



**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Honorable Bruno A. Barreiro, 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 12, 2008

SUBJECT: Span of Control Analysis

The attached span of control analysis was completed by the Office of the Commission Auditor (OCA) for 58 Miami-Dade County agencies using staffing charts submitted by either the departments or the Office of Strategic Business Management. 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.

Page 2
September 12, 2008
Span of Control Analysis

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 BCC, County Attorney, County Executive Offices and Judicial Administration were not included in this analysis. We did not receive information from Transit.

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

c: Honorable Carlos Alvarez, Mayor
Harvey Ruvlin, Clerk, Circuit and County Courts
George M. Burgess, County Manager
R.A. Cuevas, Jr. County Attorney
Jennifer Glazer-Moon, Director, OSBM
Kay Sullivan, Clerk of the Board

FY 2008-09 STAFFING CHART ANALYSIS FOR SPAN-OF-CONTROL

<i>FY 2008-09 PROPOSED BUDGET</i>	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE COUNT	DEPARTMENT SUPERVISOR POSITIONS	DEPARTMENT SPAN-OF-CONTROL	STAFFING CHART EMPLOYEE COUNT	STAFFING CHART SUPERVISOR ANALYSIS	STAFFING CHART SPAN-OF-CONTROL
AGENDA COORDINATION	9	6	3	1: 2.0	6	3	1: 2.0
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES	4	3	1	1: 3.0	3	1	1: 3.0
ANIMAL SERVICES	109	95	14	1: 6.8	95	14	1: 6.8
AUDIT AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES	61	44	17	1: 2.6	44	17	1: 2.6
AVIATION	1,514	1,307	207	1: 6.3	1,227	287	1: 4.3
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS	202	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BUILDING	234	187	47	1: 4.0	186	48	1: 3.9
BUILDING CODE COMPLIANCE	93	83	10	1: 8.3	80	13	1: 6.2
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	34	28	6	1: 4.7	25	9	1: 2.8
CITIZEN'S INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION	7	5	2	1: 2.5	3	4	1: 0.8
COMMISSION ON ETHICS AND PUBLIC TRUST	14	12	2	1: 6.0	12	2	1: 6.0
COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY	652	587	65	1: 9.0	587	65	1: 9.0
COMMUNITY ADVOCACY	20	17	3	1: 5.7	17	3	1: 5.7
COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	128	108	20	1: 5.4	108	20	1: 5.4
CONSUMER SERVICES	123	107	16	1: 6.7	105	18	1: 5.8
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION	2,767	2,216	551	1: 4.0	2,188	579	1: 3.8
COUNTY ATTORNEY	137	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICES	62	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CULTURAL AFFAIRS	35	30	5	1: 6.0	18	17	1: 1.1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	519	427	92	1: 4.6	421	98	1: 4.3
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION	6	4	2	1: 2.0	4	2	1: 2.0
ELECTIONS	118	82	36	1: 2.3	73	45	1: 1.6
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND HOMELAND SECURITY	24	18	6	1: 3.0	17	7	1: 2.4
ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY SERVICES	597	544	53	1: 10.3	528	69	1: 7.7
FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES	11	10	1	1: 10.0	10	1	1: 10.0
FILM AND ENTERTAINMENT	4	3	1	1: 3.0	3	1	1: 3.0
FINANCE	356	283	73	1: 3.9	283	73	1: 3.9
FIRE RESCUE	2,568	1,812	756	1: 2.4	1,709	859	1: 2.0
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	883	725	158	1: 4.6	713	170	1: 4.2
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTER	222	198	24	1: 8.3	197	25	1: 7.9
GRANTS COORDINATION	49	43	6	1: 7.2	41	8	1: 5.1
HOMELESS TRUST	14	10	4	1: 2.5	10	4	1: 2.5
HOUSING AGENCY	533	469	64	1: 7.3	469	64	1: 7.3
HOUSING FINANCE AUTHORITY	11	10	1	1: 10.0	10	1	1: 10.0
HUMAN RESOURCES	142	111	31	1: 3.6	111	31	1: 3.6
HUMAN SERVICES	667	621	46	1: 13.5	600	67	1: 9.0
INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL	5	3	2	1: 1.5	3	2	1: 1.5
INSPECTOR GENERAL	36	27	9	1: 3.0	27	9	1: 3.0
INTERNATIONAL TRADE CONSORTIUM	11	7	4	1: 1.8	6	5	1: 1.2
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION	264	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
JUVENILE SERVICES	119	96	23	1: 4.2	96	23	1: 4.2
LAW LIBRARY	7	6	1	1: 6.0	6	1	1: 6.0
LEGAL AID	42	20	22	1: 0.9	20	22	1: 0.9
LIBRARY	650	447	203	1: 2.2	368	282	1: 1.3
MEDICAL EXAMINER	76	54	22	1: 2.5	54	22	1: 2.5

FY 2008-09 STAFFING CHART ANALYSIS FOR SPAN-OF-CONTROL

<i>FY 2008-09 PROPOSED BUDGET</i>	<i>TOTAL EMPLOYEES</i>	<i>DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE COUNT</i>	<i>DEPARTMENT SUPERVISOR POSITIONS</i>	<i>DEPARTMENT SPAN-OF-CONTROL</i>	<i>STAFFING CHART EMPLOYEE COUNT</i>	<i>STAFFING CHART SUPERVISOR ANALYSIS</i>	<i>STAFFING CHART SPAN-OF-CONTROL</i>
METRO-MIAMI ACTION PLAN	26	23	3	1: 7.7	21	5	1: 4.2
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION	17	13	4	1: 3.3	8	9	1: 0.9
OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD COMPLIANCE	110	102	8	1: 12.8	102	8	1: 12.8
OFFICE OF THE CLERK	260	227	33	1: 6.9	227	33	1: 6.9
PARK AND RECREATION	1,273	992	281	1: 3.5	934	339	1: 2.8
PLANNING AND ZONING	155	119	36	1: 3.3	116	39	1: 3.0
POLICE	4,332	3,396	936	1: 3.6	3,388	944	1: 3.6
PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT	116	94	22	1: 4.3	93	23	1: 4.0
PROPERTY APPRAISAL	331	291	40	1: 7.3	291	40	1: 7.3
PUBLIC WORKS	940	827	113	1: 7.3	789	151	1: 5.2
SEAPORT	410	320	90	1: 3.6	318	92	1: 3.5
SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT	60	50	10	1: 5.0	50	10	1: 5.0
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	1,012	917	95	1: 9.7	905	107	1: 8.5
STRATEGIC BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	40	37	3	1: 12.3	36	4	1: 9.0
SUSTAINABILITY	2	1	1	1: 1.0	1	1	1: 1.0
TRANSIT	2,996	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
VIZCAYA MUSEUM AND GARDENS	47	31	16	1: 1.9	30	17	1: 1.8
WATER AND SEWER	2,697	2,244	453	1: 5.0	2,088	609	1: 3.4
TOTAL	28,963	20,549	4,753		19,880	5,422	

Depts not included Staffing Chart Span of Control:
 County Exec Offices (62), Board of County
 Commissioners (202), County Attorney (137), Judicial
 Administration (264), Transit (2,996)

**Source: Submitted staffing charts to OCA prior to First
 Change Memo. Analysis does not include part time
 positions**