

093058



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

CIVIL DIVISION

SEP 16 1970

Dear Dr. Tarr:

We have been making a survey of the personnel management policies and procedures of the Selective Service System (SSS).^{2/8} This work was performed at the California and Pennsylvania SSS State Headquarters, as well as the SSS National Headquarters. The primary purpose of the survey was to ascertain whether available guidelines provide adequate control over staffing and utilization of personnel at the SSS State Headquarters level.

During our survey, the reorganization at the National Headquarters had resulted in the establishment of a new personnel and training division. We understand that you are evaluating the organizational structures in the various State Headquarters for the purpose of providing a more efficient operation within these organizations. As a result, we have discontinued our survey. However, we wish to call to your attention our observations on personnel management which we believe you may wish to consider while evaluating the organization of the State Headquarters.

SUPERVISORY FIELD PERSONNEL

The California State Headquarters utilized a number of supervisory personnel to administer and coordinate SSS field activities throughout the State. For example, area coordinators, consisting of three GS-12s, one colonel, and one lieutenant-colonel, performed such general functions as (1) public relations, (2) working with uncompensated local board personnel, (3) investigating hardship cases, delinquents, and other classification problems, and (4) maintaining liaison with law enforcement and other agency officials. California also had six local board auditors who were primarily responsible for coordinating, inspecting, and assisting in the operations of the local boards within their assigned areas.

In contrast, the Pennsylvania State Headquarters utilized seven GS-9 field supervisors who performed essentially the same functions as the area coordinators and the local board auditors in California. The salary cost of the field supervision function in Pennsylvania was about \$98,000, or about \$40,000 less than the \$138,000 salary cost in California.

While California is a larger State than Pennsylvania in terms of area and active registrants, Pennsylvania has more local boards. We did not attempt to analyze the individual workloads of the supervisory field

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

714285

093058

personnel in these States; however, the wide variance in grades of personnel in one state over another appears questionable particularly when such personnel perform essentially the same functions.

During our survey, we were informed that the SSS does not have a requirement to periodically compare the staffing level with the workload of the various State Headquarters. We were advised by SSS National Headquarters officials that once a position is approved, it is the responsibility of each State Director to determine whether it continues to be essential. According to the officials, no comparative analysis has been performed by National Headquarters.

A task force report issued in October 1967 on the structure of the SSS, pointed out the inconsistencies between states as to the designation of the supervisory field personnel and their grade and salary structure. The task force suggested that (1) SSS staff members assigned to the functions mentioned above be uniformly designated as field supervisors and (2) such personnel should be classified within a specified range of grades and salaries. As far as we can determine no action has been taken on these task force suggestions. On the basis of our survey work, it is our opinion that the 1967 suggestions of the task force are still valid.

REQUIREMENTS FOR PAYROLL CLERKS

At the time we initiated our survey, the California State Headquarters employed six people in their payroll section. After we questioned the need for this many people, two employees were subsequently transferred to other duties. This shift left three payroll clerks and a payroll supervisor to handle the payroll accounting and reporting functions for about 670 employees, or an average of about 170 payroll accounts per person. In contrast, the Pennsylvania State Headquarters employs two payroll clerks, but no payroll supervisor to handle all functions of its payroll activity. These clerks handle an average of about 210 payroll accounts each in addition to their other duties. Based on the above, it appears that the staffing of the payroll function in California may need to be further examined.

During our visit to National Headquarters, we were advised that SSS plans to establish a number of regional service centers to perform the fiscal activities presently handled by the individual states. We believe that consideration should be given to establishing guidelines on numbers and grades of employees based on workload at the service centers so that the staff can be used more effectively.

UTILIZATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

During our survey, we noted that military personnel in the California and Pennsylvania State Headquarters holding essentially the same position were of different military rank.

The California State Headquarters had 7 manpower officers. All of these officers, including the chief of the division, were majors. On the other hand, the Pennsylvania State Headquarters had 8 manpower officers and a legal officer. These officers consisted of two colonels, five lieutenant-colonels, and two majors.

We suggest that you consider establishing a requirement for periodic evaluation of the staffing patterns at the National Headquarters level, and consider equalizing the grades and ranks of personnel performing similar functions. It appears to us that the newly established personnel and training division would be the appropriate division to analyze the staffing and workloads of the various State Headquarters so as to provide a greater degree of uniformity among the states and to assure that each state has an optimum organization structure. In our opinion, such action may result in a more efficient operation.

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation the SSS personnel gave us during our survey. Your comments on any action taken or contemplated on the above matters would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Max Hirschhorn
Max Hirschhorn
Associate Director

Dr. Curtis Tarr
Director, Selective Service System
1724 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20435

278

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE