



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR

**M E M O R A N D U M**

**TO:** Honorable Dennis C. Moss, Chairman  
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

**FROM:** Charles Anderson  
Commission Auditor

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles Anderson", is written over the printed name and title.

**DATE:** September 3, 2009

**SUBJECT:** Span of Control Analysis

---

The attached span of control analysis was completed for 54 Miami-Dade County departments using staffing charts submitted by the departments through the Office of Strategic Business Management (OSBM). Supervisor positions were indicated by the departments.

We focused our analysis on full-time (excluding part-time) positions in the departments' staffing charts. We calculated two spans of control; one based on information submitted by the departments and one based on comparing staffing charts to published County job descriptions. When a supervisory level position was indicated in the job description, OCA assumed that the position should be considered supervisory in nature. In cases where supervision "may" be exercised, OCA used the departments' decision. We noted many cases where the supervisor position counts differed between staffing charts and the job descriptions. This either indicates the departments need to update the job descriptions and/or the staffing charts. Our limited review of job descriptions did not constitute a desk audit. Further analysis is required to determine the actual duties of each position.

Span of control can sometimes be stated as to how many people a manager is responsible for communicating to, or an employee who has control over activities performed by subordinates and monitoring their communication. There are a variety of theories about the optimum span of control which depends on numerous variables including organizational structure, available technology, the functions being performed, and the competencies of the manager as well as staff.

A low span of control where there are few subordinates per manager or supervisor leads to a "tall" organization, one with many layers; whereas a high span of control leads to a flat organization. This analysis does not determine an optimum span of control; however, contemporary management theory advocates higher spans of control and flatter organizational structures.

A King County, Washington “Span of Control” audit from 1994 stated the following:

*There are two main schools of thought in organizational management theory regarding span of control. Classical (i.e., pre-1950) authors believed that supervisors needed to maintain close control over their subordinates, and they often specified the proper ratio as no more than 6 subordinates per supervisor. Contemporary management theory holds that such “command and control” organizations are inefficient and therefore advocates higher span of control and flatter organizational structures.*

The Departments of Finance, and Water and Sewer did not respond to our questions by the printing of this document. Additionally, for the purpose of this analysis, the Board of County Commission, County Attorney, County Executive Offices, Judicial Administration, Law Library and Legal Aid were not included.

Special thanks to OSBM for the information provided and their cooperation.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (305) 375-2524.

#### Attachment

c: Honorable Carlos Alvarez, Mayor  
George M. Burgess, County Manager  
R.A. Cuevas, Jr. County Attorney  
Jennifer Glazer-Moon, Special Assistant/OSBM Director  
Carter Hammer, Director, Finance Department  
Diane Collins, Acting Division Chief, Clerk of the Board Division  
Jess McCarty, County Attorney’s Office

<b>FY 2009-10 PROPOSED BUDGET</b>	<b>TOTAL EMPLOYEES</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT NON-SUPERVISORY COUNT</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT/SUPERVISOR POSITIONS</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT SPAN-OF-CONTROL</b>	<b>OCA NON-SUPERVISORY COUNT</b>	<b>OCA MANAGEMENT/SUPERVISOR POSITIONS</b>	<b>OCA SPAN-OF-CONTROL</b>
AGENDA COORDINATION	5	3	2	1: 1.5	3	2	1: 1.5
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES	3	2	1	1: 2.0	2	1	1: 2.0
ANIMAL SERVICES	103	91	12	1: 7.6	91	12	1: 7.6
AUDIT AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES	55	48	7	1: 6.9	37	18	1: 2.1
AVIATION [1]	1,435	1,184	251	1: 4.7	1,188	247	1: 4.8
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS				N/A			N/A
BUILDING AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMPLIANCE	279	228	51	1: 4.5	235	44	1: 5.3
BUILDING CODE COMPLIANCE	70	59	11	1: 5.4	56	14	1: 4.0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	27	20	7	1: 2.9	18	9	1: 2.0
CITIZEN'S INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION	7	5	2	1: 2.5	5	2	1: 2.5
COMMISSION ON ETHICS AND PUBLIC TRUST	13	11	2	1: 5.5	11	2	1: 5.5
COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY	157	124	33	1: 3.8	124	33	1: 3.8
COMMUNITY ADVOCACY	6	4	2	1: 2.0	4	2	1: 2.0
CONSUMER SERVICES	96	79	17	1: 4.6	77	19	1: 4.1
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION	2,906	2,322	584	1: 4.0	2,320	586	1: 4.0
COUNTY ATTORNEY				N/A			N/A
COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICES				N/A			N/A
CULTURAL AFFAIRS	25	19	6	1: 2.2	19	6	1: 3.2
ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	490	396	94	1: 4.2	351	139	1: 2.5
ELECTIONS	114	81	33	1: 2.5	81	33	1: 2.5
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND HOMELAND SECURITY	18	13	5	1: 2.6	13	5	1: 2.6
ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY SERVICES	601	545	56	1: 9.7	535	66	1: 8.1
FILM AND ENTERTAINMENT	3	2	1	1: 2.0	2	1	1: 2.0
FINANCE	322	Pending OSBM rpt	Pending OSBM rpt	1: #VALUE!	Pending OSBM rpt	Pending OSBM rpt	1: #VALUE!
FIRE RESCUE	2,581	1,772	809	1: 2.2	1,752	829	1: 2.1
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	837	673	164	1: 4.1	677	160	1: 4.2
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTER	207	180	27	1: 6.7	189	18	1: 10.5
GRANTS COORDINATION	22	19	3	1: 6.3	19	3	1: 6.3
HOMELESS TRUST	16	11	5	1: 2.2	11	5	1: 2.2
HOUSING AGENCY	401	330	71	1: 4.6	331	70	1: 4.7
HOUSING and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	96	77	19	1: 4.1	77	19	1: 4.1
HOUSING FINANCE AUTHORITY	9	8	1	1: 8.0	7	2	1: 3.5
HUMAN RESOURCES	136	111	25	1: 4.4	103	33	1: 3.1
HUMAN RIGHTS and FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES	13	13	1		12	1	1: 12.0
HUMAN SERVICES	412	375	37	1: 10.1	353	59	1: 6.0
INSPECTOR GENERAL [2]	36	27	9	1: 3.0	27	9	1: 3.0
INTERNATIONAL TRADE CONSORTIUM	10	8	2	1: 4.0	8	2	1: 4.0
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION				N/A			N/A
JUVENILE SERVICES	135	112	23	1: 4.9	109	26	1: 4.2
LAW LIBRARY				N/A			N/A
LEGAL AID				N/A			N/A
LIBRARY	516	327	189	1: 1.7	327	189	1: 1.7
MEDICAL EXAMINER	70	49	21	1: 2.3	48	22	1: 2.2
METRO-MIAMI ACTION PLAN	6	5	1	1: 5.0	5	1	1: 5.0
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION	17	13	4	1: 3.3	8	9	1: 0.9
OFFICE OF THE CLERK [3]	186	158	28	1: 5.6	158	28	1: 5.6
PARK AND RECREATION [4]	1,074	832	242	1: 3.4	832	242	1: 3.4
PLANNING AND ZONING [5]	135	101	34	1: 3.0	99	36	1: 2.8
POLICE	4,338	3,489	849	1: 4.1	3,408	930	1: 3.7

<i>FY 2009-10 PROPOSED BUDGET</i>	<i>TOTAL EMPLOYEES</i>	<i>DEPARTMENT NON-SUPERVISORY COUNT</i>	<i>DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT/SUPERVISOR POSITIONS</i>	<i>DEPARTMENT SPAN-OF-CONTROL</i>	<i>OCA NON-SUPERVISORY COUNT</i>	<i>OCA MANAGEMENT/SUPERVISOR POSITIONS</i>	<i>OCA SPAN-OF-CONTROL</i>
PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT	122	114	8	1: 14.3	110	12	1: 9.2
PROPERTY APPRAISER	342	300	42	1: 7.1	300	42	1: 7.1
PUBLIC WORKS [6]	921	777	144	1: 5.4	711	210	1: 3.4
SEAPORT	410	323	87	1: 3.7	337	73	1: 4.6
SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT	48	40	8	1: 5.0	37	11	1: 3.4
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	1,012	911	101	1: 9.0	941	71	13.3
STRATEGIC BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	38	34	4	1: 8.5	34	4	1: 8.5
SUSTAINABILITY	7	6	1	1: 6.0	6	1	1: 6.0
TRANSIT [7]	3,140	2,806	334	1: 8.4	2,735	405	1: 6.8
VIZCAYA MUSEUM AND GARDENS	44	26	18	1: 1.4	26	18	1: 1.4
<b>WATER AND SEWER</b>	2,817	Pending OSBM rpt	Pending OSBM rpt	1: #VALUE!	2,431	386	1: 6.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26,889</b>	<b>19,263</b>	<b>4,488</b>		<b>21,400</b>	<b>5,167</b>	