



PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

Classifying Management Positions In State Government

**A Report to the Legislative Post Audit Committee
By the Legislative Division of Post Audit
State of Kansas
August 1983**

PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

Declassifying Management Positions In State Government

OBTAINING AUDIT INFORMATION

This audit was conducted by two members of the Division's staff: Trudy Racine, senior auditor, and Mike Erbschloe, auditor. If you need any additional information about the audit findings, please contact Ms. Racine at the Division's offices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

**DECLASSIFYING MANAGEMENT POSITIONS IN
STATE GOVERNMENT**

How Difficult Is It To Discharge Inefficient Employees From the Classified Service?	1-6
What Is the Current Classification Status of Management-Level Positions?	6-8
What Factors Should Be Considered in Addressing The Issue of Classification?	9-10

APPENDIX 1: Kansas State Agencies' Position Limits Fiscal Year 1983, F.T.E.	11-13
--	--------------

DECLASSIFYING MANAGEMENT POSITIONS IN STATE GOVERNMENT

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE POST AUDIT'S FINDINGS

1. **How difficult is it to discharge inefficient employees from the classified service?** Classified employees are not frequently dismissed. In calendar year 1982, about one classified employee for every 100 full-time equivalent positions was dismissed. Dismissals which do occur tend to involve employees at lower salary ranges or in positions having direct responsibility for hospital patients, mental patients, or prisoners. Agency officials who were interviewed said they could probably dismiss a professional or managerial staff person through the civil service system on the basis of poor performance, but they said to do so would seldom be worth the cost in difficulty and divisiveness.

Dismissals are also less likely to result from chronic poor performance than from one adverse incident. However, when dismissals are proposed by an agency, the employee does not generally appeal; and when appeals do occur, the agency's position is likely to be upheld, although the penalty is sometimes reduced.

2. **What is the current classification status of management-level positions?** The auditors reviewed classifications in seven agencies: the Departments of Administration, Corrections, Human Resources, Revenue, and Social and Rehabilitation Services, and the Corporation Commission and State Treasurer's Office. In these seven agencies, most of the managers who are directly supervised by the agency head were unclassified, with the exception of several managers of administrative and support services. However, there are several inconsistencies at the management level. There also are inconsistencies inside and between agencies in the classification status of other professional-level positions. States around Kansas also show inconsistencies.

3. **What factors should be considered in addressing the issue of declassification?** The auditors hoped to provide more definitive information about the effects of declassifying management-level positions. However, few such changes had occurred recently at the management level in the agencies examined, and insufficient information was available for related tests. As an alternative, agency administrators were interviewed regarding the current classification status of positions in their agencies, and how it affected the agencies' operation. Administrators mentioned several factors which the Legislature may want to consider in addressing the issue of declassification. These factors are consistency, policy-making needs, ability to attract qualified staff, ease of removal, and freedom from influence. No consistent recommendation for changing the current system emerged from these interviews.



DECLASSIFYING MANAGEMENT POSITIONS IN STATE GOVERNMENT

The purpose of this audit is to provide information to assist the Legislature in addressing the issue of declassifying management-level positions in State government. The audit was authorized by the Legislative Post Audit Committee at its meeting on June 2, 1983.

The audit addresses three questions. How difficult is it to discharge inefficient employees from the classified service? What is the current classification status of management-level positions? What factors should be considered in addressing the issue of declassification?

How Difficult Is It To Discharge Inefficient Employees From The Classified Service?

Article 10 of the Kansas Personnel Regulations outlines the grounds for dismissal, suspension, or demotion of classified employees. These grounds fall into two major categories. The first relates to personal conduct detrimental to the State service, such as gross misconduct or knowingly releasing confidential information. The second relates to poor performance of duties, such as inefficiency, negligence, and habitual poor attendance. The severity of the sanction is determined by the agency, but it may be modified by the State Civil Service Board upon appeal.

Employees can be dismissed either for improper conduct in a single incident, such as insubordination or theft, or for continued poor performance. In the case of a single serious incident, an agency can dismiss a permanent employee immediately, or suspend the employee pending dismissal. However, agencies may generally dismiss a permanent employee for continued poor performance only after the employee has received two performance evaluations in the 90 calendar days immediately preceding the effective date of the proposed dismissal. The two performance evaluations must be spaced at least 30 calendar days apart and must both be "unsatisfactory." If an agency proposes to dismiss a permanent employee for deficiencies in work performance without the two evaluations, and if the employee appeals, the agency must show the State Civil Service Board that the employee was adequately counseled concerning the nature of the deficiencies in work performance and the ways in which the employee was expected to correct the deficiencies.

When an agency prepares to dismiss an employee, it is required to send the employee a letter three to ten days in advance, stating all of the reasons for dismissal, and suggesting a time for the employee to meet with the supervisor and appointing authority (the employee does not have to attend). A second letter is sent three to seven days later, stating the official date of dismissal and reasons. This letter also advises the employee of his or her right to appeal within 30 days. If the employee does choose to appeal, he or she must notify the State Civil Service Board in writing within 30 days of the dismissal.

When an appeal is made, the Board has 45 days to set a hearing and the employee must be notified in writing at least 14 days before the hearing. The

employee may represent himself or herself, or may be represented by counsel. After hearing the appeal, the State Civil Service Board has 30 days to make its decision.

Kansas' Provisions for Dismissing Employees Are About the Same as Those of Neighboring States

The auditors' comparison of Kansas' dismissal and appeal provisions to those of Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Colorado showed that the six states' requirements were basically the same, although there were several minor differences. Only Kansas and Missouri require that the employee be notified of the reason for dismissal prior to its effective date. Kansas, Missouri, and Iowa all give employees 30 days to file an appeal, while the other states specify shorter time limits. Kansas also provides longer periods of time for actions of the State Civil Service Board. However, shortening those time limits would probably have little practical effect, since continuances are fairly frequent, and the Board generally makes its decisions on the day the appeal is heard.

About One Employee in 100 Is Dismissed from the Classified Service Each Year

Dismissals occur primarily at lower salary positions. The auditors reviewed Division of Personnel Services' computer printouts for calendar year 1982, which showed dismissals from classified positions by agency and by salary range. The results showed that there were 27,362 full-time equivalent classified positions at the end of calendar year 1982, and during that year a total of 255 employees were dismissed. This is equalivant to 9.3 dismissals per 1,000 full-time equivalent employees. A review of the dismissals by salary range showed that dismissals occur more frequently from positions in lower salary ranges, as shown in the following chart.

<u>Salary Range</u>	<u>Beginning Annual Salary</u>	<u>Number of Full-Time Equivalent Positions</u>	<u>Number of Dismissals</u>	<u>Dismissals per 1000 Positions</u>
3-10	\$ 7,608-10,728	9,940	162	16.3
11-20	11,256-16,728	11,547	82	7.1
21-25	17,484-20,856	3,845	10	2.6
26-44	21,792-44,184	1,645	1	.6
Other		193	0	0.0

Dismissals tend to be concentrated at four agencies. A review of the dismissals by agency showed that only four agencies dismissed more than ten employees during the year. Together, these four agencies accounted for almost three-fourths of the dismissals, although they had slightly less than half of the classified positions, as shown below.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Number of Positions</u>	<u>Number of Dismissals</u>	<u>Dismissals per 1,000 Positions</u>
University of Kansas Medical Center	3,147	96	30.5
Department of Corrections	1,189	34	28.6
University of Kansas	1,869	19	10.2
Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services	7,389	47	6.4

Agency personnel at the University of Kansas Medical Center, Department of Corrections, and Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services were interviewed to determine possible reasons for more frequent dismissals at these agencies. They felt several factors contributed to this condition. One such factor was the failure of entry-level staff to meet probationary or training requirements. Absenteeism was also cited as a problem which occurred more frequently at lower salary ranges, both during and after probationary periods. In addition, all three of these agencies are responsible for the care of resident populations, such as hospital patients or prison inmates. According to agency officials, many direct care responsibilities for these patients or inmates are carried out by relatively low-paid staff under stressful conditions. Also, the nature of those responsibilities does not allow a margin for error. For example, an employee who sleeps on guard duty does not necessarily get a second chance.

The auditors' review of the dismissals in calendar year 1982 by type of position tended to support the statements of agency personnel. Position classifications with five or more dismissals included Custodial Worker, Food Service Worker I, Laborer II, Laundry Worker, Hospital Attendant, Psychiatric Aide, Development and Training Specialist I, Correctional Officer I, and several clerical classifications.

Dismissals usually result from a single adverse incident, not from chronic poor performance. The auditors also reviewed a sample of 87 dismissals which occurred during the past three years in greater detail, to determine the reasons for dismissal and whether the required procedures were followed. The sample was obtained from the Division of Personnel Services' log book of dismissal letters and included all dismissal letters which were recorded from seven agencies that Legislative Post Audit examined: the Departments of Administration, Corrections, Revenue, Human Resources, and Social and Rehabilitation Services, along with the Corporation Commission and Treasurer's Office. That review showed that most dismissals resulted from a single incident, such as insubordination, theft, or abusing a resident. Only 20 dismissals, or 23 percent of the sample, resulted from unsatisfactory performance over a longer period. Twelve of the employees who were dismissed for unsatisfactory performance over time were in salary ranges 3-10 (starting salary \$7,608-\$10,728) and eight were in salary ranges 11-19 (starting salary \$11,256-\$16,008). Thus, none of the employees were in management-level positions.

In all cases, the required time limits and procedures appeared to have been observed. The average amount of time between unsatisfactory evaluations

was close to two months, which indicates that agencies tend to give employees the maximum amount of time available to improve their performance.

Most Dismissals Are Not Appealed and When They Are, the Agency's Action is Usually Upheld

Appeals are heard by the Kansas Civil Service Board, composed of one member from each of the five Congressional districts. The Board meets as necessary to conduct business, and it averaged four days of meetings per month during fiscal year 1983. The appeals process allows employees to present their cases to an impartial board. The appellant and the agency representative must appear in person. Both sides are usually represented by counsel, though the appellant may represent himself. Witnesses may be subpoenaed, and Board members may ask questions throughout the hearing.

The number of appeals has been increasing over recent years, a change which individuals who were interviewed attributed largely to legislation in 1978 which clarified the need for the appellant to be aware of the appeal right. The number of appeals has increased from 16 in fiscal year 1979 to 30 in fiscal year 1980 and 47 in calendar year 1982.

Most dismissals are not appealed. Of the 87 cases which the auditors examined, only 27, or 31 percent, were appealed. In 20 of the 27 cases the appellant withdrew the appeal or the dismissal was upheld. In six cases, the dismissal was modified, or reduced, to a suspension or demotion. In one case, the agency's action was overturned and the employee was reinstated.

	<u>Number</u>
Appeals Withdrawn	4
Dismissals Upheld	16
Dismissals Modified to Suspension or Demotion	6
Employees Reinstated	<u>1</u>
Total	27

In the one case of reinstatement, a long-term employee was found by a new supervisor to be performing poorly after being promoted. The employee was counseled, closely supervised, and re-evaluated over a period of approximately one year. The agency proposed to dismiss the employee, who appealed. The appeal board ordered the employee reinstated and given a new probationary period with specific requirements to be met as approved by the Board. The employee was reinstated, was re-evaluated and again dismissed, and did not appeal the second dismissal.

When appeals do occur, the agency's position is likely to be upheld, although the penalty may be reduced. The auditors did an additional review to determine whether their three-year sample was correct in showing that most appeals are upheld. They examined all of the Board's records for calendar year 1982 alone, and the results were similar to the three-year sample. Of the 34 appeals of

dismissals which were heard that year, the Board upheld the agency in 24 cases (71 percent) and reduced the dismissal to a lesser sanction in 10 cases (30 percent). No dismissals were reversed.

The required procedures and timeliness are being observed. All appeals the auditors reviewed were heard within 45 days or were properly continued, and decisions were all made within the 30-day period, with most cases decided on the day of the hearing. Appeals heard by a hearing officer were decided at the next meeting of the full Board.

Dismissing Poor Performers is Seen as Difficult

The auditors interviewed several senior agency officials who were involved in the dismissal and appeal process at the Department of Corrections, the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, and the University of Kansas Medical Center. The agency officials who were interviewed generally perceived it to be easier to dismiss an employee on the basis of one documented act than to build a file which provides convincing evidence of poor performance over time. Building such a case was seen as particularly difficult when the employee had been with the State for a number of years and previously had satisfactory ratings. They also believed it to be more difficult to dismiss employees in salary ranges 20 to 30 (beginning annual salary \$16,728 to \$25,500), where many professional-level positions are placed. Unsatisfactory performance by these professional employees may consist of exercising poor professional judgment or carrying out their responsibilities in a manner that is not responsive to agency policy. Even when poor performance in these areas is documented, administrators feared documentation might seem subjective and be difficult to defend. In addition, several individuals expressed concern about the divisive effect of such a dismissal on other staff. In sum, although the individuals who were interviewed acknowledged that they could probably dismiss a professional or managerial level staff person through the civil service system on the basis of poor performance, they said that to do so would seldom be worth the cost.

Although the evaluation process is designed to provide a clearer understanding of the performance which is expected, several factors were seen as complicating its use for the dismissal of poor performers. These include a lack of supervisory training, the amount of time available to perform and document supervisory actions, the desire of supervisors to avoid the appearance of harassment, and the necessity of addressing all aspects of performance through job standards, including such matters as attendance, conduct and professional judgment. However, agency officials also expressed awareness that employees' rights do need to be safeguarded, and that appeals which are not resolved to the satisfaction of the employee can be taken to district court. Although some concern was expressed about the amount of flexibility given by the Board to employees in scheduling appeals, appeals decisions were generally perceived to be fair.

Agency officials suggested several ways to address these concerns. They indicated that agencies need to take steps to assure that they use the process well, by keeping personnel officers informed of disciplinary actions as soon as possible, by developing consistent and progressive disciplinary policies, by

providing regular supervision, and by providing supervisors with training and support to help them deal more adequately with subordinates who are performing poorly.

Division of Personnel representatives indicated that they are aware of these concerns, and are attempting to address them through supervisory training, planned assistance, and ongoing review of the new evaluation process.

What is the Current Classification Status of Management-Level Positions?

There were more than 37,000 established full-time equivalent positions in Kansas agencies during fiscal year 1983, including approximately 27,000 classified and 10,000 unclassified positions. The majority of the State's unclassified personnel are located in schools, universities, the judicial branch, and the offices of elected officials, as shown in Appendix 1. Legislators asked that the auditors review the classification status of several specific agencies. These agencies included the Corporation Commission, the State Treasurer's Office, and the Departments of Human Resources, Corrections, Revenue, Administration, and Social and Rehabilitation Services. Within these agencies, the auditors concentrated their analysis on positions which are directly supervised by an agency head and other unclassified positions in salary range 25 (starting salary \$20,856) and above.

The Classification Status of Positions Which Are Supervised by Agency Heads Is Not Consistent

Positions which are supervised by the heads of these seven agencies varied in title but included division directors, deputy secretaries, commissioners, and others with similar titles. The status of each position, that is, classified or unclassified, was compared to similar positions within the agency and to similar positions in the other agencies. The comparison is shown in the list on the next page. The auditors found that the majority of the managers who are directly supervised by agency heads are unclassified. Exceptions include most of the managers who are responsible for administrative or support functions and several other positions in the Department of Administration.

As the list shows, the classification status of managers who are responsible for administrative functions is inconsistent between agencies. Four agencies have classified managers in these areas and three have unclassified managers. In addition, the Department of Administration has several internal inconsistencies. The Department has eight divisions, six of which (Information Systems and Computing, Architectural Services, Personnel, Budget, Printing and Purchases) are directed by unclassified managers. However, two Divisions (Accounts and Reports and General Services) are directed by classified managers, as are three other operating units supervised by the Secretary of Administration (Buildings and Grounds Services, Equal Employment Opportunity Office and Telecommunications Office).

	Unclassified	Classified
Department of Administration	Director, Division of Information Systems and Computing	Director, Division of General Services
	Director, Division of Architectural Services	Director, Equal Employment Opportunity Office
	Director, Division of Budget	Director, Telecommunications
	Director, Division of Personnel	Director, Buildings and Grounds
	Director, Division of Printing	Director, Division of Accounts and Reports
	Director, Division of Purchases	
Kansas Corporation Commission	Executive Secretary	
	Director, Mined Land Division	
	Director, Utilities Division	
	Director, Transportation Division	
	Director, Conservation Division	
Department of Corrections	Director, Special Projects Division	
	Deputy Secretary for Community Services	
	Deputy Secretary For Institutional Services	
	Deputy Secretary For Management Services	
Department of Human Resources	Director, Division of Employment	Director, Division of Staff Services
	Director, Division of Workmans' Compensation	
	Director, Division of Labor and Management	
Department of Revenue	Director, Division of Taxation	Director, Division of Operations
		Director of Planning and Research Services
	Director, Division of Property Valuations	Director, Administrative and Management Services Bureau
	Director, Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control	Director of Personnel Services
	Director, Division of Vehicles	Director, Audit Services Bureau
Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services	Commissioner of Mental Health/Retardation Services	Commissioner of Administrative Services
	Commissioner of Youth Services	
	Commissioner of Adult Services	
	Commissioner of Income Maintenance and Medical Services	
	Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services	
	Commissioner of Alcoholic and Drug Abuse Services Institution Superintendents	
Treasurer's Office	Assistant State Treasurer	Auditor
	Data Processing Manager	
	Administrative Officer	

The Classification of Other Kinds of Positions Is Also Inconsistent

The auditors also reviewed other unclassified positions in the sample agencies, to determine if their classification status was consistent with that of peer positions in the agency, with other positions in the division, and with similar positions in other agencies. That review showed that declassification of some divisions or groups of positions has resulted in some inconsistencies.

For instance, professional positions in the Division of Architectural Services are unclassified, which is not consistent with other Divisions in the Department of Administration. The entire Division was declassified by the Legislature in 1978, but the non-professional positions were later reclassified. In addition, the Division of Budget has three unclassified policy analyst positions which were transferred from the Division of State Research and Planning in 1980 when that Division was abolished. A comparison of the job duties of the unclassified policy analysts to their peers who are classified as budget analysts showed the two to be basically similar.

Most of the professional level positions in the Kansas Corporation Commission are unclassified, though some differences exist between the Commission's divisions. This includes all professional employees in the Utilities Division, who were declassified by the Legislature at the agency's request in 1979. The Corporation Commission is more extensively declassified than any of the other agencies which were reviewed.

In the Treasurer's Office all supervisors but three are unclassified. These three supervisors cover the areas of electronic data processing and accounting, which could be considered support services similar to those in the Department of Revenue, which are also managed by persons in classified positions. The Treasurer's Office is more heavily classified than the offices of the Secretary of State and Attorney General, or the Insurance Department.

The Pooled Money Investment Board staff is administratively housed in the Department of Administration, but is responsible to the Board. The manager for the Board has a classified position. Within the Department of Administration, other staff who are responsible for smaller program areas, such as Telecommunications and Equal Employment, are also classified. However, in a number of other cases outside the Department of Administration, staff who report directly to boards are unclassified.

Other States Have Inconsistencies in Classified and Unclassified Positions, Too

The auditors also compared the classification status of the positions reviewed to corresponding positions in other states. They found that in surrounding states there is little consistency over which managers and other staff are unclassified. In Missouri, all division directors, and many agencies including the Department of Revenue and the Public Service Commission are totally unclassified. In Iowa some division directors are classified, but others such as those in the Departments of Social Services and Transportation are unclassified. In Oklahoma, Nebraska, and Colorado there is inconsistency in determining which positions are unclassified or classified.

What Factors Should Be Considered in Addressing the Issue of Declassification?

This question is different from the question originally posed when the audit began. That original question dealt with the effects of declassification, an issue the auditors hoped to assess by analyzing data for management-level positions which were declassified or added to the unclassified service during the past several years. They planned to compare data for these same positions prior to declassification or for equivalent positions in the classified service. The comparisons were to include job duties, employee qualifications, salary, and turnover. However, the auditors were unable to make meaningful comparisons for several reasons. Most of the positions which have been declassified or added to the unclassified service in the sample agencies during the past five years have been professional and technical, not management positions. The auditors attempted to identify positions in other agencies to add to the sample, but discovered that the necessary records were not kept centrally and would take too much time to find by going to each individual agency. An attempt to determine the dismissal rate for unclassified personnel also had to be abandoned because the State's management report on turnover does not include unclassified personnel.

The auditors were able to obtain information about the accomplishment of such subjective goals of declassification as "responsiveness" and "accountability" by interviewing agency administrators. These interviews included such subjects as what concerns led them to request that certain positions be declassified, whether obtaining the unclassified position had enabled them to resolve those concerns, what the rationale was for the classification patterns which exist, and how they affect the agencies' operations. Several factors were mentioned during these interviews as contributing to both the rationale for and the effect of classification status.

Consistency. Most administrators wanted the classification status of the positions in their agencies to be consistent with that of comparable agencies. They also favored consistency across the level of the organization in most cases, and preferred that the classification status of individuals with similar skills or duties be the same. Several agency heads expressed a desire to change the classification status of one or more positions, but others expressed satisfaction with maintaining their current mix of classified and unclassified positions.

Policy-making needs. Agency heads and Division of Personnel Services representatives said they thought upper-level managers who make policy should be unclassified. Most of them said that unclassified personnel in these roles tended to be more responsive to policy direction provided by the agency head, in contrast to classified managers who were sometimes seen as resisting change. They disagreed somewhat about the level of policy involvement which warranted unclassified status. Four out of seven administrators differentiated between policy-making, which they felt was done by the program managers they supervised in carrying out legislative intent, and the ability to influence policy, which they felt was the role held by managers of support services who were responsible for allocating agency resources between program areas. These four administrators thought that program managers should be unclassified and that

managers of support services should be classified. The other three administrators thought all of them should be unclassified. A third level of policy involvement was characterized as policy responsiveness. This involves the willingness of professional staff below the management level to follow the policy direction which they are given. Unclassified professional staff were felt to be more responsive to policy direction, but no one believed that professional staff should be unclassified for this reason alone.

Ability to attract qualified staff. This factor refers to both pay and skills. In general, agency heads thought that an unclassified employee should receive a higher salary to compensate for the lack of civil service protection. In most cases, they also felt that unclassified positions provided them the flexibility they needed to set the level of pay high enough to attract qualified employees. However, this advantage was said to have diminished over time because the salaries for many positions have been tied to their classified equivalents, and unclassified personnel are not guaranteed cost-of-living increases. Several agency heads also believed that they could recruit people for unclassified positions who had specific skills or expertise which were common in the private sector but rare in civil service applicants.

Ease of removal. Several agency heads said they had found it necessary to remove one or more managers from the unclassified service, because of a desire to make rapid policy changes. They said that it had been important at the time to be able to make those changes rapidly, without the disruption that might have been caused if they had attempted to remove classified employees.

Freedom from influence. This factor was cited by one agency head as a reason for positions which are responsible for certain tasks, such as equal employment opportunity, to be classified.

APPENDIX 1

KANSAS STATE AGENCIES' POSITION LIMITS
(FY 1983, F.T.E.)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Classified FTE</u>	<u>Unclassi- fied FTE</u>	<u>Total FTE</u>
028	Board of Accountancy	1.7	1.0	2.7
034	Adjutant General	60.5	38.0	98.5
036	Vocational Education Advisory Council	2.0	0.0	2.0
039	Department on Aging	22.6	3.0	25.6
046	Board of Agriculture	302.0	3.0	305.0
055	Animal Health	39.0	1.0	40.0
058	Commission on Civil Rights	41.0	5.2	46.2
082	Attorney General	0.0	53.0	53.0
082	Kansas Bureau of Investigation	127.0	2.0	129.0
094	Banking Department	52.1	1.2	53.3
100	Barber Examiners	2.0	.5	2.5
102	Behavioral Science Regulatory Board	2.0	1.0	3.0
105	Board of Healing Arts	5.0	1.0	6.0
143	Kansas Corporation Commission	151.0	71.5	222.5
145	Correctional-Vocational Training Center	102.5	.5	103.0
147	Ombudsman for Corrections	0.0	5.0	5.0
149	Board of Cosmetology	7.0	1.0	8.0
159	Department of Credit Bureau	8.0	1.0	9.0
160	Crime Victims Reparations Board	2.0	1.0	3.0
167	Dental Board	1.0	0.0	1.0
173	Department of Administration	859.5	59.0	918.5
204	Embalming Board	2.0	1.0	3.0
211	Energy Office	3.0	3.0	6.0
234	State Fire Marshal	33.0	3.0	36.0
240	Fish & Game Commission	268.0	1.0	269.0
246	Ft. Hays State University	296.4	326.6	623.0
247	Public Disclosure Commission	0.0	5.0	5.0
258	Grain Inspection	227.0	1.0	228.0
264	Department of Health and Environment	588.2	6.0	594.2
276	Department of Transportation	3,276.0	8.0	3,284.0
280	Kansas Highway Patrol	569.5	1.0	570.5
288	Historical Society	122.0	1.0	123.0
296	Department of Human Resources	1,202.0	10.0	1,212.0
300	Department of Economic Development	33.0	8.0	41.0
307	Kansas Correctional Institute	71.0	1.0	72.0
313	Kansas Industrial Reformatory	298.5	3.0	301.5
319	Youth Center at Topeka	202.0	1.0	203.0
325	Youth Center at Beloit	95.5	1.0	96.5
331	Insurance Department	56.0	80.0	136.0

<u>No.</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Classified FTE</u>	<u>Unclassi- fied FTE</u>	<u>Total FTE</u>
349	Judicial Council	0.0	3.0	3.0
355	Youth Center At Atchison	117.5	1.0	118.5
359	Kansas Arts Commission	8.0	1.0	9.0
363	Kansas Neurological Institute	618.0	7.0	625.0
365	Public Employees Retirement System	51.0	1.0	52.0
367	Kansas Sate University	1,990.3	2,332.1	4,322.4
373	Kansas State Fair Board	14.0	1.0	15.0
379	Emporia State University	293.3	353.1	646.4
385	Pittsburg State University	258.7	328.9	587.6
391	Wheat Commission	6.0	2.0	8.0
410	Larned State Hospital	773.0	21.0	794.0
434	Kansas State Library	22.0	2.0	24.0
446	Lieutenant Governor	0.0	3.0	3.0
454	Consumer Credit Commission	8.0	1.0	9.0
482	Board of Nursing	11.0	0.0	11.0
488	Board of Optometry	0.3	0.0	0.3
494	Osawatomie State Hospital	579.0	18.0	597.0
503	Park and Resources Authority	109.4	1.0	110.4
507	Parsons State Hospital	381.5	4.0	385.5
521	Department of Corrections	193.0	7.5	200.5
523	Kansas Adult Authority	6.0	5.0	11.0
525	Kansas State Penitentiary	415.5	3.0	418.5
531	Board of Pharmacy	5.0	1.0	6.0
549	Real Estate Commission	12.0	1.0	13.0
551	Kansas Reception and Diagnostic Center	101.5	6.0	107.5
555	Rainbow Mental Health Facility	109.0	6.0	115.0
561	Board of Regents	7.0	9.5	16.5
652	Board of Tax Appeals	8.0	7.0	15.0
565	Department of Revenue	1,406.5	19.5	1,426.0
579	Revisor of Statutes	6.5	1.0	7.5
585	Norton State Hospital	255.0	3.0	258.0
597	Savings and Loan Department	6.5	1.0	7.5
604	School for the Visually Handicapped	36.3	42.6	78.9
610	School for the Deaf	64.0	109.0	173.0
622	Secretary of State	0.0	45.0	45.0
625	Securities Commission	12.0	3.0	15.0
628	Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services	2,650.1	7.0	2,657.1
629	Division of Mental Health and Retardation	48.0	1.0	49.0
634	Conservation Commission	2.5	2.0	4.5
640	Soldiers' Home	131.8	1.0	132.8
652	Department of Education	149.0	23.0	172.0
653	Kansas Technical Institute	55.0	35.5	90.5
663	Board of Technical Professions	2.0	1.0	3.0
664	Topeka State Hospital	634.0	18.0	652.0

<u>No.</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Classified FTE</u>	<u>Unclassi- fied FTE</u>	<u>Total FTE</u>
670	State Treasurer	36.0	11.0	47.0
677	Judicial Department	0.0	1,555.0	1,555.0
682	University of Kansas	1,980.2	2,258.3	4,238.5
682	University of Kansas Medical Center	3,166.8	1,348.7	4,515.5
700	Board of Veterinary Examiners	0.0	0.5	0.5
709	Kansas Water Office	28.0	1.5	29.5
713	Winfield State Hospital	711.0	7.0	718.0
715	Wichita State University	613.3	887.6	1,500.9
		<u>27,223.5</u>	<u>10,217.8</u>	<u>37,441.3</u>

