo should be documented so everyone understands why changes are being made. The District can achieve greater acceptance of, and support for, recommended changes if the associated rationale and targeted benefits are clearly defined.

**Recommendation**

1. **Set a target span of control ratio for Departments and the Agency.**

   **Management Response:** Management concurs that a target span of control is a good operating practice. Establishing a uniform span of control for all District organizational units is probably not practical, however, given the nature of the District's business. Unlike many organizations, the District generally does not have large concentrations of staff performing the same functions which could lead to a greater ratio of supervisors to employee.

   Spans of control will vary by department considering the nature of the work performed, the specialty of the disciplines, the similarity of positions, and the self-directed work teams established for most

projects. Thus we know the ratio will vary across the District. Management will establish a span of control guideline considering all the above factors.

**Responsible Department:** Executive Office

**Estimated Completion Date:** July, 2000

**Wide Variation in Division Spans of Control Indicates Potential Problems and/or Opportunities**

Although a high percent of division ratios falls within the range 0.3 to 6.0 District-wide, greater variability exists among the divisions within some departments. Some examples are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Division</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Span of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRE</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry Lab</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLM</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Project Mgmt</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Stewardship</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERD</td>
<td>Everglades Systems Research</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okeechobee Systems Research</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>Water Use</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAA</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many factors influence appropriate span of control. The following are consistently mentioned in management literature:

- Complexity of Work
- Similarity of Work
- Task Certainty
- Clarity of Objectives
- Risk to Organization
- Public Scrutiny
- Number of Temporary Staff
- Employee Turnover
- Management Skill
- Non-supervisory Duties of Management
- Coordination Needs
- Staff Assistance
- Subordinate Qualifications
- Location of Subordinates

Divisions with low spans of control may have diminished effectiveness due to under-utilization of the talents of higher paid managers who could manage
more staff, and under-utilization of service level staff who could assume more responsibility. The managers in each organizational unit are in the best position to assess the importance of each factor to the work of a unit; however, no technique was found in the literature for using these factors to arrive at the appropriate span of control for an organization.

As part of this study, a tool was developed that could be used by District managers to determine an appropriate span of control range for District divisions. It is included in Exhibit 6. The tool allows a manager to rank a division, for example, on a scale of 1 to 5 for each of the factors that influence span of control and calculate a single rating based on equal weighting of all factors. With ratings for each of the divisions in the District, senior management would have a picture of the variability of management and supervisory needs among units of the agency.

Senior management should study the variability of factor results, establish a target range for District divisions and assign span of control targets for divisions to achieve over a period of time. The table below illustrates how such targets could be established given a span of control range of 4.0 to 10.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Range</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>7.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>8.0</th>
<th>8.5</th>
<th>9.0</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor Result</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

2. Establish a range for Division spans of control and Division targets.

Management Response: Reference response to number 1 above.

Responsible Department: Deputy Executive Directors

Estimated Completion Date: July, 2000
Number of Manager/Supervisor Layers is Higher Than Recommended

The management literature suggests that three layers should be sufficient for most organizations with no more than five layers in even the most complex organizations, public or private. The organization charts analyzed for this study indicate a maximum of 7 layers in the District -- from first line supervisor to Executive Director. Table 1 illustrates how the layers in each department or office grouping build to the agency total of seven. An asterisk in a cell indicates that only a portion of the office or department reports through the additional layer.

Table 1: District-wide layers of management and supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>BCB</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Non-Reg</th>
<th>EXO</th>
<th>OFM</th>
<th>LEG</th>
<th>REG SC</th>
<th>ITD</th>
<th>OBR</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>PLN</th>
<th>ERD</th>
<th>CLM</th>
<th>WRE</th>
<th>OMD</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management authorities suggest that non-value added layers of management are not benign. Negative impacts include:

- delay in timely completion of work products;
- eventual customer dissatisfaction, due to the above;
- micro-management to justify their existence;
- pay and classification problems when layers are added to justify grade levels;

- distortion of communication when it passes through several layers of management;
- diffusion of accountability within an organization; and
- delayed communication, i.e., guidance takes longer to flow down the chain of command and ideas longer to rise up.

One means of managing organization structure is to establish ground rules for adding layers. Without such ground rules that are clearly linked to organizational objectives, decisions are more likely to be influenced by the needs or preferences of individual units or managers. Defining the 'value added' for each additional layer would give managers consistent criteria to use when organizational changes are contemplated, and it would provide a basis on which to approve or disapprove proposed changes over time.

The 'value added' for each layer also should be reflected in the job descriptions for positions that would function at each layer of the organization. Recommendation #4 references some guidelines for definitions of Manager and Supervisor. These could be further refined to define the 'value added' for additional layers that Management considers essential the District structure.

**Recommendation**

3. **Define value added by Agency layers and set Agency maximum.**

**Management Response**: Management concurs with the recommendation. Value Added will be determined as follows:

1. Executive Director: Manages the overall organization to meet the mission established by the Governing Board.

2. Deputy Executive Directors, Director ECP, Director Gov't Affairs and Communication
   Manage core business processes for major portions of the organization

3. Department Directors: Manage multiple mission critical programs
   
   3(a) Deputy Department Directors: For departments with 150 or more staff, assist with managing mission-critical programs.
4. Division Directors: Manage multiple work groups and/or teams led by supervisors/managers with specialty assignment.

5. Managers/Supervisors: Manage a work group of staff with similar functions.

The "value added" of layers of management will be reviewed with each proposed position description submitted. Value added will be defined by the above guidelines. The District will strive for a maximum of five (5) levels between the first line supervisor and the Executive Director although extenuating circumstances might prevent achieving this.

**Responsible Department:** Executive Director with delegation to Deputy Executive Directors, Director ECP, Director Government Affairs and Communications with assistance from Human Resources

**Estimated Completion Date:** July, 2000

**Organization Structure Not Actively Managed**

In his book *Thriving on Chaos*, Tom Peters comments, "My co-authors and I downplayed the importance of structure in *In Search of Excellence* and *A Passion for Excellence*. We were terribly mistaken. Good intentions and brilliant proposals will be dead-ended, delayed, sabotaged, massaged to death, or revised beyond recognition or usefulness by the over-layered structures at most large and all too many smaller firms."\(^{16}\)

Information assembled during this study suggests that the District does, in fact, downplay the importance of structure in achieving its mission-driven objectives. The agency lacks a system for easily calculating and managing span of control and responsibility is not assigned to human resources for monitoring duties of managers and supervisors and how these are reflected on organization charts. Without a tool in place to calculate span of control and measure the number of levels in the organization, the district is not in a position to evaluate itself based upon facts.

\(^{16}\) Peters, p.356.
An important reason to manage organization structure and span of control is that these strongly influence how the employees in the agency are managed. Defining the authority and responsibilities that distinguish managers/supervisors from non-managers/supervisors would give managers consistent criteria to use when changes are contemplated in reporting relationships or job descriptions. It also would provide a basis on which to approve or disapprove such changes.

The State of Texas developed guidelines for defining managers and supervisors.\(^{17}\) Their guidelines identify a distinguishing feature of managers and supervisors -- that they must actually manage or supervise people, not merely manage or oversee a function. A lower span of control means that a larger percentage of total employees are doing the people management in an agency. The matrix at the right illustrates the impact of changing span of control on the size of the manager and supervisor ranks. Based on total employment of 1836, a one point change up or down in the span of control ratio, say between 4.25 and 5.25, adds or subtracts 56 people managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tot. Emps</th>
<th>Total M+S</th>
<th>% M+S</th>
<th>Span of Control</th>
<th>Reduction in M+S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that technical competence often is the primary or over-riding criterion for promotion into supervisory and managerial ranks, there is greater risk that people management will not be done well when the managerial ranks are large. It is easier to train and monitor the employee management skills of a smaller group than a larger one.

The State of Texas definitions of manager and supervisor are reproduced in Exhibit 7 as guidelines for the District.

\(^{17}\) [http://www.hr.state.tx.us/GenInfo/HRInventory/Inventory99p1.htm](http://www.hr.state.tx.us/GenInfo/HRInventory/Inventory99p1.htm)
Recommendation

4. **Distinguish responsibilities of managers and non-managers.**

   **Management Response:** Management concurs with the recommendation. The following criteria will be applied to managers and supervisors:

   - Has responsibility for a work unit of a program, and
   - Administers one or more policies or programs of the District, OR
   - Manages, administers and controls a field station or service center, OR
   - Has substantial responsibility in human resources management, legislative relations, public information or the preparation and administration of budgets.

   **AND**

   - Exercises supervisory authority that is not routine or clerical in nature and requires the consistent use of independent judgement including,
     - Hire,
     - Discipline (demote, suspend, terminate),
     - Reward (grant merit increases, promotions, awards),
     - Assign/reassign duties,
     - Approve leave of absence requests,
     - Resolve/settle employee relations issues,
     - Serve as primary evaluator for an employee's performance.

   A non-manager has none of the above responsibilities

   **Responsible Department:** Human Resources

   **Estimated Completion Date:** On-going with periodic reports to the Governing Board Human Resource Committee.
Responsibility Has Not Been Assigned For Managing Organization Structure

The District cannot be assured that organization structure and staffing are being managed in accordance with a plan or strategy unless responsibility is clearly assigned for performing these tasks and routinely reporting to senior management. Currently, Human Resources staff coordinate a quarterly update of organization charts, but they have no authority or responsibility to ensure that changes in the charts are consistent with management objectives. Once management objectives have been defined, Human Resources should be empowered to approve or disapprove changes in job descriptions or reporting relationships based upon these objectives.

Additional electronic tools would facilitate this task. In this study, using organization charts to count managers and supervisors and levels of management was cumbersome and time-consuming. No other reliable source of information was available. Helpful tools might include:

- A Table of Organization identifying all authorized positions, and the level of supervision or management in which they occur.
- A software application that would aid in tracking and reconciling primary evaluators and reporting relationships on organization charts.

Research for this study revealed an electronic tool in use by the State of North Carolina that may be worth investigating.\(^ {18}\)

**Recommendation**

5. **Assign authority and responsibility for managing organization structure.**

**Management Response:** Management concurs with this recommendation.

Organization changes are approved by the Chief of Staff, appropriate Deputy Executive Director, and the Attrition Management Group. During the next year, the policy will be changed so the organization structure cannot be changed unless:

- A function is eliminated and staff must be redirected,
- A function is created due to legislative requirements, Governing Board direction or operational necessity,

---

• In-class promotions occur,
• Demotions or redirections occur, and
• A position's duties change resulting in a title change.

Human Resources Employment/Staffing will attempt to identify software in conjunction with the review of Human Resource Information Systems (HRIS) to facilitate organization chart development.

**Responsible Department:** Executive Office

**Estimated Completion Date:** Budget Year October 2000

**The District Should Be Guided By Lessons Learned By Others**

In our review of management literature, the most frequent criticism of the federal government’s attempts to increase span of control was that structural changes were made before the pre-requisite training and improvements were implemented. The National Performance Review endorsed four strategies that address organizational structure and have successfully changed large bureaucratic organizations in the private and public sector. These are streamline headquarters and field structures; re-engineer work processes; create boundary-crossing partnerships; and create self-managing work teams. Among the expectations were that process re-engineering would naturally result in some streamlining that would make larger spans of control workable, and that extensive training would be provided to support a transition to self-managing teams.

Critics of the implementation point out that spans of control were increased for supervisors before essential improvements were made to make those changes viable. Consequently, some supervisors found themselves working through the same processes and procedures but with greatly increased spans of control. The District should take a lesson from the federal experience and develop a clear plan for the training and transitions needed to implement change.

---

Recommendation

6. Develop a plan before implementing changes.

Management Response: Management concurs with the recommendation. A performance-based budget supporting the core business functions will alleviate part of the problem in implementing change and efforts are underway to transition to this process.

Responsible Department: Executive Office and Human Resources

Estimated Completion Date: During the 2001 budget cycle and ongoing thereafter.
Exhibit 2
Distribution of Division Spans of Control
January 1999
### Exhibit 3
District-wide
January 1, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Big Cypress</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Non-Reg/Maint Serv. Ctrs</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Budget &amp; Procurement</th>
<th>Counsel</th>
<th>Regulatory Serv. Ctrs</th>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Management Services</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>PLN</th>
<th>ERD</th>
<th>CLM</th>
<th>WRE</th>
<th>OMD</th>
<th>District-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layers of Mgmt/Supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Managers + Supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supv Positions (Regular)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supv Positions (Leased)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Supv Positions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of Control Ratio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Span of Control
- Range for Departments: **1.86 to 7.00**
- Median Department Ratio: **4.27**

### Layers of Management/Supervision
- Range for Departments: **1 to 6**
- Median # of Layers: **3**

### Notes
1. Service centers with regulatory responsibilities include: Ft. Myers, Okeechobee, Orlando
2. Service centers with neither regulatory nor operations & maintenance responsibilities include Keys, Broward, Miami, Martin
Span of Control and Levels of Management

Exhibit 4
District-wide
January 1, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layers of Mgmt/Supervision</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Managers + Supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supv Positions (Regular)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supv Positions (Leased)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Supv Positions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Span of Control Ratio

- Range for Departments: 2.0 to 7.0
- Median Department Ratio: 4.25

Notes

- (1) Service centers with regulatory responsibilities include: Ft. Myers, Okeechobee, Orlando
- (2) Service centers with neither regulatory nor operations & maintenance responsibilities include Keys, Broward, Miami, Martin

Span of Control

- Range for Departments: 1 to 5
- Median # of Layers: 3
### Span of Control and Levels of Management

**Exhibit 5**  
Division-Level Example: Water Resources Evaluation Department  
January 1, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Positions providing management or supervision at this level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept Dir &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Span of Control Ratio (N-S Emps/M+S)

- **Range:** 1 to 10
- **Median Ratio:** 5.10

### Layers of Management/Supervision

- **Range:** 1 to 4
- **Median # of Layers:** 2

---

#### Position Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Positions providing management or supervision at this level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept Dir &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 6
Worksheet for Estimating Optimum Span of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor**</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of Activities Performed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of Organizational Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Task Certainty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definite rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Risk in the Work for the Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Public Scrutiny</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number or Frequency of Temporary Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Turnover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor’s Experience and Skill Managing Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor’s Burden of Non-Supervisory Duties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Coordination Required</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of Staff Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualifications &amp; experience of Subordinates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location of Subordinates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors Result: 0.0

Predominant Disciplines:

**The concept for this worksheet was developed from a list of factors and range names in Ratio of Staff to Managers in City Government, Office of the City Auditor, Seattle WA, 1996.**
A **Manager** has the responsibility for strategic operations and planning and:
- Formulates statewide policy or directs the work of an agency, higher education institution, or subdivision; OR
- Administers one or more statewide policies or programs of an agency, higher education institution or subdivision; OR
- Manages, administers and control a local branch office of an agency, higher education institution or subdivision, including the physical, financial, or human resources; OR
- Has substantial responsibility in human resources management, legislative relations, public information, or the preparation and administration of budgets;

AND
- Exercises supervisory authority that is not merely routine or clerical in nature and requires the consistent use of independent judgment.

A **Supervisor** is an employee who has responsibility for daily operations and the authority to do, or effectively recommend, most of the following actions:
- Hire
- Discipline (demote, suspend, terminate)
- Reward (grant merit increases, promotions, bonuses)
- Assign/reassign duties
- Approve leave requests
- Resolve/settle employee relations problems
- Formally evaluate employee performance