

LEADERSHIP IN CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT: LESSONS FROM A
SURVEY OF EXECUTIVES

Kent Gary Andersen
B.S., Utah State University, 2004

THESIS

Submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

at

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

SPRING
2011

© 2011

Kent Gary Andersen
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

LEADERSHIP IN CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT: LESSONS FROM A
SURVEY OF EXECUTIVES

A Thesis

by

Kent Gary Andersen

Approved by:

_____, Committee Chair
Edward L. Lascher, Jr., Ph.D.

_____, Second Reader
Mary Kirlin, D.P.A

Date

Student: Kent Gary Andersen

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the University format manual, and that this thesis is suitable for shelving in the Library and credit is to be awarded for the thesis.

_____, Department Chair
Robert Wassmer, Ph.D.

Date

Department of Public Policy and Administration

Abstract
of
LEADERSHIP IN CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT: LESSONS FROM A
SURVEY OF EXECUTIVES

by
Kent Gary Andersen

In California state government, two unique employee classifications exist, the Career Executive Assignment (CEA) and exempt. These two classifications are in the top-levels of government and are responsible for influencing policy through creation and implementation. We know that the exempt classification exists in virtually every state and federal government. The CEA civil service classification is a model system, and the first of its kind in the United States. But what else do we know about CEAs and what differences exist between the two classifications? This thesis uses an exploratory research approach to analyze a state personnel survey that assesses executive development opportunities and deficiencies. I examine questions that focus on organizational and employee performance measures, needed executive proficiencies, and general demographic information.

Data for this thesis come from the California Department of Personnel Administration Executive Competency Survey. CEA and exempt classifications received the 222 question survey in October of 2009. I examine 76 questions closed-ended questions from 398 executive respondents using statistical analysis software and conducting simple cross-tabulations.

Results suggest that CEAs and exempts are similar with respect to many demographic traits and attitudes, but there are a few notable differences between the two groups. The demographic findings are interesting and may help state personnel officials prepare for upcoming retirements. Gender composition is similar to the overall state workforce, ethnicity is primarily white, and executives are highly educated. Contrary to prior literature, the present study found that exempt respondents have served as executives longer than CEAs. Both groups of executives monitor and measure organizational performance. Supporting legislative intent, they both feel it is very important to implement programs and policies that reflect higher-management policies. Differences include CEAs having a greater concern for employee and program performance, while exempt employees believe they need a higher proficiency in change leadership, forwarding thinking, and vision and strategic thinking.

_____, Committee Chair
Edward L. Lascher, Jr., Ph.D.

Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I thank my parents, who without your support this thesis would have never been possible. Thank you to Dr. Ted Lascher and Dr. Mary Kirlin for being my first and second readers and for your valuable input in creating a successful thesis. Thank you to Jodi Traversaro for making the data available and giving me an internal perspective to the topic, and Eric Stern for introducing me to Jodi. Deanna Tuetken, thank you for your support and encouragement. Thank you to my brother David, who without your assistance I would be paying off students loans forever. To Tarisha Bal, Melissa Mallory, and Ted Ryan, thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to provide input on my thesis. Thank you to my fellow classmates for sharing your knowledge and insight with me. Finally, thank you to California State University, Sacramento and the Department of Public Policy and Administration for the opportunity to further my education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgments.....	vii
List of Tables	x
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND.....	1
Organization of the Thesis	6
Background	6
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Career Executive Assignment.....	13
Senior Executive Service	17
Performance Measurement	20
Conclusion	23
3. METHODOLOGY	26
Use of Survey.....	26
Collection of Data.....	27
Analyzed Questions	28
Use of PASW for Data Analysis.....	29
Practical Problems and Potential Sources of Measurement Error	29
4. SURVEY RESULTS AND FINDINGS.....	32
Demographic Characteristics of Executives in State Government	32
Executive Attitudes on Measuring Performance, Organizational Goal Achievement, and Proficiencies in Soft Skills.....	39
Performance Measure and Organizational Goal Achievement Tasks that Executives Think are Important.....	40
CEA and Exempt Differences Regarding the Importance of Performance Measures and Organizational Goal Achievement.....	42
Proficiencies that Executives Rate the Highest	43
Proficiency Rating Differences between Exempts and CEAs	47

Additional Proficiency Discussion	48
Bottom Line	48
5. CONCLUSION.....	50
General Demographics.....	50
Performance Measures and Organizational Goal Achievement	51
Proficiency Needs for Executives.....	52
Research Opportunities	53
Conclusion	55
Appendix A. CEA and Exempt Comparison Table	57
Appendix B. Acronym List.....	59
Appendix C. CEA Research Methods and Findings Table	60
Appendix D. SES Research Methods and Findings Table	63
Appendix E. Performance Measure Research Methods and Findings Table.....	65
Appendix F. CEA and SES Comparison Table	68
Appendix G. Executive Competency Survey	72
References.....	91

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Table 4.1 Age.....	33
2. Table 4.2 Gender.....	33
3. Table 4.3 Ethnicity.....	35
4. Table 4.4 Education Level	35
5. Table 4.5 Required Executive Competencies	45
6. Table 4.6 Moderately Required Executive Competencies.....	46
7. Table 4.7 CEA and Exempt Difference Tests.....	47

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

California state government features an interesting employee classification known as the Career Executive Assignment (CEA). The first of its kind in the nation, the CEA classification was a model for executive reform in government in the 1960's.

Government reform is an ever-evolving subject, and after discovering the CEA classification, I went on to explore existing research about its nature and effectiveness. Unexpectedly, I found very little research on the subject matter. Due to the uniqueness of the CEA system, specifically responsiveness to higher administrative policy and goals, this lack of study spurred my interest in conducting my own research.

Originally, I intended on administering a survey to CEAs to determine what motivates them to accept this classification and if legislative intent is being met. However, through the early stages of the development process I discovered that the California Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) recently conducted a survey of CEAs, designed to assess executive development deficiencies and opportunities. Part of the executive class in the survey responses are a relevant comparison group, exempt employees. The classification exempt indicates that an employee is a political appointee and is "exempt" from civil service laws and rules. Even though I include and discuss exempt classification responses, I am primarily interested in CEA findings. The DPA survey has offered a great opportunity for learning details about a subject that interested me, and is the basis for this thesis.

The DPA Human Resource Modernization department created the Executive Competency Survey primarily to assess CEAs, exempts, managers, and supervisors on a variety of competencies to improve State hiring of qualified applicants. These competencies are specific knowledge, skills, abilities, and personal characteristics necessary to excel in the position (DPA, 2010a). The DPA has conducted an initial review on competencies specific to managers/supervisors and executives, but there is still more to understand.

Coming in to this research, I had interest in analyzing components of CEAs, specifically motivation and legislative intent. However, after reviewing the survey, motivation did not come up. What did come up, and what I did not expect, is a data set on necessary skill proficiency for executive positions and information involving executive measuring and monitoring of employee and organizational performance. Therefore, even though it is not my original choice, I evaluate skills necessary for executive positions, and the measuring and monitoring of performance by CEAs and exempts. I also compare and contrast CEA and exempt responses in relation to needed skill proficiency. Additionally, I use a few general demographics and an organizational performance question to assess if the CEA legislative intent is being met, which is consistent with one of my original questions.

This analysis of the DPA survey does not have a firm hypothesis; instead, it takes an exploratory research approach looking for patterns across variables. Simultaneously, the thesis offers a contribution simply by providing additional descriptive information than what has generally been available with regard to CEA and exempt classifications.

Resulting information will likely assist the DPA in assessing hiring requirements, workforce planning, and training needs as well as determine executive usage of performance measures.

Both CEA and exempt classifications are interesting subjects for study. They are both special groups of state employees, in that they hold the most senior of positions and articulate policy priorities in state organizations. Each executive classification forms a distinct system, but both intend to influence policy. To understand nuances between systems, I examine similarities and differences in survey responses. To assess CEA system intent, I use general demographic survey findings and compare them to literature review information and CEA classification goals.

Decreased budgets are putting increased accountability and transparency pressure on state management. There is a need for consistent preparation for the Baby Boom turnover that is to occur in state government. There is an ongoing need to hire the best person for the job and train state employees efficiently and appropriately. It is consistent with state needs to analyze government job classifications and hiring systems to determine job expectations.

Californians expect state leaders to be proficient in their jobs. Californians also expect that employees of the State of California to have mechanisms in place that measure individual and organizational performance. To improve, plan, and prepare, the State of California must understand needed proficiencies within its top-level workforce and at what level this workforce measures performance. Therefore, my thesis seeks to determine the proficiency needs of California's executive employees in a selection of

“soft skills” involving character traits. Additionally, my thesis examines whether these same executives measure employee performance and their involvement in organizational performance activities. To discover the answers to these questions, my thesis analyzes the DPA Executive Competency Survey. Background information, literature review, and survey results regarding CEA and exempt employee classifications are the foundations for findings.

Why Does California Care?

There are several reasons why California should be interested in an analysis of CEA and exempt employees. First, California taxpayers are funding employee salaries, and expect good government. As the highest paid California employee classifications and significant participants in policy formation, CEAs and exempt employees have a performance responsibility to those who are paying their salaries and experience the impact of the policies they influence. Second, the current budget condition is reducing the number of state employees, without a foreseeable reduction in demand for services. This budget reduction means California needs as many tools as possible to assess the skill and ability needs of current and potential employees to ensure effectiveness. Third, the state faces a large number of Baby Boomer retirements. The state needs to prepare its next generation of leaders and target recruitments to identify individuals with the skill sets necessary to hit the ground running. Finally, occasional review of classifications is necessary to support continuance and identify opportunities for improvement. I now discuss the current budget deficit, retirements, and review of classifications in further detail.

With a \$28 billion budget deficit, it is likely that large cuts will be coming to state workers (Stanton, 2011). With reductions likely to state positions, programs, and funding, it is increasingly important that the workforce is able to perform at an optimum level. California employees have the pressure to do more with less. In 2009, the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy (2010) reported that California has the fourth lowest ratio of full-time equivalent state employees in the nation, 25% below the national average at 107 employees for every 10,000 residents. The employee to resident ratio is continuing to decline. Between March 2009 and December 2010 the ratio decreased as state and local jobs declined by approximately 55,000, while the state increased population by 600,000 (ibid, 2010). Demand for services is increasing, but as previously noted, the budget deficit influences politicians and decision makers to cut to an already reduced state workforce in an ever changing environment. Analysis is necessary regarding employee classifications and their required skills and abilities to assist decision-makers in streamlining hiring processes and aligning training with needs.

In October 2010, the California State Personnel Board (2010) released its Annual Census of Employees in the State Civil Service, reporting that 37.2% of California employees are age 50 or over and 21% are 55 or over. This is a significant portion of state employees nearing retirement age, and the state needs to be prepared for management turnover.

A final reason why Californians should be interested in executive analysis is the provision of transparent information on CEA and exempt classifications. Since CEA creation, research on the classification has been limited, yet the number of CEAs in state

service has progressively grown. The intent behind CEA is to establish a basis for a broader-gauged, higher civil service classification in the State of California. However, how can we determine if CEAs are meeting this intent without a review of the system? There are several reasons why individuals should care about this proposed research, but I feel that Behn (2001) described it perfectly when he stated simply, “We care about the *consequences* of government action.”

Organization of the Thesis

This thesis as a whole rests on an analysis of CEA and exempt employee responses to a statewide 2010 Executive Competency Survey administered by the DPA. The remainder of Chapter 1 provides background information, including general CEA and exempt information as well as a discussion of performance measurement in California government. Chapter 2 is a literature review that includes the consolidation of the limited research conducted on CEA’s. I enhance CEA literature review findings through use of the comparable Federal Senior Executive Service program. The literature review also includes information on performance measurement use by state and local agencies. Chapter 3 summarizes the methods used in the survey conduction and data analysis while Chapter 4 presents the resulting data and findings. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes with the overall findings and further research opportunities.

Background

To develop a better understanding for the context of this thesis, I provide background information regarding CEA and exempt positions as well as performance measurement in California government. Within the CEA and exempt background, I

discuss classification, salary, and other general information. See Appendix A for a CEA and exempt comparison table. The performance measure discussion involves why to measure performance and usage in California government.

Career Executive Assignment

CEA positions are at the highest level in state organizations, just below political appointees. It is in the high positions that CEAs provide policy influence and advice (SPB, 2006). CEAs apply for a position, are appointed, and placement occurs in “top managerial levels.” CEA positions have two principal roles: to influence policy and/or manage major state functions. In April of 2011, there were 1,339 full time CEAs as reported by the DPA’s Personnel Information Exchange database. California Government Code § 18547 define the meaning and intent of CEAs:

“Career executive assignment” means an appointment to a high administrative and policy influencing position within the state civil service in which the incumbent's primary responsibility is the managing of a major function or the rendering of management advice to top-level administrative authority. Such a position can be established only in the top managerial levels of state service and is typified by broad responsibility for policy implementation and extensive participation in policy evolution.

Eligibility for CEA positions is restricted. Before January 1, 2009, CEA eligibility was limited to State employees who had civil service eligibility. To expand the applicant pool, the California State Legislature changed the Government Code. In a 2008

memo from the California State Personnel Board (SPB) to all state agencies, employee organizations, and members of the governor's cabinets, the SPB added the italicized portion that follows to explain the revised CEA applicant minimum classifications:

Either I

Must be a State civil service employee with permanent civil service status
or who previously had permanent status in the State civil service.

Or II

Must be a current or former employee of the Legislature, with two or more consecutive years as defined in Government Code § 18990.

Or III

Must be a current or former non-elected exempt employee of the Executive Branch with two or more consecutive years (excluding those positions for which salaries are set by statute) as defined in Government Code § 18992.

Or IV

Must be a person retired from the United States military, honorably discharged from active military duty with a service-connected disability, or honorably discharged from active duty as defined in Government Code § 18991.

Mechanisms within the CEA system increase employee responsiveness and accountability to the appointing power. A CEA works on behalf of the appointing power, and with a 20-day notice, removal can occur without justification for termination (SPB,

2006). However, if the CEA held a permanent or probationary civil service position at the time of appointment, the CEA has return rights to that position (DPA, 2010b). With the threat of removal, the theory is that a CEA will respond and be accountable to the appointing power. This “at will” nature of the system can make CEAs increasingly vulnerable to political pressure (Little Hoover Commission, 1999). However, departments and the SPB have not found significant turnover during an administration change (ibid, 1999).

The Legislature and Governor establish salaries for CEA positions (Little Hoover Commission, 1999). The DPA (2009b) reports that as of March 26, 2008 CEA I-V yearly salaries range from \$74,076 to \$126,240 (\$160,572 for attorneys, engineers, and physicians). According to the Little Hoover Commission (2005), CEA’s earn approximately one-third less than federal peers in California. Further discussion of the effect of pay on CEAs occurs within the literature review section of this thesis.

Exempt

Unlike CEAs, exempt employees do not have a civil service classification. The Constitution and civil service laws allow the governor and his/her appointees to select officials who are “exempt” from the civil service (Little Hoover Commission, 1999). To reiterate, the classification exempt means that an employee is “exempt” from civil service laws and rules. In April 2011, there were 3,749 full time exempt employees as reported by DPA’s Personnel Information Exchange database. Benefits of being exempt include significant authority, opportunity for accomplishment, and high public profile (Little Hoover Commission, 2005).

To receive exempt classification an individual receives governor appointment, is an elected official, or is a member of a board or commission. Some clerical and administrative positions are also exempt. Similar to CEAs, exempt employees also have return rights. If an exempt employee held a permanent or probationary civil service position, the employee has return right to that position (DPA, 2010b).

There are several types of exempt employees, all of which can be found in the California Constitution, Article VII, Section 4. Examples of exempt employees include appointed legislative and judicial officers and employees, elected officials, members of boards and commissions, etc. The three major categories of exempt employees are California Professional Exemption, California Administrative Exemption, and California Executive Exemption (United Employees Law Group, 2010).

Exempt salaries are set either by the California Citizens Compensation Commission or by the appointing power and approved by the DPA (DPA, 2011). Due to the quantity of classifications with the exempt category, the exempt pay scale is not as straightforward as the CEA pay scale. As a result, exempt pay can range from an annual minimum salary of \$31,440 for a secretary to a maximum of \$175,000 for a cabinet position (DPA, 2011).

Performance Measurement

There are several reasons for measuring the performance of government, including the accountability and transparency to organizational stakeholders, as well as to encourage a specific outcome. Using performance measurements sends a message to leadership and staff that this is a priority area. As a frequently used phrase indicates:

what gets measured gets done. Performance measurement can include an assessment of organizational performance and/or individual performance. My thesis examines how often executives measure and monitor organization and employee performance as well as the importance that executives place on performance measures.

In August of 2003, the California Performance Review (CPR) released a report with information, collected by a volunteer committee organized by Governor Schwarzenegger, providing recommendations to improve state government to meet 21st century challenges. One such recommendation was to improve state performance measures. The CPR (2003) found that 90 percent of agencies use performance measures and regularly monitor results, but that inadequate funding and ability to develop performance measures often disrupts efforts to establish or improve performance measures. To discover executive use and monitoring of performance measures, I analyze specific questions in the survey that relate to both employee and organizational performance. Based on the increased pressure to improve state performance measures from the CPR report and the executive relationship to the appointing power, I expect that this research will show that CEAs and exempts measure and monitor both their employee performance and the broader organizational performance and effectiveness.

California specifically encourages performance standards and ratings per Government Code § 19992. The Government Code lays the path for department officials to establish standards and rate the performance of employees. Also in the Code are allowances for the department to establish rules in which reduction in pay or classification of an employee can occur because of unsatisfactory performance. Tying

employee performance to organizational goals has the potential to result in satisfactory outcomes.

As a model for state government, the CEA system represents a unique opportunity for excellence. The under-studied nature of CEAs leaves a gap in establishing current system deficiencies and successes, which if understood, could translate into a more effective government. Analysis of the Executive Competency Survey offers the potential for greater knowledge involving CEA and exempt positions. To develop support for the research method, build a foundation for findings, and summarize other research findings, I examine the available literature surrounding the thesis topic.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

I turn now to a review of the relevant literature, with an eye toward drawing implications for my own empirical study of the CEA system in California. This literature review examines CEA literature, focusing on CEA creation, termination, and outside competition. Because there is limited research, I supplement CEA literature with review of studies about the comparable federal Senior Executive Assignment (SES) program. SES information pertains to political responsiveness and public management experience, the need for monitoring, and support for incentives. As some SES research takes a comparison approach to political appointees, review also leads to a few implications for exempts. Finally, I examine performance measurement within government, focusing on the difference between performance management and performance measures, uses and reasons for government to measure performance, usage by government, and the importance of buy-in from all levels of government. See Appendix B for acronym descriptions. See Appendix C, D, and E for CEA, SES, and performance measure tables explaining research methods and findings, serving as a resource for comparing and augmenting information within this literature review.

Career Executive Assignment

This thesis aims, in part, to consolidate literature on the CEA system. It is not a complete collection of all information, as many articles reference CEAs in passing, but rather a review of the primary literature. The literature involving CEAs are heavily qualitative in nature and lack substantial findings. The significant themes throughout the

research involve the creation of the CEA system, termination of CEAs, and outside competition.

Research involving CEAs has come in waves by year and from three primary sources. After CEA establishment, Lloyd D. Musolf (1963, 1964, 1971) conducted the first wave of research by reviewing documents, interviews and discussions with California State Personnel Board (SPB) staff, CEAs, and members of the California State Employees Association. The second wave of research comes from John A. Rehufuss (1982a, 1982b, 1986), who conducted CEA analysis through structured interviews with CEAs and SPB staff combined with a review of literature. The final, and most recent wave of research, was conducted by the Little Hoover Commission (1979, 1999, 2005), an independent state oversight agency. The Little Hoover Commission (LHC) used an array of analysis techniques, including surveys, interviews, consultations, discussion and testimonies, public hearings, and literature review. Research methods used vary widely, relying primarily on interviews and discussions with interested and involved parties. Research interest in the topic is sporadic, and of late, only conducted by a state oversight agency. Overall, CEA findings are limited, as much of the literature does not focus on a specific hypothesis, but more on describing the system itself.

The need for responsiveness and the desire to slow the increase in exempt positions, led to the SPB advocating for the new CEA system in the late 1950's and early 1960's. State government was becoming more specialized, and governors and legislators desired more exempt positions to replace top policy-making civil servants (Rehufuss & Furtado, 1982b). The SPB, chief architect of the CEA system, desired more

responsiveness from top bureaucrats (Musolf, 1963). Fisher and Erickson (1964, p.83) explain that it is in the higher executive that “loyalty and responsiveness to program changes are essential to democratic government.” Without an increase in responsiveness, there was a threat that the legislature would continue to swell the number of exempt positions (Musolf, 1963, 1964; Birkenstock, Kurtz, & Phillips, 1975).

In 1963, the California State Legislature established the CEA system. The system, the oldest system of its type in the nation, aimed to provide flexibility for the administration (and more recently, departments) with selection, compensation, and termination of top-level civil service employees (LHC, 1995). Creation of the CEA system also attempted to ensure institutional knowledge retention, stability, and leadership continuity necessary for an effective organization (SPB, 2006).

Though California was the first state to implement a top executive level merit system, the Second Hoover Commission proposed the federal “Senior Civil Service” in 1955, with a revised variation denied funds by Congress in 1958 (Musolf, 1963). CEA was not without opposition, as Musolf (1963, 1964) and Rehfuss and Furtado (1982b) note, originating from the California State Employees’ Association (CSEA), involving constitutional, political, and administrative objections. The CSEA took the issue to court, and the Superior Court of California upheld the statute’s constitutionality (Birkenstock, Kurtz, & Phillips, 1975).

There have been incremental changes to the CEA system since inception. In 1973, SPB amendments to classification, pay, and selection of CEAs appear to have eliminated much of the dissatisfaction of the CSEA (Birkenstock et al., 1975).

Specifically, classification of CEAs were placed into one broad category, salary ranges were broadened, increases in promotion pay were elevated, and selection procedures were simplified through the use of a management data bank of CEA candidates (ibid, 1975). Other changes include decentralization to departments for recruitment and selection of CEAs and making terminated CEAs eligible for positions that involved promotions they would have received had they not become a CEA (Rehfuss & Furtado, 1982a). Beginning in 2009, SPB opened CEA eligibility to individuals who previously had permanent status in the State civil service or meet specific military service requirements (SPB, 2008).

The existing research raised a question about whether the threat of termination for CEAs is relevant or existent. Rehfuss and Furtado (1982a) found that CEAs had “blind support” for the system by having little knowledge or not seriously considering the likelihood of termination. In 1963, Musolf recognized the concern that the CEA system of removals is vulnerable to partisan political purposes. However, in 1971, Musolf proceeded to explain that the fear of partisan abuse through removals had not materialized, and that between 1963 and 1970 there were only nine removals of CEAs. Even until 1973, only 25% of CEAs have been removed (Birkenstock et al., 1975). By 1986, despite the legal ease in replacing CEAs, the turnover rate was approximately 5% per year (Rehfuss, 1986). Rehfuss and Furtado (1982a) offer an explanation for the low termination rates as either limited flexibility of the plan, or extraordinarily effective selection of CEAs.

Studies also suggest that California, through outside competition and increased pay, can achieve flexibility and competitiveness for the CEA system. Rehufss and Furtado (1982b) explain that part of CEA establishment is to increase managerial flexibility by not requiring changes in job specifications, allowing appointees to have a wider range of skills and experience. Allowing out of state service employees to apply, the depth of skills and experience increases, and CEA system effectiveness can be improved (Musolf, 1971; LHC, 1999). Musolf (1964) went so far as to say that denying outside entry into the system risks California's ability to meet demands, and may be at odds with the intent of statute. Further hindering efforts to hire the best and brightest, when compared to their federal peers in California, CEAs earn approximately one-third less (LHC, 2005).

Senior Executive Service

To complement CEA research, I examine the United States Senior Executive Service (SES). My research is not the first to compare CEA and SES, and is a common approach in CEA literature (LHC, 1999, 2005, Rehufss & Furtado, 1982a, 1982b, Rehufss, 1986). The SES and CEA systems are comparable, and research on SES has used methodology that is more sophisticated. Information gleaned from SES literature and transferred to my CEA research involves political responsiveness and public management experience, the need for monitoring, and support for incentives. To frame the discussion, I first explain the SES system and some differences between CEA and SES. See Appendix F for a CEA and SES comparison table.

The SES was a key component of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Perry & Miller, 1991). The SES “is a personnel system covering top level policy, supervisory, and managerial positions in most federal agencies” (Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, 2008). It is the highest obtainable position for a federal employee, other than a presidential appointment. Buchanan (1981) identified three programmatic components of the SES: personnel allocation, performance effectiveness, and personnel development and certification. Buchanan (1981) further explains that performance effectiveness is the “heart and soul” of the SES program. Federal agencies assess SES applicants by their ability to meet attributes that are common with successful private and public executives, known as the Executive Core Requirements: leading change, leading people, results driven, business acumen, and building coalitions (United States Office of Personnel Management, 2010). The SES intends to provide a link between political appointees and the rest of the federal workforce to oversee and operate government programs and activities.

Differences between the CEA and SES systems are that CEA has more concern for responsiveness to policy and removal occurs without any formal reason. SES has more concern for high quality appointments, removals occur after low annual appraisal ratings, and involves a pay-for-performance incentive system (Rehfuss & Furtado, 1982a).

SES research originates from multiple authors, focusing primarily on the SES system, or a broader discussion involving pay-for-performance, executive leadership, and state and global comparisons. Similar to CEA research, SES review occurs in stages.

The first stage is in the early 1980's, shortly after SES system establishment. The second stage is the 2000's, where there is an increased focus on motivating bureaucrats. The research methods are almost exclusively survey analysis, in which the authors present clear documentation of the process of evaluation.

Relationships vary among SES members and politicians. SES members can be political appointees, but cannot exceed 10% of the overall federal SES population (Dolan, 2000). The non-career members of the SES are more likely to interact with Washington, D.C. politicians than career SES (Dolan, 2000). An interesting political relationship exists between the SES, President, and Congress. Presidents tend to prefer political appointees, as they are more responsive to presidential direction, while Congress wants program managers to implement the program purpose and not be sensitive to presidential direction (Gilmour & Lewis, 2006). Gilmour and Lewis (2006) explain that senior executives have more public management experience than political appointees. Gilmour and Lewis (2006) also explain that programs administered by political appointees score lower than SES administered programs. However, decreasing political appointee presence can make administrative government harder to manage or control by the President and lessen new ideas and energy in government (Gilmour & Lewis, 2006). Therefore, a balance is necessary between SES members that are politically responsive to implementing the President's goals while also maintaining institutional knowledge and experience that comes with career executives.

Monitoring selection, demotion, and incentives for the SES system needs to occur. Rosen (1981) explains that individuals selected for the SES system are not the

best candidates. Poor selection is possibly due to political or personal favoritism, as well as pressure to meet affirmative action goals (Rosen, 1981). However, for SES to contribute fully, it obviously must have the best performers. Therefore, Rosen (1981) supports a selection process that requires the United States Office of Personnel Management to play a large role in guidance and monitoring. Buchanan (1981) points out that political leadership control over demotions and bonuses increases SES responsiveness and therefore needs monitoring to safeguard political abuse. Research conducted by Perry & Miller (1991, p.561) “suggest that avoidance of political abuses of the civil service promotes public confidence and an effective working climate within an agency.”

There is evidence that incentives and rewards are important for motivating public employees (Ingraham & Barrilleaux, 1983; Perry & Miller, 1991; Selden & Brewer, 2000). Intrinsic rewards, such as agency performance, public perception, feedback on goals, and support from the organization, are also significant for motivation (Buchanan, 1981; Perry & Miller, 1991; Selden & Brewer, 2000). When personal performance produces rewards, an individual is increasingly satisfied and thus more motivated and committed to the organization (Selden & Brewer, 2000).

Performance Measurement

As discussed in the background section of this thesis, the California Performance Review (2003) and state law encourage the use of performance measures. A growing body of literature supports this interest in performance measures (de Lancer Julnes & Holzer, 2001; Kravchuk & Schack, 1996; Poister & Steib, 1999). Much of the research

considers performance measurement, but this review only covers a small piece. This review is a collection of information on findings regarding public sector use of performance measures. It does not center on whether or not the measure of performance should occur, the type of design, implementation, or overall effectiveness. Note that there are concerns with measuring performance in government, including different audiences needing different information, unclear mission and objectives, multiple and contradictory goals, need for more information, difficulty in evaluating all the outputs and outcomes, and the challenge with measuring customer satisfaction in a regulatory environment (Kravchuk & Schack, 1996). Heinrich (2002, p. 721) goes on to explain that, “performance measures will be indicators, at best, and not highly accurate gauges of actual performance.” Moving beyond the critiques of measuring performance, the conclusions discussed within this portion of this literature review are identification of the difference between performance management and performance measures, uses and reasons for government to measure performance, usage by government, and the importance of buy-in from all levels of government. Much of the research uses survey data to support conclusions.

The research I examined contained considerable discussion regarding performance management and performance measures. Linkages exist between the two, as performance measures are part of the overall framework of performance management. Performance management involves establishing a strategic direction, identifying measurable goals, and tracking and revising to better achieve the goals (Performance Management Council, 2010). Performance measures relate to the strategic planning and

enables an organization to gauge progress in meeting goals, identify areas that need attention, or leverage opportunities (ibid, 2010). You cannot simply have performance measures and expect results. An agency must manage and put performance measures into action to gain results (ibid, 2010). Melkers and Willoughby (2004) suggest concentrating on outcomes rather than outputs to advance state management. To expand performance measure effectiveness, a comparison standard is also needed (Behn, 2003).

Literature discusses multiple uses and reasons for government to measure performance. Steinberg (2009) explains three major uses for performance measures in government: accountability to citizens, elected officials, and other interested parties, improved allocation of resources, and assure achievement of desired results. Poister and Steib (1999) state that performance measures are for budgeting, strategic planning and management, program evaluation, performance management, quality management, and benchmarking. Behn (2003) offers eight reasons to measure performance: evaluate, control, budget, motivate, promote, celebrate, learn, and improve.

Government of all sizes and types are using performance measures as a tool for improving service delivery (Steinberg, 2009). However, less than 40% of municipal jurisdictions surveyed by Poister and Steib (1999) make any kind of meaningful use of performance measures. The Performance Management Council (2010) found that California is using performance measures, but are not optimizing them. Heavily influencing the adoption of performance measures is the existence of an internal organizational requirement, while political and cultural factors more heavily influence implementation (de Lancer Julnes & Holzer, 2001).

To increase performance measurement effectiveness, research recommends early buy-in from multiple personnel levels of government. The Performance Management Council (2010) found that leadership and executive buy-in are essential when starting performance management. There is a significant positive effect on performance measurement development and use when top management commits to use the performance information, decision-making authority, and training in performance measurement techniques (Cavalluzzo & Ittner, 2004). Line managers and employees are more likely to buy into the measures when they are in the process of developing them (Poister & Steib, 1999). By engaging all employees in decisions surrounding performance measures, they will overcome the fear that they will be open to personal scrutiny (Performance Management Council, 2010).

Conclusion

In this literature review, I summarized a significant quantity of research surrounding the CEA and SES systems, as well as government use of performance measures. Next, I explain what the literature lends to the overall thesis, including support of methodology, implications for my research, and potential next steps.

A majority of the literature reviewed supports my research approach and methodology. Nearly all of the information that I examined began with a review of applicable literature. Furthermore, a majority of research analyzed surveys to draw conclusions. This thesis uses both literature review and survey analysis to draw conclusions. Other methods used in reviewed research include regression analysis to

explore the relationship between independent and dependent variables, case study comparisons, and interviews with source parties.

CEA literature offers little in terms of sophisticated research methodology and no recent peer review journal articles; however, there is information from the literature review that is applicable for this thesis. When the SPB proposed the CEA system, increased responsiveness was a primary goal. I expect survey results to exhibit this responsiveness. Creation of the CEA system attempts to ensure institutional knowledge retention, stability, and leadership. In this thesis, I examine survey questions that relate specifically to institutional knowledge and leadership through examination of years of service as a CEA/exempt and number of employees directly supervised. Reviewed literature provides a tantalizing further research opportunity by asking what the effect that outside competition and increase in pay would have on CEA system flexibility and competitiveness.

The SES system provides a strong foundation in sophisticated research and more recently published journal articles than the CEA system. SES research shows that senior executives have added public management experience than political appointees, and program performance is lower when administered by political appointees than SES. This information leads me to believe that; overall, CEAs will possess greater experience and proficiency than exempt employees. Additionally, this experience and effectiveness difference is an opportunity for further research. SES research found that control over demotion increases responsiveness. A CEA's appointing superior has similar control over demotion; therefore, I expect CEA survey responses to have a positive relationship

when asked about implementation of organizational goals. SES research also shows political appointees are more responsive to Presidents, and I expect exempts to have a similar response to politicians. A final note for further research opportunities for CEAs is the impact of rewards on motivation. SES research found that incentives and rewards are important for motivation, and may be for CEAs.

Reviewing performance measure literature offers multiple uses and reasons for government to measure performance. I expect to find a positive response from CEAs and exempts in their use of performance measures that advance these uses and reasons. Research found that even if government is using performance measures, they might not be putting the results to use. I will examine whether or not survey respondents are implementing and using performance measures. Performance measure research recommends early buy-in from multiple personnel levels of government. Further research should inquire into determining who creates performance measures, and what level of employee buy-in exists.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

As the CEA system is a relatively unstudied topic and survey data is available, I use an exploratory research approach to examine information. With no firm hypothesis, limited direction from literature, and the availability of DPA data, it is appropriate to take an exploratory approach to determine what, if any, findings exist within the data. I originally considered conducting a survey of CEAs, but ultimately it proved to be cost and time prohibitive. I also considered conducting face-to-face interviews with CEAs, but dropped the idea because of concerns that access would lead to systematic bias due to an unavailable random sample. Therefore, I chose to analyze an existing survey for the basis of this research.

Quantitative data within this thesis comes from the California DPA Executive Competency Analysis Survey. I had no participation with the planning or field administration of the survey. As the DPA is the primary investigator, my thesis is a secondary analysis of survey responses. Individual California CEA and exempt employees are the target population among respondents and are therefore the units of analysis. This methodology section provides information regarding survey use, collection of data, identifying which questions to analyze, description of the statistical software used, and practical problems and potential sources of measurement error.

Use of Survey

The DPA conducted the Executive Competency Analysis Survey in 2009 as a human capital analysis of state executive employees to analyze development deficiencies

and opportunities. I examine results from the survey as provided by the DPA. Survey responses assist my thesis by providing base data for assessing answers put forth by California executives. Compared to other methods of data collection, a survey is a less invasive method of asking sensitive questions regarding age, ethnicity, gender, self-proficiency, and frequency of work production. It is also a simple, inexpensive method to gather large quantities of data. A survey increases reliability as respondents are subject to a standard approach, reducing unpredictability. The use of a survey and a transparent method provides subsequent researchers who use the same questions, but asked at a different point in time, the ability to develop a longitudinal design trend study.

Collection of Data

In October of 2009, the DPA sent the survey to all CEA and exempt classified employees via email; responses were returned to the DPA in the same manner, concluding in November of 2009. Response to the survey was voluntary, as there is no internal requirement to complete the survey. The DPA took all responses and inputted them into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The Excel spreadsheet is how the DPA presented me with the information. The DPA asked 222 questions in the Executive Competency Survey. See Appendix G for the complete list of questions.

The quantity of survey questions is very large, which makes it impractical to discuss all of them in this thesis. Therefore, I selected 76 questions for examination. Of these 76 examined questions, I do not present detailed data from all of them, as a narrative discussion is sufficient. The method of selecting the questions that I examine was by initially reviewing the survey and determining reoccurring themes. Once I

discovered themes, I identified questions that relate to organizational and employee performance measures, needed executive proficiencies, and general demographic information. Topics that the survey discusses which I do not cover involve the reporting and collection of information, methods for keeping current as an effective leader, human resource challenges, and handful of other topics.

Of the universe of respondents, 417 classified themselves as CEA (312) or exempt (105). I removed nine CEA and 10 exempt responses from the overall analysis due to a lack of information beyond the current appointment type. Therefore, the total analyzed respondents are 398: 303 CEA's and 95 exempt's coming from 58 identifiable departments/agencies. A response rate is unavailable as the number of emails sent is unknown. However, reiterating information from the introduction, as of April 2010 there were 1,339 CEA and 3,749 exempt full time employees.

Analyzed Questions

The Executive Competency Survey contains closed- and open-ended questions with many closed-ended questions using an ordinal response scale to measure the strength of respondent feelings towards a specific topic. To reduce the unpredictability of responses and develop concise findings, I only examined closed-ended ("fixed-choice") questions. To determine broad characteristics of CEAs and exempts, I analyze eight direct general demographic questions using nominal measurement. Next, I focus on questions that are ordinal measures, which relate to performance measurement and self-perceived soft skill proficiency. To determine importance and frequency of use of performance measures by executives, I selected the two questions that specifically

address this. As meeting organizational goals can apply to performance measurement, I selected four questions that relate directly and indirectly to organizational goals. To determine needed executive proficiency in soft skills, I selected 23 questions that ask the respondent to rate soft skills related to needed proficiency and relationship to job.

Use of PASW for Data Analysis

To analyze the Executive Competency Survey I used the Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW) program, formerly called the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. I recoded the received Excel survey data within Excel using a series of codes to represent responses. With the Excel document created, I transferred the information into the PASW program. With the ability to manipulate the information with PASW, I was able to sort data based on whether the respondent categorized himself or herself as a CEA or exempt employee. The respondent category is the independent variable and the compared category is the dependent variable. The categorical variables are analyzed using cross-tabulation. A simple cross-tabulation analysis shows the percentage of the independent variable respondents that fall into each dependent variable category. I also use PASW cross-tabulation to establish statistical significance and conduct a chi-square test regarding the differences between specific CEA and exempt responses.

Practical Problems & Potential Sources of Measurement Error

Practical Problems (Researcher)

From a researcher's standpoint, the review of survey data has some practical problems. One problem is that respondents to the survey come from a limited sample of

departments/agencies; therefore, generalizations regarding findings are not applicable to every state department/agency. Another practical problem is surveys are traditionally weak on validity. Respondents have different understandings of terms and answer questions based on those understandings. It is impossible to make any changes to these questions after the survey data is collected; therefore, this problem is merely recognized.

Practical Problems (Subjects)

From the standpoint of the researched subjects, practical problems also exist. The most significant concern is response bias tendency. As the DPA administered the survey, respondents may answer in a way that they consider desirable to the DPA. Another concern is the electronic administration of the survey, as this may influence respondents concern for confidentiality and may not answer truthfully. I cannot specifically address the existence of these problems, as I had no control over the administration of this survey.

Potential Sources of Measurement Error

There are potential sources of measurement error that may occur during the administration and evaluation of the survey information. A procedural error that may occur is the incorrect coding of the survey responses. Thorough review of responses took place to minimize this possibility. Another source of measurement error is determining with accuracy who actually responded to the survey. Some recipients of emails may have messages screened by others, who in turn, may respond to the survey. There is also the possibility that respondents might either intentionally indicate incorrect answers or be affected by poor memory, which may result in inaccuracies of the data. As respondents to the survey were self-selected, there is the potential for nonresponse error. That is,

potential respondents choose as to whether to take the survey, and making that choice may filter these respondents as having different characteristics than those who chose not to return the survey. In addition, with the incredibly large quantity of questions asked, respondents may begin not answering questions the further they got into the survey. This leaves a gap in observable data, and brings up the concern that respondents begin selecting an easy or inaccurate response to proceed through the survey more quickly.

Using the available DPA survey is the most cost and time effective approach for this exploratory research. As the length of the survey was considerable, I have selected a sample of questions to analyze. Cross-tabulations using PASW is how I assessed the responses in the subsequent results chapter.

Chapter 4

SURVEY RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Based on the earlier background discussion, CEA and exempt respondents perform similar roles, but are different in the scheme of civil service classifications. With two classifications, located in the top echelons of state government, similarities in responses were bound to occur. I also expected to find some major differences between CEAs and exempts with respect to activities and priorities. As Dolan (2000) explains, career and political executives bring different talents and perspectives to their jobs. Unexpectedly, a large quantity of CEA and exempt responses were similar. However, there are a few notable differences between executives.

Building on the literature review, this chapter begins by presenting some interesting demographic results. These findings do not simply assess gender equality (which has been a major subject of prior work), but provide information on whether or not CEAs are establishing institutional knowledge retention and stability. Following is a discussion regarding executive attitudes on measuring performance, organizational goal achievement, and proficiencies in soft skills. This discussion presents the “meat” of the analysis for this thesis, which focuses on similarities and differences within executive responses.

Demographic Characteristics of Executives in State Government

Analysis of general demographics assists in creating a profile of the makeup of executive respondents. General demographics also assist with institutional transition planning, data on equal employment, etc. The survey asked for information regarding a

respondent's age, gender, ethnicity, level of education, length of time as CEA or Exempt, number of employees directly supervised, department, office, and location.

Table 4.1 – Age

Age	Appointment Type		
	CEA	Exempt	Total
21-29	0 0.0%	2 2.1%	2 0.5%
30-39	15 5.1%	8 8.5%	23 5.9%
40-49	87 29.3%	30 31.9%	117 29.9%
50-59	153 51.5%	37 39.4%	190 48.6%
60 or over	28 9.4%	14 14.9%	42 10.7%
Decline to State	14 4.7%	3 3.2%	17 4.3%
Total	297 100%	94 100.0%	391* 100.0%
*7 missing responses or 1.8%			

Table 4.2 – Gender

Gender	Appointment Type		
	CEA	Exempt	Total
Male	160 53.7%	53 56.4%	213 54.3%
Female	124 41.6%	37 39.4%	161 41.1%
Decline to State	14 4.7%	4 4.3%	18 4.6%
Total	298 100%	94 100.0%	392* 100.0%
*6 missing responses or 1.5%			

After removing respondents who selected “decline to state”, 64% of CEA and 56% of exempt respondents are age 50 or over (see Table 4.1). Examining the total percentage of respondents 40 or over, 94.7% are CEAs and 89% are exempts. For comparison, the SPB (2010) reported that the total number of state employees over 50

was 37.2%, with the total number over 40 at 67.4%. These findings indicate that California executives are primarily above 40 years of age. The number of near retirement age executives has a positive implication for California government. Information on the age of executives provides state personnel the foresight to begin training the next generation of executives in preparation for retirements.

Regarding gender in Table 4.2, when you remove “decline to state” respondents from the totals, CEAs are 56.3% male and 43.7% female. For exempt, 58.2% are male and 40.7% are female. Compared to overall state government, the SPB (2010) found gender composition to be 53.5% male and 46.5% female. The executive gender results are not skewed one way or the other and are comparable to the overall gender makeup of state government. At the same time, the results for CEAs are not in line with past findings and represent an encouraging trend. By contrast, Reh fuss (1986) found in 1985 that CEA gender composition was only 11.7% female.

Table 4.3 – Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Appointment Type		
	CEA	Exempt	Total
Asian	22 7.4%	3 3.2%	25 6.4%
Black / African American	18 6.0%	6 6.4%	24 6.1%
Hispanic	32 10.7%	7 7.4%	39 9.9%
Other – East Indian, Filipino, Native American, Pacific Islander	7 2.3%	3 3.2%	10 2.6%
White / Caucasian	193 64.8%	69 73.4%	262 66.8%
Decline to State	26 8.7%	6 6.4%	32 8.2%
Total	298 100%	94 100.0%	392* 100.0%
*6 missing responses or 1.5%			

Table 4.4 – Education Level

Level of Education	Appointment Type		
	CEA	Exempt	Total
High school diploma or GED	1 0.3%	1 1.1%	2 0.5%
Some college, no degree	32 10.6%	17 18.1%	49 12.4%
Associate's degree	17 5.6%	9 9.6%	26 6.6%
Bachelor's degree	149 49.3%	32 34.0%	181 45.7%
Master's degree	75 24.8%	24 25.5%	99 25.0%
Doctorate	28 9.3%	11 11.7%	39 9.8%
Total	302 100%	94 100.0%	396* 100.0%
*2 missing responses or 0.5%			

Looking at ethnicity Table 4.3, with “decline to state” respondents removed, CEA totals are 8.1% Asian, 6.6% Black, 11.8% Hispanic, 2.6% other, and 71% White. Exempt totals are 3.4% Asian, 6.8% Black, 8% Hispanic, 3.4% other, and 78.4% White. The SPB (2010) reports the ethnic makeup of California state government at 9.2% Asian, 10.6% Black, 22.1% Hispanic, 9.5% other, and 48.6% White. These results indicate diversity within respondents is unrepresentative of the state government population.

Rehfuss (1986) found in 1985 that CEAs were composed of 20.5% minorities.

Comparing survey results with the Rehfuss findings, CEA minority population has increased 10%. However, it is still significantly low, since state government shows that 48.6% of the workforce is White. Compared to SES research, Dolan (2000) found that 85% of SES survey respondents were white, which is comparable to the overall universe of SES members.

In order to see if age has any effect on the percent of executives that are an ethnic minority, I looked only at respondents who are age 49 years or younger. Reducing the examined age reveals that CEAs who are 49 years or younger are 68% White and 32% minority. For exempt, 74% are White and 26% are minority. These totals are only slightly different when compared to all executive respondents.

Due to the nature of classification responsibility, it is not surprising to see that 80.6% CEA and exempt respondents hold a bachelor's degree or higher (see Table 4.4). In the total universe of respondents, CEAs are more likely to have a higher education level than exempts are. These education findings can support that the selection of individuals to CEA or exempt positions requires a bachelor's degree or higher, education is deemed favorable by the appointing party, or candidates for executive positions have obtained marketable skills through education. Either way, it is evident that CEA and exempt employees are highly educated.

The literature indicated that the creation of the CEA system aimed at ensuring institutional knowledge retention and stability. To determine if this is in fact occurring, I examined a question that asks respondent to state the length of service as a CEA or

exempt classification. It is possible that respondents could have served as both CEA and exempt when self-determining years of service. It is also consistent with the nature of the job for executives to move to different positions and classifications often. Of CEA respondents, 41.9% have been a CEA or exempt for less than three years. This year of service percentage seems low if the idea of the classification is to ensure knowledge retention and stability. Based on the respondents, when using years of service as CEA or exempt to support knowledge retention and stability, the CEA system is not succeeding. However, the CEA results could be due to the increase in accountability through removal of employees by the appointing power, thereby increasing classification turnover.

Additional literature review findings support the idea that CEAs should have more public management experience than exempts. However, 44.2% of exempts versus 35.6% of CEAs have five years or more serving as a CEA or exempt classification. If years of service correlates with more public management experience, than in this case exempt classified employees have more public management experience than CEAs.

The literature review indicated that another goal of the CEA system was to ensure leadership continuity. If the number of employees directly supervised explains the level of leadership, it is encouraging to see that 83.2% of CEAs directly supervise four or more employees and 32.7% directly supervise 10 or more. Ultimately, both CEA and exempt respondents perform a managerial role.

Respondents come from 58 state departments/agencies. Note that 20 of the 58 departments/agencies had only one CEA/exempt classified employee respond. Four departments comprise of nearly half of all the responses, Corrections and Rehabilitation,

Transportation, Health Care Services, and Developmental Services. Of those four, Corrections and Rehabilitation and Transportation include 37% of CEA and 43.2% of exempt respondents. This is not surprising, as these departments represent the largest number of employees by department in the state (SPB, 2010).

As CEA and exempt employees perform high-level policy functions and managerial roles, it is not surprising the headquarters/central office is the primary location of 69.1% of executives. Approximately 32% of executives stated that they work in Sacramento, which is consistent with the SPB (2010) report showing that 31% of all state employees are located within Sacramento.

In summary, the age of the executive workforce puts California in a good position to transition and train new executives. The male/female ratio is similar to the overall state workforce. However, CEA ethnicity only reflects an increase of 10% in diversity since 1985. Executives are highly educated, with CEAs more so than exempts. Survey findings show that both CEAs and exempt employees perform a managerial role and therefore exhibit a leadership role. Nearly 42% of CEAs have been a CEA or exempt employee for less than three years, which does not support positional knowledge retention or stability. Exempt employees have more years serving as a CEA or exempt, weakening the literature argument that CEAs should have more public management experience.

Executive Attitudes on Measuring Performance, Organizational Goal Achievement, and Proficiencies in Soft Skills

I turn now to responses that reflect the actual work and positional requirements of CEAs and exempts. Many similarities and some differences surface with executive responses regarding performance measures, organizational goal achievement, and required soft skill proficiencies. This section sheds light on the day-to-day proficiency needs of executives and feelings on specific tasks. For example, CEAs are more likely to believe they need to be more proficient in written communication than exempts do, while both executives agree that implementing programs and policies that reflect higher-management policies is very important. Setting the stage for response details, I first provide findings on general similarities and key distinctions between CEAs and exempts.

General Similarities between CEAs and Exempts

Examining executive responses, it is apparent that these two classifications are very similar in their opinions regarding measuring performance, organizational goal achievement, and necessary proficiency in soft skills. Both CEA and exempt respondents feel that it is important to monitor and measure organizational achievement. They both feel it is very important to critical to focus personal efforts to achieve organizational objectives, while defining task, milestones, and ensuring optimal use of resources to meet said objectives. Executives also find it very important to critical to implement programs and policies that reflect higher-management policies.

When it comes to necessary proficiency for executive positions, both classifications agree that advanced or mastery proficiency is required in decision-making

and analytical thinking skills. Advanced or mastery proficiency is also required for executives with communication, ethics and integrity, and personal credibility skills.

Key distinctions between CEAs and Exempts

Though CEA and exempt responses are similar in many regards, there also are some key differences between the two. CEAs more than exempts feel it is very important to develop, implement, and monitor employee and program performance measures. When it comes to organizational goals and objectives, CEAs are more likely than exempts to feel it is very important to critical to formulate and establish objectives and priorities and implement plans and assign resources to accomplish those goals and objectives.

Necessary executive proficiency requirements also differ. Exempt positions, more than CEAs, require greater levels of proficiency in change leadership, forward thinking, and vision and strategic thinking. When it comes to skills in written communication, CEAs more than exempt respondents require greater levels of proficiency.

Performance Measure and Organizational Goal Achievement Tasks that Executives Think are Important

To determine what tasks executives think are important and to assist the DPA in assessing use, expectations, and alignment of the workforce to the organizational mission, I examine questions that relate either directly or indirectly to performance measurement and organizational goal achievement. Questions deal with appraisal of employees, encouragement of communication, formulation of strategies that reflect higher management policies, formulation of objectives and plans consistent with organization

objectives, measurement of performance and effectiveness, prioritization of resources to accomplish organizational goals, and monitoring employee and program effectiveness.

CEAs and exempts both agree that monitoring and measuring organizational performance and effectiveness is at least important. Because of the emphasis that California places on measuring performance, it is surprising that more than a quarter of respondents drop off when asked if it is very important or critical. Depending on the output that is measured, it is difficult to assess responses regarding the frequency of monitoring and measuring organizational performance and effectiveness. For example, data may only be available on a monthly basis. However, more than 30% of executive respondents monitor and measure performance and effectiveness less than once a month, which, depending on the output, may be too infrequent.

Over 70% of CEA and exempt respondents believe it is very important to critical to define tasks and milestones to achieve objectives, while ensuring the optimal use of resources to meet those objectives. Executives also overwhelmingly agree that there is an observable relationship to their job performance. It seems, though, that CEA and exempt respondents believe that it is necessary, but not essential to have this skill when entering the job. At least 40% of CEAs and exempts state the needed proficiency for the position does not require an advanced or mastery proficiency level.

CEA and exempt respondents believe it is very important to critical to focus personal efforts to achieve results consistent with the organization's objectives, of which respondent's state there is an observable relationship to their performance. Again, CEA

and exempt respondents do not believe this skill is essential when entering the job. Half of respondents say their position requires novice to skilled proficiency levels in this area.

Executives feel that it is very important to critical to mentor, coach, and regularly appraise employees to perform successfully, contribute to the organization, and to ensure career development. A minimum of 72% of executives perform this activity weekly to daily, reinforcing the importance rating.

Overwhelmingly, executives feel that it is very important to critical to encourage regular communication with customers and stakeholders to gain their input and address their needs. Over 74% of executives encourage communication with customers and stakeholders weekly to daily.

Nearly 70% of executives feel that it is very important to critical to formulate strategies, objectives, priorities, and contingency plans to implement new or revised programs and policies that reflect higher-management policies. Literature supports increased responsiveness from CEAs and exempts to the appointing power, therefore within this question I expected answers to reflect this responsiveness. I expected a greater amount of executives to feel it is very important to critical to reflect higher-management policies, but 70% is significant.

CEA and Exempt Differences Regarding the Importance of Performance Measures and Organizational Goal Achievement

Following with the theme of performance measurement and organizational achievement, here I discuss questions where executive classifications differed in their ratings.

Executives believe that developing, implementing, and monitoring performance measures to evaluate employee and program effectiveness, accountability is important, and 90% of respondents perform this activity at least quarterly. However, CEAs are 14% more likely to rate this questions as very important or critical than exempt respondents. Compared to an earlier question, executives more frequently monitor organizational performance and effectiveness than employees and programs.

Of CEA respondents, 73.5% feel that formulating objectives and priorities and implementing short- and long-term tactical and strategic plans consistent with the long-term objectives of the organization is very important to critical. The response rate for CEAs is approximately 12% higher than for exempts. Interestingly, despite the higher importance rating given by CEAs, exempts formulate objectives and priorities more frequently.

Over 75% of CEA respondents believe it is very important to critical to establish organizational objectives and program/project priorities for assignment of resources to accomplish the goals of the organization. This importance ranking is 17% higher than exempts are. A majority of CEAs and exempts perform this activity monthly to weekly.

Proficiencies that Executives Rate the Highest

There are 23 survey questions asking executives to rate the required proficiency for their position in a selection of soft skills. These soft skills are what I consider character traits. Analysis of soft skills assists the DPA in establishing classification needs, determining desirable traits, and assessing training opportunities. I do not spend a lot of time discussing each question, but group responses based on the percentage of

respondents that consider their position requiring an advanced or mastery proficiency or novice or skilled proficiency. Based on a scale of answers, I assume that respondents who selected novice or skilled, feel that those proficiencies are not as necessary as others are.

Here I examine the most highly rated questions by executives. I consider an executive position to require proficiency in a soft skill if 70% of both CEA and exempt respondents selected advanced or mastery (see Table 4.5). If the selected soft skill does not meet the 70% threshold then, generally, the executive's position does not require a high level of proficiency, and may not need specific hiring or training attention. There are a few situations where one type of executive meets the threshold and the other does not. These, and others, fall into the moderately required executive proficiencies (see Table 4.6). Totals do not include respondents who checked not required, which never exceeded 3.5% of total responses. Only once did the percentage of respondents who checked novice reach 10%.

Before I move on to discussing proficiency, the survey also asked respondents to rate whether or not there is an observable relationship to their position for all 23 soft skills. Respondents overwhelmingly stated that in all soft skills there is an observable relationship. The lowest percentage for either CEAs or exempts selecting an observable relationship to their position was 83.8%. In 17 of 23 of the questions, at least 90% of executives stated there is an observable relationship in the corresponding soft skill.

Table 4.5 – Required Executive Proficiencies

Soft Skill	Question	CEA % Advanced or Mastery (total responses)	Exempt % Advanced or Mastery (total responses)	CEA % Skilled or Novice (total responses)	Exempt % Skilled or Novice (total responses)
Analytical Thinking	The ability to approach a problem by using a logical, systematic, sequential approach.	75.5% (197)	80.8% (59)	23.8% (62)	19.2% (14)
Communication	The ability to listen to others and communicate in an effective manner.	77.6% (201)	74.6% (53)	22.0% (57)	25.4% (8)
Decision Making	The ability to make decisions and solve problems involving varied levels of complexity, ambiguity and risk.	79.5% (205)	88.7% (63)	19.8% (51)	11.3% (8)
Ethics and Integrity	The degree of trustworthiness and ethical behavior of an individual with consideration for the knowledge one has of the impact and consequences when making a decision or taking action.	84.9% (220)	88.7% (63)	14.6% (38)	11.3% (8)
Personal Credibility	Demonstrating concern that one be perceived as responsible, reliable, and trustworthy.	74.5% (187)	83.1% (59)	24.7% (62)	16.9% (12)

Based on responses, there are five required proficiencies for executive positions.

It is not a surprise, based on the leadership and policy influence behaviors of the positions, that decision-making and analytical thinking are on this list. However, something that does stand out is with communication, ethics and integrity, and personal credibility. These show that a positive perception of the executive and the ability to deliver information is important, indicating that working with government individuals and the public at large is likely.

Table 4.6 – Moderately Required Executive Proficiencies

Soft Skill	Question	CEA % Advanced or Mastery (total responses)	Exempt % Advanced or Mastery (total responses)	CEA % Skilled or Novice (total responses)	Exempt % Skilled or Novice (total responses)
Flexibility	The ability to adapt and work with a variety of situations, individuals, and groups. The ability to be open to different and new ways of doing things; willingness to modify one's preferred way of doing things.	63.0% (163)	63.4% (45)	36.7% (95)	36.6% (26)
Forward Thinking	The ability to anticipate the implications and consequences of situations and take appropriate action to be prepared for possible contingencies.	58.3% (151)	69.0% (49)	41.3% (107)	31.0% (22)
Interpersonal Skills	The ability to get along and interact positively with coworkers. The degree and style of understanding and relating to others.	66.9% (168)	71.8% (51)	33.1% (83)	28.2% (20)
Relationship Building	The ability to develop, maintain, and strengthen relationships with others inside or outside of the organization who can provide information, assistance, and support.	59.3% (149)	64.8% (46)	39.9% (100)	35.2% (25)
Team Leadership	The ability to effectively manage and guide group efforts. Includes providing the appropriate level of feedback concerning group progress.	60.1% (151)	64.8% (46)	39.5% (99)	33.8% (24)
Written Communication	The ability to communicate ideas, thoughts, and facts in writing. The ability/skill in using correct grammar, correct spelling, sentence and document structure, accepted document formatting, and special literary techniques.	75.2% (188)	66.2% (47)	24.4% (61)	33.8% (24)

Building on the indication from the previous required executive proficiencies is that interpersonal skills and written communication are close to the 70% threshold. This only furthers the thought that executives work with people and must be able to communicate effectively. Findings within the moderately required executive proficiencies build on the ability to work with others with a high percentage of respondents selecting advanced or mastery for skills involving flexibility, relationship building, and team leadership.

Proficiency Rating Differences between Exempts and CEAs

There are four soft skills in which CEA and exempt responses varied by more than 10%. To determine if these are chance variances or actual differences, I assess statistical significance and conduct a chi-square test. The four soft skills are change leadership, forward thinking, vision and strategic thinking, and written communication.

Table 4.7 – CEA and Exempt Difference Tests

Skill	Statistical Significance	Chi-Square
Change Leadership	.496	2.530
Forward Thinking	.12	2.850
Vision and Strategic Thinking	.095*	3.460
Written Communication	.456	2.742
*Significant at the 10% level		

Only one of the skills, vision and strategic thinking, was statistically significant at the 10% significance level. The high chi-square test explains that it is unlikely that the difference in response between CEAs and exempts was simply a chance occurrence. Of the exempt respondents, 63.4% explained that their positions need an advanced or

mastery proficiency in vision and strategic thinking. By contrast, only 51.6% of CEA respondents felt their position required advanced or mastery proficiency. This means that exempt employees are more likely to see the need for a higher proficiency level of vision and strategic thinking for their positions.

Additional Proficiency Discussion

Based on the high level of employee management responsibility as indicated by earlier responses, it is surprising that executives have a lower need of proficiency for skills involving change leadership, developing others, planning and organizing, resource management, and workforce management. This may be because of responsibilities that take executives away from personnel management to work with higher-level administration.

Coinciding with the earlier findings on the lack of respondent diversity, executives themselves feel that an advanced or mastery proficiency in fostering diversity is not critical. This may not have a direct relationship to the ethnic makeup of executives, as CEAs or exempts likely have little influence on the hiring of other executives. However, the idea of diversity and equal employment has surfaced as something that warrants DPA attention.

Bottom Line

There are an extensive number of results discussed within this chapter. However, which of these findings are the most significant? Obviously, executives have similar feelings towards many of the items discussed. Of these similarities, monitoring and measuring organizational achievement is consistent with state encouragement of use.

Executives find it very important to critical to implement programs and policies that reflect higher-management policies, supporting legislative intent. Findings also identified needed executive proficiencies, assisting the DPA in identifying potential candidates.

There are also some key differences between CEAs and exempts. CEAs seem to have a greater concern for employee and program performance as well as resource assignment and goal achievement. Building on differences, exempt employees need a higher level of proficiency in change leadership, forwarding thinking, and vision and strategic thinking. This lends to the thought that exempts, more than CEAs, are involved in policy formation, while CEAs more than exempts are involved in employee management and program implementation.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

My thesis aims at enhancing our understanding of CEA and exempt respondents through analysis of the Executive Competency Survey in terms of general demographics, specific performance measure tools, and required proficiency in soft skills for executive positions. The thesis builds upon background information, literature review, and analysis of selected survey questions. This chapter offers a concluding discussion of the findings, as well as a presentation of further research opportunities.

General Demographics

With many governmental organizations concerned about upcoming Baby Boomer retirements, it is a positive sign that about two in five respondents were under the age of 50. This allows time for the DPA to develop and implement transition and training plans for California's next executives. By continuing to assess the workforce through tools such as the Executive Competency Survey, the DPA is properly positioning California for succession planning.

Regarding equal opportunity employment, executive respondents reflect positive and negative implications. The gender mix of CEAs and exempts show a trend toward an equal mix of male and female. However, the ethnic composition of executives does not reflect state government or the California population, even when controlled for age. Obviously, something is working in regards to gender mix, but something else is keeping a representative percentage of minorities from entering the executive class.

One of the reasons why California should care about this research is to determine whether the CEA system is performing as intended. My analysis of survey demographics has mixed implications for whether the CEA classification is meeting its intent. There is little consistency when comparing survey results to the available literature, which is sporadic and lacking sufficient recent examination. The one consistency is that CEAs act in a leadership role, which is also true of exempts. However, CEA responses show limited time spent performing as a CEA or exempt classification, which does not support the system theory for ensuring institutional knowledge retention and stability. Beyond intent, literature supports that CEAs will have more public management experience than exempts, but results showed exempts respondents having more years serving as a CEA or exempt classification. Based on the professional bureaucrat nature of CEAs, I expected that CEAs would have more public management experience. Ultimately, more information is necessary to make a decision as to whether or not CEAs are meeting system intent.

Performance Measures and Organizational Goal Achievement

There is broad agreement that state government needs to monitor and measure organizational and employee performance and goals. In this thesis, I assess how executives feel about measuring organizational and employee performance, how often they perform the activity, if there is an observable relationship to their position, and their needed proficiency.

Findings indicate that executives believe it is important to measure and monitor organizational performance, and very important to critical to define tasks and milestones

and assign resources to meet organizational objectives. Most executives are performing these activities anywhere from monthly to weekly. Executives formulate objectives and priorities and implement strategic plans more often than CEAs. With an observable relationship to job performance, and a need for advanced or mastery skill proficiency, executives also believe it very important to critical to focus personal efforts to achieve organizational objectives.

Both executive classes, with CEAs more so, believe it is important to develop, implement, and monitor performance measures to evaluate employees' and program's effectiveness and accountability. Executives also find it very important to critical to mentor, coach, and regularly appraise employees to perform successfully and encourage regular communication with customers and stakeholders. Even though executives feel employee development is important, they more frequently measure and monitor organizational performance than employee effectiveness and accountability.

When it comes to the intent of the classifications regarding responsiveness to the appointing power, I expected to find all executives rating questions regarding implementation of higher-management policies as very important to critical. Though percentages were relatively high, not all executives rated these questions as very important to critical. This begs the question as to the level of responsiveness from executives to their appointing power.

Proficiency Needs for Executives

There are a few takeaways from the analysis of the proficiency needs of executive positions. One is that effective communication proficiency is necessary for executives.

As a policy-influencing tool, executives likely spend much of their time using written and oral communication techniques, which represents a future training and selection opportunity for the DPA. Another takeaway is that executives need interpersonal proficiency and an externally positive view of themselves. Findings also indicate that there is not a great proficiency need for top down organizational changing skills.

DPA should examine the surprisingly low need for proficiency in skills that relate to performing a managerial role. While background literature supports the conclusion that CEAs act in a leadership role and survey findings show that executive respondents supervise at least four employees, there may be a missing link between what is required of executives and what is occurring. Another item for DPA investigation is the lack of diversity within executive positions, and why executive respondents feel they do not need a high proficiency in the ability to foster diversity. As California is a very racially diverse state, something seems amiss as to why these results occurred.

Of all the possible differences that may exist between CEA and exempt classifications, this research was able to identify one statistically significant area in which there is divergence. Exempt respondents were more likely to perceive a need for higher proficiency in vision and strategic thinking than CEAs. This may be because exempt respondents have a greater role in policy formulation than CEAs.

Research Opportunities

Through review of available literature, the complexity of CEA and exempt classifications, and analysis of the survey, I have identified further research opportunities and suggested methods. One interesting topic would be the examination of the effect that

outside competition and increased pay would have on CEA system flexibility and competitiveness. It would also be helpful to examine the impact of other rewards on motivation. SES research found that incentives and rewards are important for motivation, and may be for CEAs. Research also found that program performance is lower when administered by political appointees than SES. This effectiveness difference is another opportunity for further research. Finally, performance measure research recommends early buy-in from multiple personnel levels of government. A question for further research is determining who is creating performance measures, and what level of employee buy in exists.

With the creative nature of the CEA system and the political nature of exempt positions, future research could involve which classification is more adept, and to what extent, at influencing policy. Comparing the policy impact of CEAs and exempts would like need intensive case studies, not surveys.

As discussed in the methods chapter, I only analyzed a selection of respondents and a portion of questions asked in the survey. Future analysis could occur with all respondents, including supervisors and managers, and any combination of questions. As the number of respondents progressively decreased as the survey continued, the potential for respondents losing interest, and the challenge of sorting questions into themes, I recommend the DPA reduce the number of questions if using this survey again. I also recommend a more statistically sound approach to gathering data, including a random sample of executives.

There were other potential research methods that I considered for this project: conduction of an independent survey, interviews with CEAs and Exempts, and observation of a selected group executive leadership over a period of time. However, due to a lack of available funds, and the timeliness of the Executive Competency Survey, I chose not to select these alternative research methods. Each of these methods could bring varying types of information to light. Based on the literature reviewed, I recommend expanding the research methods to include the use of regression analysis to explain the relationship between independent and dependent variables, case study comparisons, and interviews with source parties.

Conclusion

The uniqueness of the CEA classification and the political nature of exempts provided a terrific opportunity for research. The availability of a DPA survey involving executive classifications offered me a chance to analyze respondents in a variety of topics including if classifications are meeting intent, general demographics, use of employee and organization performance measures, and needed proficiencies for positions. Examination of each system has the potential to provide better government to Californian's, offer transparency to citizens, build succession plans, and develop valuable information on classifications. As California moves further into the 21st century, modernization of the human resource system is going to evolve through analysis of human capital and position requirements. My thesis is but another part in preparing California to make informed decisions to meet the challenges of an ever-changing environment.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CEA and Exempt Comparison Table

CAREER EXECUTIVE ASSIGNMENT vs. EXEMPT APPOINTMENT

CEA	EXEMPT
Civil service classification.	Not a civil service classification.
Civil service examination required for appointment.	No examination required for appointment.
<p>Competition in an examination limited to current State of California employees.</p> <p>Exception:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative employees meeting the provisions of Government Code Section 18990. • Executive Branch employees meeting the provision of Government Code Section 18992. 	Any person qualified to perform the desired duties may be appointed.
Approval of appointment up through Agency required.	Approval of appointment up through the Governor's Appointment Secretary required.
Salary and levels determined by the Department of Personnel Administration.	Salary and levels determined by the Governor's Appointment Secretary.
Merit salary adjustments are limited to 5% up to the maximum of the CEA level. Salary increases are not automatic and are tied to performance.	There is no established limitation on annual merit salary adjustments except that they cannot exceed the established exempt salary level. Salary increases are not automatic and are tied to performance.
Full medical, dental and vision benefits upon appointment.	Full medical, dental and vision benefits upon appointment.
Annual leave or vacation and sick leave provided upon appointment.	Annual leave or vacation and sick leave provided upon appointment.
Annual leave or vacation and sick leave balances transfer with a CEA returning to a civil service position.	<p>Annual leave or vacation and sick leave balances transfer with an exempt returning to a civil service position.</p> <p>Annual leave or vacation balances are paid to an exempt with no return rights upon termination of their exempt appointment.</p>

CEA and Exempt Comparison Table continued

CEA	EXEMPT
Eligible for enhanced Non Industrial Disability (NDI). NDI pays 50% of salary and the employee may supplement leave credits for the additional 50% in order to receive a full salary if temporarily disabled.	Eligible for enhanced Non Industrial Disability (NDI). NDI pays 50% of salary and the employee may supplement leave credits for the additional 50% in order to receive a full salary if temporarily disabled.
Eligible for enhanced managerial benefits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance dental coverage (lower deductible and greater annual cap). • One additional hour of leave per month. • \$50,000 life insurance policy. • \$150,000 travel policy (while on state business) 	Eligible for enhanced managerial benefits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance dental coverage (lower deductible and greater annual cap). • One additional hour of leave per month. • \$50,000 life insurance policy. • \$150,000 travel policy (while on state business)
Eligible for CalPERS membership upon appointment.	Eligible for CalPERS membership upon completion of two years of service. Exception: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a prior CalPERS contributor eligibility is immediate.
Termination requires a 20-day notice.	Termination requires no notice.
Mandatory return right to former civil service classification upon termination of CEA appointment, unless appointed under GC 18990 or 18992.	No mandatory return rights to any position, UNLESS appointed to the position without a break in service from a civil service position.
A CEA will receive a "Red Circle" (maintain their CEA salary) salary for 90 days following termination of their appointment if they were a CEA for at least one year and have at least 10 years of civil service experience.	Former employees reinstating to a civil service position will receive a salary comparable to their exempt salary, but not to exceed the maximum of the civil service classification.
Salary received without a budget.	Salary may be suspended until a budget is approved.

APPENDIX B

Acronym List

Acronym	Description
CEA	California Career Executive Assignment
CSEA	California State Employees Association
DPA	California Department of Personnel Administration
GASB	Governmental Accounting Standards Board
LHC	Little Hoover Commission
SES	United States Senior Executive Service
SPB	California State Personnel Board

APPENDIX C

CEA Research Methods and Findings Table

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Birkenstock, John, Kurtz, Ronald, & Phillips, Steven (1975)	Narrative understanding of the creation, issues, and future of the program by an executive officer and two Employment Service Division program managers of the SPB.	Threat of legislature removing many top management positions from the merit system and fill them with exempt appointees facilitated SPB to ask for legislation to create the CEA system. California State Employees' Association (CSEA) protested that the CEA system was unconstitutional and would be used for political purposes. In 1973 the SPB amended system shortcomings involving classification (five categories), salary (broadened range, bonus plan was initiated then dropped), and selection (CEA data bank of eligible candidates). These amendments appear to have eliminated much of the dissatisfaction of the CSEA regarding partisan political manipulation. During the ten years of CEA existence, only 25% have been removed.
Fisher, John F., & Erickson, Robert J. (1964)	Narrative understanding of the background, development, initial form, and long term possibilities of the CEA program by two members of the SPB	Alteration of the examination process, with the most significant deviation from past examinations for executive positions, makes individual score averaging and ranking unnecessary. An examining panel takes all evidence into account (written tests, interviews with applicant and supervisors, performance valuations, group orals and simulations, etc.) and categorizes or eliminates CEA applicants. To realize the potential of the new system requires total integration into the management development program of State civil service. CEA largely removes the pressures of narrow promotional lines rigidly defined by minimum qualification patterns, which is a result of inexact selection process, the rule-of-three, and what amounts in practice to absolute tenure.
Little Hoover Commission (1979)	Analysis of a personnel system survey sent to all CEAs and exempt executives as well as a sample of rank-and-file employees.	There is little evidence to support that CEA positions are being utilized at low organizational levels. Far fewer CEA (29%) than exempt (52%) officials would expand the CEA system. Nearly a third of potential CEAs agree that the system should permit competitive selection from outside of State civil service, but 53% disagree or disagree strongly. One-half of CEA and exempt executives feel that candidates certified to them from promotional eligible lists are only sometimes highly qualified. Nearly 60% of CEA and exempt executives either disagree or disagree strongly that the policies and procedures are effective in meeting management needs for a competent workforce. LHC recommends that the CEA system should be strengthened and made flexible rather than reduced.
Little Hoover Commission (1999)	Advisory committee discussions and testimonies, interviews, and review of literature.	Not a high turnover rate when the administration changes. CEA system fails the "best available talent", because they only can be selected from the ranks of civil service. Expand CEA ranks and increase out-of-service recruitment of managers. DPA has encouraged departments to designate more managers as CEAs, but unions have resisted.

CEA Research Methods and Findings Table continued

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Little Hoover Commission (2005)	Public hearings, consultation with state and federal experts, task force review, and examination of California Performance Review recommendations.	CEAs earn approximately one-third less than their federal peers in California. Management compensation is not competitive, hindering efforts to hire the best and brightest. As of 2005 SES employees in Sacramento area earn between \$107,550 and \$162,000 while CEA employees earn between \$69,216 and \$117,960. To resolve this issue, LHC recommends the development of competitive pay packages and enhance compensation for senior executives. Pay increases can fluctuate dependent upon state budget.
Musolf, Lloyd D. (1963)	Review of documents bearing a direct or indirect relationship to the CEA system, including national, municipal, and state documents. Discussion with SPB and California State Employees Association.	The chief architect of the CEA is the SPB. SPB desires more responsiveness in top bureaucracy, and SPB fears that if responsiveness is not achieved, the legislature will be inclined to authorize more merit system exempt positions. SPB also realized that efforts to encourage state agencies to look outside for executives were not especially successful. CSEA opposition involved constitutional, political, and administrative concerns. Constitutional concerns rested on whether CEA establishment creates a second personnel system, the exemption of CEA protection from certain provision of civil service laws, and whether statute meets the legal rule that the legislature shall not delegate its own authority (e.g. salaries are for legislative action, not within the scope of SPB independent authority). Political concerns surround the fear that the CEA system can be used for partisan political purposes. Administrative concerns involve CSEA arguing the need for flexibility and responsiveness is not met by the new statute.
Musolf, Lloyd D. (1964)	Narrative understanding of the opportunities and risks with the CEA program.	The State Personnel Board responded to the continuing increases in exempt positions by advocating for the CEA program. CEA is a mixture of ideas, closed promotions, appealing to civil servants, and tenure at pleasure, appealing to political heads. Closed promotions may be at odds with the intent of statute. Denying outside entry into the system risks the system's ability to meet demands. Political heads of agencies may look for partisans for CEA appointment, thereby identifying enthusiasm for a program.
Musolf, Lloyd D. (1971)	Interviews with SPB staff and CEAs. Review of literature.	Found that between 1963 and 1970, there were only 9 removals of CEAs. The fear that CEAs would be subject to partisan abuse through removals had not materialized at the time, thereby reinforcing the spirit of egalitarianism through political neutrality. Greater flexibility could be realized with a bolder CEA system that allowed outside competition.

CEA Research Methods and Findings Table continued

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Rehfluss, John, & Furtado, Debra (1982a)	One to two hour interviews with 25 CEAs, selected randomly from the ten agencies with the largest number of CEAs, selected interviews with other persons from the SPB, and officials who supervise high level CEAs.	As of March 31, 1981 90% of CEAs are male and 82% of the CEA population is Caucasian. Blind support for the CEA system seems to exist, meaning many CEAs interviewed had little knowledge of the system and several had not considered the likelihood of termination. It's not completely clear just why agency heads have not terminated more CEAs. Respondents expressed confidence in the competence of CEAs. Terminations were 13.2% in 1975 when the Brown administration replaced the Reagan administration. Terminations fell to 2.1% in 1979-1980. Termination rates can be either less flexible than claimed for the plan, or extraordinarily effective selection. If limitations are put on terminating CEAs, a renewed effort to increase the number of exempt employees is anticipated. The CEA program undergoes incremental changes, including decentralization of recruitment and selection of CEAs to departments and improving the "safety net" of terminated CEAs by making them eligible for positions which involved promotions they would have received had they stayed in civil service. The CEA program is a system that maximizes flexibility and responsiveness, not a system for developing managerial excellence or an elite system.
Rehfluss, John, & Furtado, Debra (1982b)	One to two hour interviews with 25 CEAs, selected randomly from the ten agencies with the largest number of CEAs. Review of literature.	The idea of CEAs is to create freedom for both political agency heads and CEA managers. State government was becoming more specialized, and governors and legislators desired more exempt positions to replace civil servants who held top state policy-making positions. CEA status is limited to the position held, and the individual civil servant gains no tenure in the job or status as an elite member of a CEA system. Responsiveness and managerial flexibility and significant issues in top management reforms. The CEA system is well established, accepted by all parties to the contract, and well integrated in the state civil service system.
Rehfluss, John A. (1986)	Telephone or personal interviews with 85 randomly selected Sacramento CEAs from eight largest departments. Review of literature.	Despite legal ease in replacing CEAs, turnover rate is approximately 5% per year. In 1985, CEAs were composed of 11.7% women and 20.5% minorities. Women and minorities are more likely than male non-minorities to report that the overall benefits of being a CEA outweighed the drawbacks. Women and minorities share a "management ideology" with white male counterparts.

APPENDIX D

SES Research Methods and Findings Table

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Buchanan, Bruce (1981)	69 interviews with policy makers, personnel specialists, and SES members. Review of literature.	There was skepticism in the SES: reduced individual autonomy, concern that a change of administration may lead to a “cleaning of house”, anxiety and uncertainty over the performance appraisal process. But it is the “only game in town.” Current mandated performance appraisal plans does not adequately account for good management. Performance planning and appraisal process creates inequities and erodes support within the SES. The difference of responsibilities within SES and the ambitiousness of the responsibilities are subjective to interpretations of superiors. Cross-departmental difference in application of the SES system. Difficulty in research design. Four major indicators to determine whether or not SES is working after five years: successful program installation, positive and supportive attitudes among the SES, preoccupation with clarifying linkage between individual, agency, and program performance, and clear indication that SES can pass the political test in administration changes.
Dolan, Julie (2000)	Survey of a stratified random sample of 1,000 SES employees between November, 1996 and January, 1997. 570 usable surveys returned.	85% of respondents are white, comparable to overall universe. Career and political executives make policy, program, and budgetary decisions for their organization. Noncareer SES are substantially more likely to interact with numerous other political actors in Washington than are their career counterparts.
Gilmour, John B., & Lewis, David E. (2006)	Regression analysis of Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) FY2004 scores and consultation with OMB worksheets to determine SES or political administration of the program.	Senior executive management continuity helps programs craft and communicate clear goals to program employees during a longer period of time. Frequent turnover of political appointees creates leadership vacuums. Senior executives have more public management experience the political appointees. Programs administered by political appointees get lower grades than programs administered by SES. Decreasing political appointee presence has drawbacks: make administrative government more difficult to manage or control by the president and diminish the influx of new ideas and energy in government.

SES Research Methods and Findings Table continued

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Ingraham, Patricia W., & Barrilleaux, Charles (1983)	Analysis of SES respondents from the 1979 Federal Employee attitude survey and a 1981 survey by the State University of New York at Binghamton that was a random sample of SES members (178 returned), and a 1980 survey by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board of a random sample of SES members (1125 returned).	Incentives and rewards important to motivation. Financial incentives are an effective management tool. Dissatisfaction exists within the SES on the current availability of major bonuses and opportunity for a higher base salary. Performance evaluations are not yet functioning as intended. Managers should be allowed to work in an environment in which political pressures are minimal.
Perry, James & Miller, Theodore K. (1991)	Data for analysis came from the 1986 Merit Principles Survey (1700 cases were studied). Statistical analysis using LISREL as a general modeling framework.	Results suggest that avoidance of political abuses of the civil service promotes public confidence and an effective working climate within an agency. Poor relations between careerists and political appointees affects competence, performance, and motivation. Rewards increase both individual performance and competence, but so do public approval and agency performance.
Rosen, Bernard (1981)	Review of a survey of 223 career executives. Interviews with career executives.	Believes SES will go the extra mile only if political appointees use their power over SES fairly. The best employees were not selected for the SES system due to political or personal favoritism and pressure to meet affirmative action goals.
Selden, Sally C., & Brewer, Gene A. (2000)	Review of OPM Survey of Federal Government Employees, 1991-1992. Analyzed 2,474 SES member responses. Analyzed data with LISREL 8.12 – Observed variables are measured with ordinal scales. The two concepts that are operationalized are individual performance and contingent rewards	Individuals with more challenging jobs record higher performance levels. Feedback on goals is a necessary condition for high performance. Higher levels of commitment and self-efficacy lead to higher performance. Education is not a significant determinant of performance. SES members with more years of service are higher performers. SES members who are assigned conflicting work assignments record lower performance levels. As overtime increases performance decreases (overwhelming demands on employees may reduce performance). When performance produces rewards (internal or external), employees are more satisfied and thus more motivated and more committed to the organization. Individuals with higher job satisfaction are more committed to the organization.

APPENDIX E

Performance Measure Research Methods and Findings Table

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Behn, Robert D. (2003)	Literature review.	Eight purposes that public managers have for measuring performance: evaluate, control, budget, motivate, promote, celebrate, learn, and improve. For performance measures to be effective, public managers need some kind of standard with which the measure can be compared. Public managers may not have complete freedom to choose their own performance measures. There is no one magic performance measure. Public managers need a heterogeneous family of measures.
Cavalluzzo, Ken S., & Ittner, Christopher D. (2004)	Hypotheses testing using the United States General Accounting Office 1996-1997 survey of 1300 middle- and upper-level civilian managers in the 24 largest executive branch agencies. Narrowed down to 380-528 usable surveys.	Top management commitment to the use of performance information, decision-making authority, and training in performance measurement techniques have a significant positive influence on measurement system development and use.
de Lancer Julnes, Patricia, & Holzer, Marc (2000)	Literature review. Using the sampling frame of a 1996 survey conducted by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) of state and local government officials, the authors sent out 934 surveys in Spring 1997 with 513 respondents. The survey responses are tested against hypotheses using regression analysis.	Efficiency measure and outcome measures are less extensively developed than output measures for program in public organizations, which is consistent with previous GASB studies. Performance measurement information is a process in which at least two stages can be identified – adoption (development of measures) and implementation (actual use). All measures are used less frequently to report out and for strategic planning purposes. Adoption is heavily influenced by rational/technocratic (an internal organizational requirement) factors and implementation is more heavily influenced by political/cultural factors. Five suggestions that can effect performance measures utilization.
Melkers, Julia, & Willoughby, Katherine (2004)	Analysis of data from a GASB survey regarding the Service Efforts and Accomplishments research conducted in the summer of 2000.	The use of performance measurement in states has improved communication among state government budget actors and among external stakeholders. Concentrating on outcomes rather than outputs advances state management and budget practices. Measurement systems in the states are not comprehensive or comprehensively applied.

Performance Measure Research Methods and Findings Table continued

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Performance Management Council (2010)	28 question survey of 150 state organizations, including agencies, departments, boards and commissions. Case studies, literature review, and individual contributions from government leaders and academic specialists from government departments and agencies.	1. Some departments are using strategic planning to develop a performance culture. 2. Performance measures are being used, but are not optimized. 3. Departments face challenges in the implementation and growth of performance management. It is not always a department priority and is not usually emphasized during periods of budget reductions. 4. IT funding is needed to leverage information gathering efforts. Leadership and executive buy-in are essential to start performance management. Performance measures should be used to explain and provide information to inform decision-makers. Departments will benefit by engaging employees at all levels in decisions about performance measurement to overcome the fear that they will be exposed to personal scrutiny.
Poister, Theodore H., Steib & Gregory (1999)	Analysis of 695 survey responses (57% response rate) of senior officials from municipal jurisdictions with populations exceeding 25,000.	40% or fewer municipal jurisdictions make any kind of meaningful use of performance measures in their management and decision process. Performance measures in local government is not limited to budgeting. It is used for strategic planning and management, program evaluation, performance management, quality management, and benchmarking. The motivation to use performance measures in cities appears to be locally generated, stemming from a desire to make better decisions and to maintain accountability to citizens and local elected officials, rather than from the need to meet state and federal reporting requirements. Most jurisdictions work from missions, goals, and objectives in developing indicators, and they compare actual performance against set standards or targets. Prevailing philosophy holds that performance measurement systems are more effective in influencing behavior in desired ways when line managers and employees buy into the system and the measures. In turn, this is more likely to occur when they are involved in the process of developing the measures.

Performance Measure Research Methods and Findings Table continued

Author(s) & (year published)	Method	Findings
Steinberg, Harold I. (2009)	Identification of the elements of using performance measures to improve service delivery; development of case studies describing five governments' successful use of performance measures to improve service delivery; and administration of an online survey (focused on 175 responses) to determine the extent to which the elements are used.	Government units of all sizes and types are using performance measures as a tool for improving service delivery. Key to controlling outcomes is to use consistent measures from period to period, while recognizing that measures can and should be modified. Other key success factors include regular and frequent analysis of performance results data in comparison to prior periods, targets or benchmarks. Also, regular reviews of the analysis and results by the chief executive and/or his designee with the responsible agency heads.

APPENDIX F

CEA and SES Comparison Table

Comparison of the California Career Executive (CEA) Program and the Federal Government Senior Executive Service (SES) Program. The chart below summarizes and provides an overview comparing a few of the key areas of the CEA and SES Programs.

	Career Executive Assignment (CEA) Program	Senior Executive Service (SES) Program
Definition	<p>The CEA system was created in 1963 to allow for a separate system of merit personnel administration specifically designed to meet the State's needs for competent managerial and executive civil service personnel.</p> <p>CEA positions are high administrative and policy influencing positions within state civil service.</p>	<p>SES Program was implanted in 1978 to create a corps of senior executives not technical experts</p> <p>SES positions cover managerial, supervisory and policy positions (above the federal grade level GS-15 requirement) that are not filled by Presidential appointment with Senate confirmation</p>
Types	<p>Broadband, class code 7500 CEA classes – consist of five levels of policy formulating high-level management positions to which most CEA positions are allocated. The CEA Broadband was created to emphasize broad managerial and policy influencing skills, vs. specialized technical skills.</p> <p>Specific CEA classes – some CEA positions are allocated to distinct classes like general civil service classes. These classes were developed when a very specific set of skills is required to perform the duties of the job and often when it was necessary in order to obtain a qualified candidate pool (less than five internal state civil service candidates would meet the requirements) to include an outside MQ pattern, to allow candidates from outside state service to apply.</p>	<p>Career: competitive selection; provides entitlements to the incumbent; no time limit</p> <p>Non-Career: does not require competitive selection; no entitlements to the incumbent; no time limit</p> <p>Limited Term: 3yr max limit term position; project type work</p> <p>Limited Emergency: position can be established for a maximum of 18 month; unanticipated, urgent need</p> <p>Note: total # of limited appointments government wide is restricted to 5% of total SES positions OPM has given each agency a pool of limited appointment authority up to 3% of its total SES positions</p>
Eligibility for Appointment	<p>CEA Broad Band Classes - candidate must have permanent civil service status (G.C. 19889.3 and SPB Rule 548.70), or legislative employees who meet the requirements of GC 18990 or Exempt employees who meet the requirements of GC 18992</p> <p>Specific CEA classes – each class has separate specific MQs developed for the class. Generally there is an outside pattern which allows individuals from outside state service to compete.</p>	<p>General SES Position – can be a career or non-career appointment, at discretion of the agency</p> <p>Career Reserved SES Position- must be a career appointment</p>
Testing Process	<p>State departments have been delegated authority to conduct their own examinations for CEA positions.</p> <p>Examinations must be competitive and of such character to fairly test the qualifications, fitness and ability of competitors to perform the duties of the position to be filled. Examinations must be based on job-related evaluation criteria that is used to assess the qualifications of each candidate for</p>	<p><u>There are different appointment processes for SES Career and Non-Career Appointments see below:</u></p> <p><u>SES Career Appointments:</u> Are governed by ERB and QRBs (see below)</p> <p>Executive Resource Boards (ERB) –Each agency appoints ERBs to conduct the merit staffing process for career appointments responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Recruitment-</u> all SES career appointment vacancies must be announced to all Federal Civil Service Employees; and to United States

CEA and SES Comparison Table continued

	<p>the CEA position to be filled and compare and rank each candidate against all other candidates. For more information see CCR 548.70.</p> <p>Departments must advertise their CEA examinations service-wide and post their CEA Exam Bulletins on the SPB phone lines for a minimum of five working days (SPB is currently in the process of creating a new on-line CEA Exam Bulletin system departments will use to post their CEA bulletins which will replace the phone lines. SPB Staff anticipates implementation of the new on-line system by August 2006)</p>	<p>Employment Service Offices for a minimum of 14 days</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Rating and Ranking</u>- all eligible candidates are raked and ranked based on their knowledge, skills and abilities and other job related factors. Record must adequately document the basis for qualifications, rating and ranking • <u>Candidates are rated based on Executive Core Qualifications</u>¹ <p>Qualifications Review Boards² OPM convene (QRBs) which provide an independent peer review of candidates proposed for initial career appointment to SES positions. A QRB either approves or disapproves the candidates qualifications. If approved the agency may proceed with the appointment.</p> <p><u>SES Non-Career Appointments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be made to General (not Career Reserved) SES positions • Must obtain non-career appointment authorization from the White House Office of Presidential Personnel for each appointment • Competition is not required • Appointing official determines that the individual meets the qualifications for the position
Probation	<p>CEA Broad Band – incumbents <u>do not</u> serve probationary period</p> <p>Specific CEA classes – depending on eligibility incumbents may serve a 1 year prob period</p>	<p>Career Appointments: serve a 1 yr prob period</p> <p>Non-Career Appointment: no prob period, individual serves at the pleasure of the agency</p>
Transfer/Reinstatement	<p>CEA positions can be filled non-competitively through transfer and reinstatement as outlined in CCR 548.90 and 548.95</p> <p>Note: SPB recommends that appointing authorities should only consider filling CEA positions through transfer or reinstatement after conducting a CEA examination, thus allowing all interested eligible candidates the opportunity to apply</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency can non-competitively transfer current SES career appointee • Agency can non-competitively reinstate a former SES member (some restrictions apply) • Agency can non-competitively appoint a SES CDT graduate, certified by a QRB Board
Termination Process	<p>CEA Broad Band Class: Appointees serve at the pleasure of the appointing power. The appointing power must provide incumbent with 20 days written notice (CCR 599.990) Appointing authority is not required to provide justification for termination of the assignment</p>	<p>Career Appointments: Each incumbent must be given an individual performance plan. Incumbents can be removed for performance based on appraisal periods (90 days to 1yr). Appointee must be rated based on a performance plan. If rating is unsatisfactory dept may remove or reassign incumbent. If removed appointee is</p>

¹ In the Feb 2004 report titled: Senior Executive Service, the US Office of Personnel Management defines the current ECQs as: Leading Change; leading People; Results Driven; Business Acumen; and Building Coalitions/Communication. The ECQs are described as representing a shift from passive management to active leadership and placing emphasis on making things happen and getting results rather than on managing a process.

² OPM draws on SES members to serve on QRBs. The Board normally consists of three SES members, each from a different agency. QRB members cannot review candidates from their own agencies.

CEA and SES Comparison Table continued

	<p>Note: Terminations are not viewed as punitive (unless a situation specifically warrants a punitive measure), and are considered without fault</p> <p>Specific CEA classes –the appointing authority’s flexibility for termination depends on the eligibility of the incumbent appointed to the position. If the incumbent was an internal civil service candidate the same process applies as described above. If the incumbent was an outside candidate the regular civil service process for termination applies, which is much more restrictive.</p>	<p>given 30 days notice</p> <p>Non-Career: can be terminated at any time with 1 day notice. Agency has the option of providing reason for the action</p> <p>Limited Appointees- can be removed at any time, with 1 days notice</p>
Appeal process	<p>Appeal from Examination or Departmental Appointment: employee can appeal within 30 days upon grounds of irregularity, fraud or discrimination</p> <p>Appeal from Termination: affected employee may not appeal except for allegations upon the grounds that the termination was effected for reasons of age, sex, sexual preference, marital status, race color, national origin, ancestry, or disability, religion, or religious opinions, political affiliation, or political opinions</p>	<p>Candidates/Incumbents have no appeal rights on actions taken by the ERB, the QRB, or the appointing official. Appeals may be pursued on other legal avenues, for example prohibited personnel practice allegation, or discrimination complaints</p>
Return Rights	<p>Civil Service employee who is appointed under the CEA selection process to a CEA position retains permanent status in general civil service and has mandatory right of return to his/her former position</p>	<p>Career SES Appointments: Do have return rights, entitled to placement in his/her former position (or like position)</p> <p>Non-Career SES Appointments: No return rights</p>
Controls on the total # of positions	<p>There is no statutory cap on the total # of CEA positions</p> <p>Historically CEA positions were limited to the top policy-influencing managerial positions in State Government. The original intention of the CEA program was to cover employees at the Division Chief or higher level of responsibility. This guideline roughly translates to 0.50% of the positions in California state civil service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no statutory “cap” on total SES allocations • Total SES non-career appointees government-wide cannot exceed 10% of SES allocations • Total SES non-career appointees within an agency cannot exceed 25% of that agency’s total SES allocations • Total SES limited appointees government-wide cannot exceed 5% of total SES allocations
Determining which positions meet the criteria	<p>CEA Broad Band positions Departments submit proposals to reallocate existing CEA positions or create new CEA position to SPB for review</p> <p>Each proposal is reviewed by SPB staff and a determination is made by SPB Executive Office on a case by case basis</p> <p>Specific CEA classes Departments work with DPA to allocate positions to Specific CEA classes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US Office of Personnel Management (OPM) allocates # of SES positions to each agency on a 2 yr basis. Each Agency submits detailed written requests to OPM biannually. • Adjustments can be made during the biennial cycle, within statutory limits, to meet unanticipated needs. • Within their allocations, agencies have authority to establish and/or abolish positions and to reassign incumbents.

CEA and SES Comparison Table continued

Data	<p><u>2004 breakdown of total CEA positions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 216,204 total state civil service positions • 1,297 total CEA positions • 0.60% of CEA positions to total state workforce <p>Note: The most recent figures available for the SES positions were from 2004. For comparison purposes 2004 figures for the CEA program have been included here.</p>	<p><u>2004 breakdown of total SES positions</u></p> <p>7,868 total SES positions of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6,811 were filled • 5,997 Career appointments • 674 Non-Career appointments • 140 Limited Appointments <p>Note: Total Federal Civilian workforce in 2003 was 2,725.9 million (all data taken from the 2005 OPM report from titled Factbook)</p>
Compensation	<p><u>CEA Broad Band Class</u>- class code 7500 consists of five levels</p> <p><u>CEA I</u>- \$5,768-7,324 monthly</p> <p><u>CEA II</u>- \$7,302-\$8,051 monthly</p> <p><u>CEA III</u>- \$8,030-\$8,854 monthly</p> <p><u>CEA IV</u>- \$8,426-\$9,287</p> <p><u>CEA V</u> – 8,916-\$9,830</p> <p><u>Legal and Medical</u> – CEA Broad Band positions which require legal or medical licensure can pay up to \$11,669 monthly</p> <p>Note: Departments have discretion to pay above the salary range of the level a position is designated. For more information see DPA PML-2006-006</p> <p><u>Specific CEA classes</u></p> <p>Separate salary ranges are designated for each specific CEA class. For more information please see the class specifications section of the SPB or DPA websites</p>	<p><u>Agencies with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System</u> \$104,927- \$158,100 annually</p> <p><u>Agencies without a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System</u> \$104,927 - \$145,600 annually</p> <p><u>Recruitment bonus</u>: lump sum to new appointees up to 25% of basic pay for positions difficult to fill</p> <p><u>Relocation bonus</u>: lump sum to current employees up to 25% of basic pay</p> <p><u>Retention Payments</u>:</p> <p><u>Other</u>: agencies may pay pre-employment interview expenses; moving costs for new appointees; and in certain circumstances provide performance awards bonuses to career appointees to recognize and reward excellence. Additionally under certain circumstances SES career appointees may receive bonuses through Presidential Rank Awards.</p>
Other	<p>Currently the State of California has no other civil service types of positions similar to CEA positions</p>	<p><u>Senior Level (SL) and Scientific/Professional (ST) Positions</u> similar to SES positions, but do not meet the criteria for SES positions</p> <p><u>ST Positions</u> - non-executive positions which involve high level research and development in the physical, biological, medical, or engineering sciences. As of 10/31/03 total of 404 positions.</p> <p><u>SL Positions</u> – non-executive positions which do not meet the criteria for ST, examples include high level special assistant or senior attorney positions. As of 10/31/03 total of 404 positions.</p> <p><u>SES Candidate Development Programs</u> designed to develop pools of qualified candidates for the SES. Participants are selected through competitive merit staffing procedures. Agencies establish Programs with OPM approval.</p>

*Note: Information provided on the SES Program was compiled and summarized from the US Office of Personnel Management's Report titled: The Senior Executive Service, dated February 2004. For more details on the SES program please refer to the US Office of Personnel Management's website at <http://www.opm.gov/>

APPENDIX G

Executive Competency Survey

Section A: General Questions

1. What is your current appointment type?
 - a. CEA
 - b. Exempt
2. What is your CEA classification?
3. What is your exempt classification?
4. What is your department/agency?
5. Do you work in Headquarters, a field office or an out-of state office?
6. What County do you work in?
7. How long have you been doing C.E.A. or Exempt Level Work?
 - a. 0 – 6 months
 - b. 7 – 12 months
 - c. More than 1 year, but less than 2
 - d. At least 2 years, but less than 3
 - e. At least 3 years, but less than 5
 - f. At least 5 years, but less than 10
 - g. More than 10 years

8. How many employees do you directly supervise?

- a. None
- b. 1 – 3
- c. 4 – 6
- d. 7 – 9
- e. 10 – 19
- f. 20 or more

9. What is your highest level of education?

- a. High School Diploma or GED
- b. Some college, no degree
- c. Associate's degree
- d. Bachelor's degree
- e. Master's degree
- f. Doctorate

10. What is your gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female
- c. Decline to State

11. Of which ethnic group do you consider yourself a member?

- a. Asian
- b. Black/African American
- c. East Indian
- d. Filipino
- e. Hispanic
- f. Native American
- g. Pacific Islander
- h. White/Caucasian
- i. Decline to State

12. What is your age?

- a. 21 – 29
- b. 30 – 39
- c. 40 – 49
- d. 50 – 59
- e. 60 or over
- f. Decline to State

Section B: Importance and Frequency of tasks

A. Importance ranking:

- a. Does Not Apply
- b. Moderately Important
- c. Important
- d. Very Important
- e. Critical

B. Frequency ranking:

- a. Does Not Apply
- b. Less Than Once A Month (includes Quarterly)
- c. Monthly
- d. Weekly
- e. Daily

How would you rate the Importance (A) and Frequency (B) of the following tasks related to leading and managing people that you perform in your current job? (13 -20)

13A-B. Lead managerial employees, stakeholders, contractors, and/or consultants in a variety of work settings and/or geographical locations, based on organizational objectives, budget considerations and staffing needs.

14A-B. Ensure employees are appropriately recruited, selected, hired, and retained.

15A-B. Mentor, coach, and regularly appraise employees to perform successfully, contribute to the organization, and to ensure career development.

16A-B. Provide regular guidance to subordinates and sufficient authority and discretion to carry out work activities and/or make decisions.

17A-B. Promote teamwork and motivate subordinates and peers toward achieving the goals of the organization.

18A-B. Model and communicate organizational values.

19A-B. Foster an inclusive environment where diversity and individual differences are valued and used positively to achieve the mission and goals of the organization.

20A-B. Manage and resolve conflict and disagreements in a constructive manner, taking corrective action when necessary.

How would you rate the Importance (A) and Frequency (B) of the following tasks related to communication that you perform in your current job? (21 - 27)

21A-B. Explain significant developments, goals, policies, and procedures to subordinates, emphasizing their impact on organizational activities and the expected outcomes.

22A-B. Be readily available/accessible to ensure open communication and input from employees.

23A-B. Encourage regular communication with customers and stakeholders to gain their input and address their needs.

24A-B. Conduct briefings or other meetings, communicate outcomes, provide progress/status reports, and follow-up.

25A-B. Initiate and maintain contact with higher-level management, keeping them apprised of program development.

26A-B. Make clear and convincing oral presentations to higher-management or outside organizations.

27A-B. Review and approve correspondence, forms, publications and reports intended to communicate information about department or agency programs or projects.

How would you rate the Importance (A) and Frequency (B) of the following tasks related to leading change and promoting strategic vision that you perform in your current job?
(28 - 33)

28A-B. Create an organizational environment that encourages new ideas and innovation, including automation or other technology and encourages continuous business process improvements.

29A-B. Develop, update and/or implement the organizational strategic plan and share the vision with others to move the organization toward its goals.

30A-B. Initiate and/or promote organizational change management with continuous business process improvements and influence others to translate vision into action.

31A-B. Understand, keep current, identify, and interpret developing trends and sensitive issues impacting policy, system or procedural problems.

32A-B. Formulate strategies, objectives, priorities, and contingency plans to implement new or revised programs and policies that reflect higher-management policies.

33A-B. Formulate objectives and priorities and implement short and long-term tactical and strategic plans consistent with the long-term objectives of the organization.

How would you rate the Importance (A) and Frequency (B) of the following tasks related to managing business and resources that you perform in your current job? (34 - 42)

34A-B. Monitor and measure organizational performance and effectiveness.

35A-B. Understand the organization's financial and budget management processes.

36A-B. Understand and appropriately apply specialized program expertise principles, procedures, requirements, regulations, and policies.

37A-B. Establish organizational objectives and program/project priorities for assignment of resources to accomplish the goals of the organization.

38A-B. Establish a balance among competing objectives to accomplish overall organizational goals.

39A-B. Develop, implement, and monitor performance measures to evaluate employees' and program's effectiveness & accountability.

40A-B. Obtain relevant information, including diverse viewpoints to make planning decisions and solve work problems.

41A-B. Identify and analyze problems, ask questions, and weigh relevance and accuracy of information to generate and evaluate alternative proposals and make recommendations for critical/sensitive program activities.

42A-B. Formulate and implement policy decisions and recommendations for executive management/organization.

How would you rate the Importance (A) and Frequency (B) of the following tasks related to building coalitions that you perform in your current job? (43-48)

43A-B. Negotiate and gain cooperation with internal or external groups to facilitate program implementation.

44A-B. Understanding the implications of the global market to the organization's effectiveness and goals and objectives.

45A-B. Understand organizational and political nuances required to establish networks and build alliances with key individuals or groups in public and/or private sector.

46A-B. Foster consensus building among subordinates, peers and higher-level management.

47A-B. Integrate customer and/or stakeholder expectations into the delivery process of services or products.

48A-B. Involve relevant people in decision-making activities.

How would you rate the Importance (A) and Frequency (B) of the following tasks related to building trust and accountability that you perform in your current job? (49 -50)

49A-B. Maintain a high level of professional expertise.

50A-B. Model high standards of honesty and integrity.

Section C: Importance, Expected at Entry, Relationship to Job Performance, and Proficiency Level Requirements of General Competencies

Importance ranking:

- a. Does Not Apply
- b. Moderately Important
- c. Important
- d. Very Important
- e. Critical

Expected at Entry ranking:

- a. Not Needed
- b. Needed
- c. Essential

Relationship to Job Performance ranking:

- a. No Observable Relationship
- b. Observable Relationship

Proficiency Level ranking:

- a. Not Required
- b. Novice
- c. Skilled
- d. Advanced
- e. Mastery

How would you rate the Importance (A), Expected at Entry (B), Relationship to Job Performance (C), and Proficiency Level (D) requirements for each of the following general competencies? (51 - 73)

51A-D. Analytical Thinking - The ability to approach a problem by using a logical, systematic, sequential approach.

52A-D. Change Leadership - The ability to manage, lead, and enable the process of change and transition while helping others deal with their effects.

53A-D. Customer Focus - The ability to identify and respond to current and future customer's needs; provide excellent service to internal and external customers.

54A-D. Communication - The ability to listens to others and communicate in an effective manner.

55A-D. Decision Making - The ability to make decisions and solve problems involving varied levels of complexity, ambiguity and risk.

56A-D. Developing Others - The ability and willingness to delegate responsibility, work with others, and coach them to develop their capabilities.

57A-D. Ethics and Integrity - The degree of trustworthiness and ethical behavior of an individual with consideration for the knowledge one has of the impact and consequences when making a decision or taking action.

58A-D. Flexibility - The ability to adapt and work with a variety of situations, individuals, and groups. The ability to be open to different and new ways of doing things; willingness to modify one's preferred way of doing things.

59A-D. Forward Thinking - The ability to anticipate the implications and consequences of situations and take appropriate action to be prepared for possible contingencies.

60A-D. Fostering Diversity - The ability to promote equal and fair treatment and opportunity for all.

61A-D. Global Perspective - The ability to recognize and address issues that are outside our local perspective. The ability to view issues without any pre-set biases or limitations. The ability to see the "big" picture.

62A-D. Influencing Others - The ability to gain others' support for ideas, proposals, projects, and solutions.

63A-D. Interpersonal Skills - The ability to get along and interact positively with coworkers. The degree and style of understanding and relating to others.

64A-D. Organizational Awareness - The ability to understanding the workings, structure, and culture of the organization as well as the political, social, and economic issues affecting the organization.

65A-D. Personal Credibility - Demonstrating concern that one be perceived as responsible, reliable, and trustworthy.

66A-D. Planning & Organizing - The ability to define tasks and milestones to achieve objectives, while ensuring the optimal use of resources to meet those objectives.

67A-D. Team Leadership - The ability to effectively manage and guide group efforts. Includes providing the appropriate level of feedback concerning group progress.

68A-D. Relationship Building - The ability to develop, maintain, and strengthen relationships with others inside or outside of the organization who can provide information, assistance, and support.

69A-D. Resource Management - The ability to ensure the effective, efficient, and sustainable use of public service resources and assets; human and financial resources, real property and business information.

70A-D. Results Orientation - The ability to focus personal efforts on achieving results consistent with the organization's objectives.

71A-D. Vision and Strategic Thinking - The ability to support, promote, and ensure alignment with the organization's vision and values. The ability to understand how an organization must change in light of internal and external trends and influences.

72A-D. Workforce Management - The ability to effectively recruit, select, develop, and retain competent staff; includes making appropriate assignments and managing staff performance.

73A-D. Written Communication - The ability to communicate ideas, thoughts, and facts in writing. The ability/skill in using correct grammar, correct spelling, sentence and document structure, accepted document formatting, and special literary techniques to communicate a message in writing.

Section D: Check all that Apply or Open-Ended Questions

74. How do you keep current as an effective Executive Leader? (Check all that apply)

- a. Executive Coaching/Mentoring
- b. Networking
- c. Journals
- d. Web
- e. Training Classes/Workshops
- f. Certificate Programs
- g. California State Library
- h. Other
- i. Other (please specify)

75. If applicable, please list the sources of the networks, journals, Executive Coaching/Mentoring resources, or training courses used to maintain your effectiveness as an Executive Leader (open-ended)

76. What are the top 5 Human Resources challenges you face as an Executive in State Service? (open-ended)

77. If you identified a Human Resource challenge(s) in 76, please identify your recommended solution. (open-ended)

78. What advice would you give to an aspiring Executive? (open-ended)

79. How do you see the job of a State Executive changing in the next 5 years? (open-ended)

80. Please provide the web-link (URL address) for the top 5 websites that you use to gain proficiency in the competencies required for success in your current position. (open-ended)

81. Please describe the training provider or knowledge tool that stood out as being the best investment of time and money in your career.

Section E: Gaining Proficiency (check all that apply)

Response Options

- a. Not Applicable
- b. Self Study
- c. On the Job/Work Experience
- d. College
- e. Seminars/Formal Training
- f. Mentoring
- g. Innate Characteristic

How did you gain proficiency in each of the following general competencies? (Check all that apply) (82-104)

82. Analytical Thinking - The ability to approach a problem by using a logical, systematic, sequential approach.

83. Change Leadership - The ability to manage, lead, and enable the process of change and transition while helping others deal with their effects.

84. Customer Focus - The ability to identify and respond to current and future customer's needs; provide excellent service to internal and external customers.
85. Communication - The ability to listens to others and communicates in an effective manner.
86. Decision Making - The ability to make decisions and solve problems involving varied levels of complexity, ambiguity and risk.
87. Developing Others - The ability and willingness to delegate responsibility, work with others, and coach them to develop their capabilities.
88. Ethics and Integrity - The degree of trustworthiness and ethical behavior of an individual with consideration for the knowledge one has of the impact and consequences when making a decision or taking action
89. Flexibility - The ability to adapt and work with a variety of situations, individuals, and groups. The ability to be open to different and new ways of doing things; willingness to modify one's preferred way of doing things.
90. Forward Thinking - The ability to anticipate the implications and consequences of situations and take appropriate action to be prepared for possible contingencies. -

Seminars/Formal Training

91. Fostering Diversity - The ability to promote equal and fair treatment and opportunity for all.
92. Global Perspective - The ability to recognize and address issues that are outside our local perspective. The ability to view issues without any pre-set biases or limitations. The ability to see the "big" picture.

93. Influencing Others - The ability to gain others' support for ideas, proposals, projects, and solutions.
94. Interpersonal Skills - The ability to get along and interact positively with coworkers. The degree and style of understanding and relating to others.
95. Organizational Awareness - The ability to understanding the workings, structure, and culture of the organization as well as the political, social, and economic issues affecting the organization.
96. Personal Credibility - Demonstrating concern that one be perceived as responsible, reliable, and trustworthy.
97. Planning & Organizing - The ability to define tasks and milestones to achieve objectives, while ensuring the optimal use of resources to meet those objectives. -
Seminars/Formal Training
98. Team Leadership - The ability to effectively manage and guide group efforts. Includes providing the appropriate level of feedback concerning group progress.
99. Relationship Building - The ability to develop, maintain, and strengthen relationships with others inside or outside of the organization who can provide information, assistance, and support.
100. Resource Management - The ability to ensure the effective, efficient, and sustainable use of public service resources and assets; human and financial resources, real property and business information.
101. Results Orientation - The ability to focus personal efforts on achieving results consistent with the organization's objectives.

102. Vision and Strategic Thinking - The ability to support, promote, and ensure alignment with the organization's vision and values. The ability to understand how an organization must change in light of internal and external trends and influences.

103. Workforce Management - The ability to effectively recruit, select, develop, and retain competent staff; includes making appropriate assignments and managing staff performance. - Seminars/Formal Training.

104. Written Communication - The ability to communicate ideas, thoughts, and facts in writing. The ability/skill in using correct grammar, correct spelling, sentence and document structure, accepted document formatting, and special literary techniques to communicate a message in writing.

Section F: Final Questions

105. Please identify your current critical job training needs. If known, please list the training/education providers. (open-ended)

106. When was the last time you received a performance evaluation as an Executive Leader?

- a. Less than 1 year ago
- b. 1-2 years ago
- c. 3-5 years ago
- d. More than 5 years ago
- e. Have not received a performance evaluation as an Executive Leader

107. Do you or your department regularly provide performance evaluations to direct reports?

- a. Yes
- b. No

108. If no, to question 107, please explain the factors that contribute to the lack of regular performance evaluations in your department.

109. Would you be interested in sharing knowledge and collaborating with other experts in your field?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unknown at this time

110. If yes, to question 109, please provide your e-mail address.

111. Are there any critical tasks that you perform on your job that were not addressed in the survey? If so, please briefly describe them and indicate the importance and frequency with which you perform these tasks. (open-ended)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (112-114)

112. The survey instructions were clear.

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. Agree
- d. Strongly Agree

113. The survey was easy to fill out.

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. Agree
- d. Strongly Agree

114. The statements were well developed and accurately described the classification(s).

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. Agree
- d. Strongly Agree

115. If you have any comments regarding the survey, please place them in the text box below. We appreciate your feedback! (open-ended)

REFERENCES

- Behn, R. (2001.) *Rethinking Democratic Accountability*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Behn, R. D. (2003.) Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 586-606.
- Birkenstock, J., Kurtz, R., & Phillips, S. (1975.) Career Executive Assignments – Report on California Innovation. *Public Personnel Management*, May-June, 151-155.
- Buchanan, B. (1981.) The Senior Executive Service: How We Can Tell If It Works. *Public Administration Review*, 41(3), 349-358.
- California Department of Personnel Administration. (2009a.) *About the State Workforce*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from <http://www.dpa.ca.gov/job-info/workforce/main.htm#footnote1>
- California Department of Personnel Administration. (2009b.) *How much do CEAs get paid?* Retrieved January 4, 2011, from <http://www.dpa.ca.gov/job-info/cea/how-much-do-ceas-get-paid.htm>
- California Department of Personnel Administration. (2010a.) *Leadership Competency Model*. Retrieved April 12, 2011, from <http://www.dpa.ca.gov/hr-modernization/leadership-competency-model/main.htm>
- California Department of Personnel Administration. (2010b.) *My CEA or Exempt Appointment Ended. What are my Options?* Retrieved January 4, 2011, from <http://www.dpa.ca.gov/job-info/cea/termination/main.htm>

California Department of Personnel Administration. (2011.) *Exempt Salary Schedule*.

Retrieved March 22, 2011, from

http://www.dpa.ca.gov/pv_obj_cache/pv_obj_id_75E032C911EE288323C1FFBA0AFF3FD373661D00/filename/salary-schedule.pdf

California Performance Review. (2003.) *A Government for the People for a Change:*

Prescription for Change. Retrieved March 21, 2011, from

http://www.cpr.ca.gov/CPR_Report/pdf/prescriptionforchange.pdf

California State Personnel Board. (2006.) *Report on CEA Positions in State Civil*

Service. Retrieved February 10, 2011, from

<http://www.spb.ca.gov/WorkArea/downloadasset.aspx?id=1182>

California State Personnel Board. (2008.) *Eligibility for Career Executive Assignment*

(CEA) Examinations. Retrieved January 30, 2011 from

<http://www.spb.ca.gov/WorkArea/showcontent.aspx?id=4554>

California State Personnel Board. (2010.) *Annual Census of Employee in the State Civil*

Service. 2009-2010 Fiscal Year. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from

<http://www.spb.ca.gov/WorkArea/showcontent.aspx?id=6502>

Cavalluzzo, K. S., & Ittner, C. D. (2004.) Implementing Performance Measurement

Innovations: Evidence from Government. *Accounting, Organizations, and Society*, 29, 243-267.

Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy. (2010, October.) *State and*

Local Government Employees: Where does California Rank? – 2009 Update.

Retrieved February 1, 2011 from <http://www.ccsce.com/PDF/Numbers-Oct10-Govt-Employees-Rank.pdf>

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. (2008). *United States Government Policy and Supporting Positions (Plum Book), Appendix No. 2.*

Retrieved February 20, 2011 from

http://www.gpoaccess.gov/plumbook/2008/p200-201_appendix2.pdf

de Lancer Julnes, P., & Holzer, M. (2001). Promoting the Utilization of Performance Measures in Public Organizations: An Empirical Study of Factors Affecting Adoption and Implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 61(6), 693-708.

Dolan, J. (2000.) Influencing Policy at the Top of the Federal Bureaucracy: A Comparison of Career and Political Senior Executives. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 573-581.

Fisher, J. F., & Erickson, R. J. (1964.) California's Career Executive Assignment: I. Meeting the Challenge for Better Managers. *Public Personnel Review*, 25(2), 82-86. Little Hoover Commission. (1995.) *Too many agencies, too many rules: Reforming California's Civil Service.*

Gilmour, J. B., & Lewis, D.E. (2006.) Political Appointees and the Competence of Federal Program Management. *American Politics Research*, 34(1), 22-50.

Heinrich, C. J. (2002.) Outcomes-Based Performance Management in the Public Sector: Implications for Government Accountability and Effectiveness. *Public Administration Review*, 62(6), 712-725.

- Ingraham, P. W., & Barrilleaux, C. (1983.) Motivating Government Managers for Retrenchment: Some Possible Lessons from the Senior Executive Service. *Public Administration Review*, 43(5), 393-402.
- Little Hoover Commission. (1979.) *Personnel Management in the State Service*.
- Little Hoover Commission. (1999.) *Of the People, by the People: Principles for Cooperative Civil Service Reform*.
- Little Hoover Commission. (2005.) *Serving the Public: Managing the State Workforce to Improve Outcomes*.
- Kravchuk, R. S., & Schack, R. W. (1996.) Designing Effective Performance-Measurement Systems under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. *Public Administration Review*, 56(4), 348-358.
- Melkers, J., & Willoughby, K. (2004.) Staying the Course: The Use of Performance Measurement in State Governments. *Managing for Performance and Results Series*. IBM Center for The Business of Government.
- Musolf, L. D. (November, 1963.) Career Executive Assignment in California: Documents with an Introduction. *California Government Series No. 2*.
- Musolf, L. D. (1964.) California's Career Executive Assignment: II. A Perilous but Necessary Voyage. *Public Personnel Review*, 25(2), 87-89.
- Musolf, L. D. (1971.) Separate Career Executive Systems: Egalitarianism and Neutrality. *Public Administration Review*, 31(4), 409-419.
- Performance Management Council. (2010.) *What Gets Measured Gets Done: Performance Management in California State Government*.

- Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (1991.) The Senior Executive Service: Is It Improving Managerial Performance? *Public Administration Review*, 51(6), 554-563.
- Poister, T. H., & Steib, G. (1999.) Performance Measurement in Municipal Government: Assessing the State of the Practice. *Public Administration Review*, 59(4), 325-335.
- Reh fuss, J., & Furtado, D. (1982a.) Bureaucratized Executive Management Reform: The California CEA Case. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 4(4), 381-394.
- Reh fuss, J., & Furtado, D. (1982b.) Executive Management Reform – The Case of California. *State Government*, 55(2), 43-49.
- Reh fuss, J. A. (1986.) A Representative Bureaucracy? Women and Minority Executives in California Career Service. *Public Administration Review*, 46(5), 454-460.
- Rosen, B. (1981.) Uncertainty in the Senior Executive Service. *Public Administration Review*, 41(2), 203-207.
- Selden, S. C., & Brewer, G. A. (2000.) Work Motivation in the Senior Executive Service: Testing the High Performance Cycle Theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(3), 531-550.
- Stanton, S. (2011, January 1.) 10 Things to Watch for a Sacramento Turnaround in 2011. *The Sacramento Bee*, pp. 1A. Retrieved January 7, 2011, from <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/01/01/3292192/10-things-to-watch-for-a-sacramento.html#>

Steinberg, H. I. (2009.) State and Local Governments' Use of Performance Measures to Improve Service Delivery. *AGA CPAG Research Series: Report No. 23.*

United Employees Law Group. (2010.) *California Other Exemptions*. Retrieved March 22, 2011, from <http://www.california-labor-laws-attorneys.com/california-other-exemptions.php>

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2010.) *Guide to Senior Executive Service Qualifications*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from http://www.opm.gov/ses/references/GuidetoSESQuals_2010.pdf