MASTER'S THESIS

M-645

DOWDELL, Robert Hartley.

TRENDS IN THE FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION OF
DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION.

Carleton University, M.A., 1964

Political Science, public administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Trends in the Functions and Organization
of Departmental Personnel Administration.

ROBERT
R.H. DOWDELL
HARTLEY

A thesis submitted to Carleton University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Political Science 590
August, 1964.

ABSTRACT

"Trends in the Functions and Organization of Departmental Personnel Units"

R.H. Dowdell

October 1964

There have been two distinct phases in the emergence of the departmental personnel specialist. The first was contemporary with the initial organization of departmental personnel units in the ten years after World War II, and consisted of the gradual achievement of consensus regarding the proper role of the Personnel Officer. It culminated in the concept of the personnel adviser, moving in top management circles, and asserting a strong influence on manpower management policies and practices through the application of knowledge, technical and social skills, and personal traits. The second phase has been devoted to organization: to the achievement of a suitable occupational framework as the basis for recruitment, training and compensation; and to the organization of personnel units in departments.

Beginning in 1960, the departmental personnel function was subjected to a thorough-going examination, which culminated in 1963 with the development of an occupational structure for departmental personnel specialists which paralleled those of the two central agencies, and gave promise of achieving full parity with them as the general level of qualifications increased. Simultaneously, an increasing degree of acceptance has been achieved for placing the personnel unit directly under the Deputy Minister, in recognition of the importance of his responsibilities in personnel management, and his need for direct access to expert advice.

INTRODUCTION

For more than a decade, personnel administration in the Public Service of Canada has been under scrutiny both by its practitioners and by consultants from the private sector. The objectives of these studies have been diverse but they may be subsumed under two headings: clarification of the functions of personnel administration, and the improvement of its performance. To one degree or another, one of the major concerns in studies under both of these headings has been the respective roles of the departments and the control agencies—the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Board. Gradually, this triune balance of power has shifted in favour of the departments, and (a corps of departmental personnel specialists has emerged) to enable them to assume their responsibilities. As departments gradually assumed greater responsibility, the role of the departmental personnel unit has increased in importance. But more significantly, its basic character has changed. Initially little more than a centre of clerical tasks, the personnel unit has come to be regarded as an important source of advice to management.

The period of this significant transition has been very brief. Less than a generation ago, no government department had a recognizably specialized personnel officer. Today, such officers not only exist, but suggestions from influential quarters urge that they be admitted to the highest counsels of management. In view of these circumstances, a number of questions arise: how has this rapid development come about? How well prepared are the personnel specialists to meet the demands they face?

This paper proposes to examine these questions. Three main areas will be considered:

- (i) the evolution of the role of the departmental personnel unit;
- (ii) the ability of the personnel occupation to secure the talent required to do its job;
- (iii) the organization of departmental personnel units.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	Page 3 & 4
Part I The Evolution of the Personnel Function.....	1
Part II The Organization of Departmental Personnel Administration.....	25
A. Occupational Structure.....	25
B. Organization of Departmental Personnel Units.....	38
Conclusion.....	53

PART I

THE EVOLUTION OF THE PERSONNEL FUNCTION

Personnel administration, as a specialized aspect of management in the Federal Civil Service, is a war baby. But whereas in the United States, its origins can be traced to World War I, in Canada, it was World War II which fostered the development of this function. Prior to that time, deputy ministers personally handled matters involving recruitment, promotion and the evaluation of jobs, and worked closely with the control agencies in these activities. The records required in connection with pay, leave and attendance, and superannuation were the responsibility of the accounting office.

Although not recognized as such at the time, the first step toward a specialized personnel function was taken when, with the coming into force of the revised Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act of 1931, departmental accounting staffs were absorbed by the newly created office of the Comptroller of the Treasury. Left behind in the departments were a number of functions not directly concerned with the pre-audit of accounts - among them the maintenance of personnel records. The nature of the activities associated with these records meant that, initially at least, personnel administration as a specialized activity in departments was essentially a clerical function.

During World War II, the Civil Service increased enormously in size and complexity. Many thousands of temporary employees had to be found under conditions of acute labour shortage, and had to be trained in duties which reflected new functions of government. It quickly became necessary to assign relatively senior people to carry out the recruitment, training and organization of this greatly enlarged work force, and personnel management gradually emerged from behind the

clerk's desk and began its slow progression into the councils of management.

This emerging group of personnel specialists found many resources already at hand. In the United States, personnel administration had grown into a recognizably separate occupation almost twenty years earlier. It had developed a body of literature, and a number of organizations for its practitioners had been established. In the public sphere, the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada (later renamed the "Public Personnel Association") fulfilled this role. This international organization was supported by local chapters in major centres of government activity. Its objective of improving public personnel administration has been carried out by providing for personal contact and the interchange of experience, as well as by conducting research and providing consultative services to improve methods and techniques. It fostered an awareness of the importance of the personnel function, and helped to develop a degree of self-confidence among personnel officers who were still rather uncertain of themselves and the role they ought to play.

Among the returning veterans were many who had acquired experience (during their military service) in various phases of personnel administration such as aptitude testing, selection, training and counselling. Many of these veterans found employment in civilian personnel work, both in the Public Service and in industry. As the responsibilities of departmental personnel officers increased, pay levels were adjusted to a point where the trained staff of the Civil Service Commission began to be attracted, and these officers were among the first full-fledged "chiefs of personnel" in several departments.

The personnel function was given considerable stimulus by the report in 1946 of the Royal Commission on Administrative Classifications in the Public Service, whose chairman was (now The Honourable) W.L. Gordon. In its report, the Commission stated: "The existing machinery and procedures for the

administration of personnel matters in departments are generally rudimentary in form and routine in operation", and in the same section:

"The appointment in every department of an experienced and properly qualified personnel officer with adequate rank and power would promote general efficiency by improving staff management and affording relief to Deputy Ministers".¹

The choice of the term "relief" in the Commission's report is a significant one, for it implied keeping deputy ministers free of the many details which were the concern of those involved in personnel administration at this time, and which were regarded as its major characteristic. The most important task of the personnel specialist in a department was the presentation to and defence before the Civil Service Commission of departmental needs in recruitment and classification. The Civil Service Commission, despite shaky beginnings prior to World War I, continual harassment by politicians for the next two decades and one or two "scandals" involving malpractices in examinations, had developed a considerable expertise in personnel activities. The merit principle as the guiding philosophy of personnel administration was securely established, and its legislative framework, the Civil Service Act of 1918, had proved to be highly durable despite the enormous pressures of wartime recruitment. Ironically, the major defect of this Act was the very rigidity and inflexibility which had prevented the service from degenerating into the chaos which, in 1918, had marked the demise of its predecessor, the Civil Service Act of 1908. The Commission's massive body of rules and regulations, its procedures and its attitudes, seemed to be based on the assumption that departments were stupid or dishonest, or both. The frequent parliamentary enquiries in the 1930's had left in the minds of many of its employees a fear of further harassment if the slightest error was detected, and elaborate procedures were developed to ensure that every case and every person was treated in exactly the same way. Self-protection was justified

¹ Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on Administrative Classifications in the Public Service, (Ottawa, 1946), quoted in J.E. Hodgetts and D.C. Corbett, Canadian Public Administration, (Toronto, 1960) p. 262.

in the interests of protecting the public from malfeasance and the departments from themselves. As a result, every action required endless explanation and defence, and departmental administrators could not avoid the feeling that, from the Commission's point of view, no results at all were preferable to results that might be obtained by methods which deviated from the rules.

By the early 1950's, most departments had established personnel units, but their functions varied widely, reflecting differences in the degree of acceptance and use of their services by departmental management—as, indeed, is still the case. However, there had emerged in the Public Service a distinct personnel community which was increasingly conscious of the more developed state of its art in the United States, and which felt the need to seek out and develop its own purpose and identity. An organization known as the Public Personnel Institute had been formed in 1947, comprising the Chiefs and Directors of Personnel from departments and crown agencies, and senior officers of the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Board. The purpose of this organization was to bring together people responsible for policy-making in personnel administration to discuss common problems and more consistent ways of dealing with them, and to mould a service-wide approach to personnel matters. The Institute established a committee in 1956 which was asked "... to examine and report ... on the functions and organization of the personnel branches of the Public Service, and the grading of duties and salaries as personnel officers."². The committee's report is less comprehensive than its terms of reference suggest. Instead of reporting on the existing state of affairs, it made recommendations which were designed to bring some consistency into a field in which ideas and practices varied widely, and in which there were sharp differences of opinion. The report is of some significance in examining the

2. Public Personnel Institute, Committee Report on Personnel Programmes in Government Agencies, (Ottawa, 1956), p.1.

evolution of thought and practice in personnel administration, and at least as much so for what it emphasized as what it glossed over or omitted altogether.

Appendix "F" of its report comprises the committee's consensus on what the functions of a departmental personnel unit ought to include. It is reproduced here in its entirety because it represents a major point of reference in much of what follows.

APPENDIX "F"

DETAILED PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

1. POLICY

- A. Advise head of Agency (Department, Board or Crown Corporation) on all matters under the jurisdiction of the Personnel Branch.
- B. Make recommendations to the head of the Agency on personnel policy.
- C. Interpret agency policy and control agency's instructions.
- D. Liaise with control agencies on all matters pertaining to personnel management.
- E. Co-ordinate personnel practices within the agency.
- F. Carry out research on personnel matters.

2. ORGANIZATION AND CLASSIFICATION

- A. Advise head of Agency concerning:
 - Organization necessary to perform the agency's functions.
 - Establishment of positions to carry out agency's functions.
 - Salary levels.
 - Working methods.
- B. Perform job analysis, including the preparation of job description, job specializations and evaluation of positions.
- C. Conduct community wage surveys to establish the going rate, and make recommendations to bring Department wages and salaries in line with the community level.

3. EMPLOYMENT

- A. Assist in recruitment, selection and placement of employees, involving interviewing, testing, physical examinations, check of references and obtaining approval of supervisor.
- B. Prepare suitable induction programme, including formal training and follow-up.
- C. Arrange with outside agency for security clearances, and prepare necessary documents in connection with same.

4. STAFF CHANGES

- A. Establish lines of promotion, including:
 - Records to aid in the identification of eligible employees for promotion.
 - Information for the organization relative to promotion policies and lines of promotion.
 - Establishment, in co-operation with employees, of rules and regulations regarding seniority.
- B. Establish policies regarding transfers.
- C. Formulate policy regarding discharges, including:
 - Information to supervisors regarding agency policies governing discharges.
 - Information to employees regarding agency discharge policies.
 - Detailed records with supporting data of all discharges.
 - Removal of the causes for discharge as far as possible.
- D. Recommend demotion policy.
- E. Carry out exit interviews to determine reason for employees leaving, and make periodic analysis of reasons for separations, including preparation of Labour Turnover Statistics.

5. TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

- A. Formulate and direct training programme in keeping with agency's objectives, involving:
- Pre-hiring training in co-operation with local public or private vocational training enterprises.
 - Apprentice training.
 - Training of new employees.
 - Training of present employees in improved methods.
 - Training of employees for transfer, promotion and versatility.
 - Training of foremen and minor supervisors.

6. HEALTH AND WELFARE

- A. Arrange for initial and periodic physical examination.
- B. Ensure that provision is made for providing First Aid to the injured, and medical treatment for minor illnesses.
- C. Co-operate with local Health Authorities.
- D. Carry out health education.
- E. Conduct studies of causes, and methods of eliminating fatigue, monotony, mental strain and occupational diseases.
- F. Conduct surveys and studies of the rate of absenteeism.
- G. Organize and co-ordinate a safety programme within the Department, including safety education, studies of the cause of accidents, safety inspection and guidance of employees' safety committees, safety contests, and preparation of safe-practice codes.
- H. Ensure that there is adequate fire protection.

7. EMPLOYEE SERVICES

- A. Arrange for advances on wages to new employees.
- B. Perform necessary work in connection with:
 - Mutual benefit societies.
 - Credit unions.
 - Pension plans.
 - Unemployment insurance.
 - Workmen's compensation.
 - Group Life and Hospital insurance.
- C. Arrange for financial aid for employees attending outside classes at approved schools and colleges.
- D. Organize and supervise employee recreational activities.
- E. Supervise operation of cafeterias.
- F. Counsel employees in personal matters.
- G. Carry out general educational activities not related to training for agency jobs.
- H. Prepare and issue employee magazines and bulletins.
- I. Perform administrative duties in connection with Department's Housing schemes.

8. GROUP RELATIONS

- A. Liaise with employees' associations and unions.
- B. Negotiate contracts.

9. RECORDS

- A. Set up and maintain central file of all major personnel records.
- B. Make periodic check of all records for such items as retirements, statutory increases, transfers, special training and promotions.

- C. Study all statistical data to determine trends or action to be inaugurated.
- D. Prepare special reports for executives and supervisors.
- E. Study and analyse personnel trends and programmes of other Departments and industry.

Virtually everything that has been written on personnel administration takes as one of its principal theses the view that the personnel officer is a staff officer—an adviser to management. But Peter Drucker has observed the disparity between the statement of this philosophy and the emphasis which personnel writers and practitioners place on the programmes which personnel units operate themselves.³ The Public Personnel Institute's report is a classic example. In paragraph 8, the main body of the report states:

"All the authoritative writers in our field remind us that the personnel officer should be a consultant or adviser. He exists as a specialist to help line officers improve their ability to administer staff."

Despite this statement, even a cursory examination of the Committee's list of functions confirms Drucker's point. Only items 1-a ("advise the head of the agency on all matters under the jurisdiction of the personnel branch"), and 2-a (regarding advice on departmental organization) are clear examples of an advisory role. Item 4-c mentions giving information to supervisors and employees on policy governing discharge, but this is "informing" rather than "advising". The other functions in the list are expressed in terms of what the personnel unit does, rather than what it helps management to do. For example: the personnel branch will establish lines of promotion (4-a), formulate and direct a training programme (5-a), formulate policy regarding discharges, including the removal of causes for discharge wherever possible (4-c), supervise and organize recreational activities (7-d).

³ Peter F. Drucker, The Practice of Management, (New York, 1954), pg. 277.

Perhaps a clue to the attitudes behind these expressions lies in item 1-a, already mentioned: "to advise the head of the agency on all matters under the jurisdiction of the personnel branch" (underlining mine). If the personnel officer is an adviser, then personnel administration is clearly not under his "jurisdiction", but rather a function of all levels of management. It should be borne in mind that many personnel units in the Civil Service were only a few years old at the time of this report, and were (and to some extent, still are) concerned with carving out a distinctive role for themselves. What is more natural than they should seek an area of jurisdiction comparable to that of their fellow executives in the operational units of the agency? The new personnel offices got their start by taking over many of the functions previously performed by line managers, and tended to guard their newly-established preserves rather jealously.

A further reason for this emphasis on doing rather than advising may be found in the distrust of the "specialist" in the capacity of others to do the job properly--an attitude which, more often than not, is a rationalization of his lack of confidence in his own capacity, and his fear that the amateur can, after all, do the job as well as he can. These factors are mentioned because, despite the greater degree of understanding and acceptance of the advisory role which now prevails, it is still not fully understood or practiced as it should be--and for substantially the same reasons.

By today's standards, there are some major omissions in the functions ascribed to personnel units in this report. There is no mention of the analysis and projection of manpower requirements, the development of programmes to systematically appraise and develop staff to meet these requirements, or the forecasting of recruiting needs. Then as now, effective manpower planning was almost non-existent in the Civil Service, but there is at least, in recent years, a growing awareness of this deficiency, and steps have been initiated in some departments to remedy it. For many years, planned staff development

was characterized as the "crown prince" method of promotion, and was looked upon as involving a kind of favouritism incompatible with the merit system of competitive selection. It was not until recently that the merit principle (involving equality of opportunity to be considered and selection based on fitness for the job) was clearly distinguished from the merit system, or the methods by which the principle is put into practice. The merit system is still based entirely on selection by competition, and planned assignments or training in anticipation of advancement have tended to be regarded as "pre-selection"--an invidious method of stacking the deck in favour of a particular employee. It is now recognized, however, that, provided there is equality of opportunity to be considered for special training, and an acceptably valid method of identifying talent for development, career planning and the merit principle are by no means incompatible. But both of these prerequisites impose added responsibility on the personnel office, who must advise management on methods which will get results without destroying morale.

The Civil Service Act places responsibility for the selection of employees for promotion with the Civil Service Commission. However, in the early 1950's, departments began to conduct competitions within their own jurisdictions, subject to post-audit and approval by the Commission. Despite this limited form of delegation, the Commission was looked upon as having the primary responsibility for selection methods, and the Institute's report makes no mention of the personnel officer's responsibility for the development of appropriate techniques and advising management on their application. However, the Commission's inability to effectively control departmental promotions by the post-audit method gradually made personnel officers more aware of their responsibilities, and at the same time generated pressure for full delegation. In 1962, the Commission delegated more fully the responsibility for conducting promotion competitions, and made provision for doing so even when they are interdepartmental in scope. However, departmental authority

is still curtailed, since the departments must conform to practices and procedures prescribed by the Commission and are subject to periodic inspection of their competitions. Furthermore, all non-competitive promotions are still subject to the Commission's approval.

Section 2 of the "Detailed Personnel Functions" deals with an area of activity which has undergone major changes. Here it is stated that it is the responsibility of the personnel officer to advise on the organization necessary to perform the agency's functions, and to perform job analysis and job evaluation. In 1956, a systematic annual review of departmental establishments by the Treasury Board had been in operation for only two years. The "establishment review" procedure imposed a heavy burden on personnel officers, who had been accustomed to justifying the need for additional staff whenever the occasion arose. It forced departments to examine their requirements more systematically, and all at once, for the next fiscal year. Each change in organization had to be examined and reported upon by the Civil Service Commission, which also had the responsibility for classifying any new positions approved. Departments were ill-equipped to present sound arguments for organization changes on such a large scale because the Commission had a virtual monopoly of expertise in organization and position classification. Gradually, however, departments began to develop their own groups of specialists to formulate and defend their organization and classification needs. But no sooner had this trend been established than the "organization and establishment" units began to slip away from the personnel branches into separate divisions reporting independently to senior management. A great stimulus in this direction was given by the Civil Service Commission in 1958, when it recommended that it should cease to exercise any element of control over departmental organization.⁴ Correctly anticipating that this

⁴ Civil Service Commission, Personnel Administration in the Public Service, Queen's Printer, (Ottawa, 1958), p.12.

recommendation would be accepted in revising the Civil Service Act, departments placed more emphasis on developing their resources in this field and senior management in some departments began to feel that the scope of this activity warranted the attention of a special unit separate from the personnel branch. This trend has continued to the point where it can no longer be stated that advising on organization is a generally-accepted responsibility of the personnel unit.

In summary, the Institute's description of personnel functions was a useful effort to clarify the duties and responsibilities of personnel officers, and to bring about some consistency among the various departments and agencies. However, it was deficient in failing to identify more clearly the advisory role in specific personnel activities, and in emphasizing programmes which the personnel branch administers itself. It also neglected many of the broader aspects of personnel management such as manpower planning and staff development.

Less than a year after the publication of the Public Personnel Institute's report, events began to take place which initiated a process of rapid change in the concept of the personnel officer's function. In 1957 Arnold Heeney, former Clerk of the Privy Council and at the time Canadian Ambassador to Washington, was appointed Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. The other two Commissioners--Ruth Addison and Paul Pelletier--had been in office for less than a year, and none of the three had had any prior experience in the Commission itself or in personnel administration generally. These three, neophytes in the personnel business though they were, were asked by the St. Laurent government to review the Civil Service Act and Regulations and examine the role of the Commission in the machinery of government.

The Civil Service Act had been on the statute books for 39 years, and although amended in a minor way several times, its basic character had remained

substantially as Sir Robert Borden's Union Government had devised it, and as it had been thrust upon a startled Parliament, Civil Service and public in 1918. It had been a radical piece of legislation, designed as strong medicine for the chaotic conditions which existed in the Civil Service in 1918. These conditions had been largely the result of rampant patronage which was the sequel to the virtual collapse of the delicate and circumscribed merit system created in 1908. The new Act made the entire Civil Service—outside Ottawa as well as inside—subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, which was given exclusive power to recruit, select and appoint staff, evaluate positions, review the organization of departments, recommend rates of pay and related benefits, and regulate hours of work and leave privileges. What the Commission gained in authority, departmental management lost, and the rump of responsibility in personnel matters left to the departments is the most important single factor in the failure of departmental personnel specialists to emerge for more than twenty years.

The new legislation was highly successful—painfully so, from some points of view—in curtailing patronage and setting the merit system on a firm basis. But its very success depended on the rigidity with which its terms were applied, and the imposing structure of procedures which were created to implement them. Any tendency the Commission staff might have had toward a more flexible approach soon evaporated under the heated criticism levelled at the organization by still-hostile Members of Parliament in a series of detailed enquiries over the next 18 years. Forced to defend every action, and subject to criticism for good reason or no reason at all, the Commission's staff became ultra cautious, and habits were formed which became a way of life in the organization for a generation. The fact that one chairman held office for almost 20 years, and was succeeded by a commissioner who had come up through the ranks of the organization, did not encourage the examination of time-honoured ways of doing things.

The inflexibility of the basic legislation governing personnel administration in the Civil Service does much to account for the fact that many of the new government agencies created during the 1930's, the war years, and the post-war period were exempted from the Civil Service Act. As government activities expanded into areas in which operations had to be on a basis more comparable to private business, and as senior business executives were recruited to administer these activities, it was found less and less desirable to curtail management's responsibility for personnel administration in the manner which prevailed in the older departments. As a consequence, by the late 1950's almost half of the civilian public service was not subject to the regime created under the Civil Service Act. This inconsistency had long been a source of concern to people both inside and outside the Civil Service, and was one of the main reasons for the government's request that the Commission examine the legislation and its own role in personnel administration.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Heeney, and supported by a full-time secretariat⁵, the Commission began a wide-ranging examination of personnel administration in mid-1957. Its report, published in December 1958, and entitled "Personnel Administration in the Public Service"⁶, made scores of detailed recommendations. Basically, these were focused on five main objectives:

- (i) To clarify the respective roles of the control agencies--the Commission itself and the Treasury Board--and the departments;
- (ii) To reunify the public service under a single legislative framework for personnel administration;
- (iii) To strike an effective balance between the pressures from departments for greater administrative freedom, and those from

⁵ The author had the privilege of being a junior member of the secretariat.

⁶ Personnel Administration in the Public Service, op.cit.

staff organizations for more uniform central controls in the interests of protecting employees from arbitrariness and lack of consistent management practice;

- (iv) To provide a greater measure of participation by organized employees in the determination of their conditions of employment;
- (v) To provide in the legislation for some of the more modern techniques and concepts in personnel administration.

More than a year elapsed before the Cabinet completed its review of the Commission's recommendations, and turned over to the legislative draftsmen the basic content of a new Civil Service Act. Not all of the Commission's recommendations were accepted—notably those on the veterans' preference, and the application of the legislation to the whole public service—but the new Act bore unmistakably the stamp of the Heeney Report. However, between the publication of the Report and the introduction of the Act, an event took place which had important effects on the Act itself and the subsequent activities of the Commission and the departments. No sooner was the report published than its major author—Mr. Heeney—was posted back to the diplomatic circles of Washington. Six months later, he was replaced by The Honourable Sam Hughes, a Justice of the Ontario Supreme Court, and grandson of the redoubtable World War I Minister of Militia of the same name. Mr. Justice Hughes brought with him an intense interest in the role of the Commission as a quasi-judicial agency, arising out of its responsibility for hearing appeals against disciplinary actions and promotions.

The new chairman's contribution to the drafting of both the Act and the Regulations was an insistence on legal precision at the expense of administrative flexibility, and after the Act was put into effect his pre-occupation with courtroom justice led to the cancellation of many departmental actions as a result of appeals. An Act which had been designed to promote administrative flexibility was used to create procedural rigidities to a degree previously unheard of, and while the volume of work in the Appeals Division mounted, departmental administrators seethed in

frustration.

Many provisions of the new Act bore the seeds of major changes in departmental personnel administration. Matters of departmental organization were clearly defined as a departmental responsibility, subject to such controls as the Treasury Board might apply. The Commission was to provide a consultative service when invited. Although retaining its exclusive authority in matters of appointment, the Commission was empowered to delegate the selection of staff to departments. Staff development and training, and discipline, were clearly established as the primary responsibility of departments. The transfer of employees within a department was henceforth subject to less control by the Commission, and deputy ministers were given much more leeway in administering the various categories of leave which were established to meet virtually every contingency.

The new Civil Service Act was still a bill before Parliament—neither enacted nor proclaimed in force—and its full implications only vaguely understood, when another series of shockwaves were felt. The Conservative government fulfilled an election promise by appointing a Royal Commission in September 1960 to examine the organization of the public service and make recommendations to improve its efficiency. Reports from the now-famous "Glassco Commission" began to be published in the summer of 1962, and the first volume contained both a "plan for management" and a report on personnel management.

Two members of the Royal Commission were from the business world, and the third was a former Auditor General, Mr. Watson Sellar, who like both his predecessors and his successor, throughout his tenure of office urged that he be given more authority to appoint and pay his own staff.⁷ Many members of the various

⁷ For a full exposition of this theme, see Norman Ward, The Public Purse, (Toronto, 1962). This work is an interesting and informative history of financial management in the federal public service, and highlights in particular the role of the Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons.

"task forces" established to examine specific aspects of administration were also from private business, although substantial contributions were made by the universities. To suggest, therefore, a certain bias in the Commission's point of view is not altogether unwarranted. One of the basic themes in the report is the desirability of giving management the authority to manage, subject to strict accountability for results, and many of its recommendations are aimed at the plethora of controls established by the central agencies, particularly in matters of personnel and finance. The Commissioners found what to them appeared to be the most suitable standard in the operations of the crown agencies which are exempt from the Civil Service Act. To the extent that protection against patronage is still required, the Civil Service Commission could provide it by certifying appointments after satisfying itself that selections were free from improper influence and that recruitment was reasonably calculated to obtain the best person available. In the interests of an orderly approach to the labour market, the Commission should continue to provide a recruiting service for positions up to a specified salary level (\$5,200 per annum was suggested), but only as a matter of administrative convenience and subject to change by the Treasury Board. The element of control would vanish. Pay research would continue with the Civil Service Commission, as would the hearing of appeals in disciplinary cases. All else would be the responsibility of departments, under the benevolent guidance of a reconstituted Treasury Board. The Board would relinquish detailed control over establishments, finance and allowances, and concentrate instead on the development of administrative policy and standards, and evaluation of management practices.

The Royal Commission's recommendations would end the fragmentation of authority and responsibility in personnel management by giving management the freedom necessary to manage its personnel, and by holding it accountable for performance. But the importance of human resources in the public service—which

the Commission has regarded as proportionately greater than in industry⁸—demands that this freedom be exercised upon the best advice available. Consequently, the Report attached great importance to the personnel units in departments, and in particular to the competence of senior personnel officers. The Treasury Board should interest itself in the development of competent personnel officers and should have the authority to rotate them between departments in the interests of staff development and to provide additional support in areas of administrative weakness. The staff of the Treasury Board itself should be staffed by the rotational assignment of senior departmental officers. This arrangement would guard against a feeling of superiority in the central agency, as well as broaden the viewpoint of departmental officers. Chiefs of Personnel should be fully accountable to their departmental superiors, but their careers should, at least in part, be subject to judgements on their effectiveness by the Treasury Board staff. They would thus be an extension of the Treasury Board in the departments—in them, but not wholly of them—and their advice, or failure to concur in a management proposal, would not be taken lightly.

The Glassco proposals have, since shortly after they were made, been under scrutiny by a new agency called the Bureau of Government Organization, "BUGO", as it is called, has the task of examining the feasibility of the Glassco recommendations and co-ordinating the efforts of departments in implementing those which are adopted by government. It seems certain that in the main, the Glassco proposals will be accepted, but taking into account some of the features of the public service which, whether by accident or design, the Royal Commission's "business-minded" approach appears to have overlooked. One major controversy centres around the respective roles of the Civil Service Commission and the departments in recruitment and selection. There is mounting evidence that, although

⁸ Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on Government Organization, Queen's Printer (Ottawa, 1962), p.245.

departments would like to see more flexibility and a great deal more speed in administration of these functions, they are loathe to assume as much responsibility as Glassco suggests. The Royal Commission felt that patronage was no longer a factor which required serious attention, and that it could be contended with by having the Civil Service Commission certify appointments. The more important issue was managerial freedom. However, many senior officials doubt that an effective method could be devised whereby, with only a post-audit, the Civil Service Commission could adequately satisfy itself as to the absence of improper influence in selections. There are still enough areas of the service in which patronage is still a "malign influence"⁹ that civil servants in general, and heads of departments in particular, do not feel quite as sanguine about this matter as the Royal Commissioners. But if complete managerial freedom in recruitment and selection is, as yet, not desirable, the authority of the Civil Service Act under which the Commission can delegate these matters could accomplish much the same objectives while retaining better safeguards. The Civil Service Commission could lay down procedures and standards under which departments could operate particularly with reference to occupations unique to a given department, while continuing to recruit and select for classes common to many departments, or for departments which are not yet prepared to assume the responsibility.

The reconstitution of the Treasury Board has already begun. A Cabinet Minister has been appointed President of the Board, with no other departmental responsibilities. This indication of a clear separation of the Treasury Board staff from the Department of Finance confirms with a major recommendation of the Glassco Commission, and suggests the adoption, in time, of others—including the creation of divisions of the Board's staff to concern themselves with programmes, personnel, and administrative improvement. There remains the ticklish problem of

⁹ Sir Robert Borden's descriptive epithet, quoted in Personnel Administration in the Public Service, op.cit.

demolishing the structure of controls and replacing them by standards against which managerial performance can be evaluated. This will be no easy task, and to accomplish it will require finding the solution to a problem which has plagued theorists and practitioners in public administration for a long time—how to find a substitute for business's "profit standard". The Royal Commissioners, perhaps in an excess of optimism, glossed over this point and made no specific proposals. The likelihood is that there will be no simple solution, but the continued search in each specific administrative function for improvement in practice and the measurement of results.

Hard on the heels of the publication of the first reports of the Glassco Commission, the government announced the formation of a committee to study the implication of collective bargaining in the Civil Service. In doing so, it virtually committed itself to major alterations in the processes by which civil servants participate in determining their conditions of employment. The Civil Service Act of 1962 had done little more than provide a legal basis for the "consultation" between staff organizations on the one hand, and the Commission and the Treasury Board on the other, which had been going on for years. The new Act required these agencies to "consult" when the staff side requested it, but their recommendations to government remained entirely unilateral. The staff associations were highly dissatisfied with these provisions when they were announced, preferring a form of collective bargaining suited to the unique requirements of the Civil Service. However, their wishes might have been expressed to no avail for years had not the government itself provided what could be taken as proof that civil servants were indeed "second class citizens", denied the basic rights of employees in business and industry. In mid-1962, only a few months after the new Act officially went into effect, the government announced that, as part of a general economy drive, it was suspending action on pay increases recommended by the Commission. The fact that cyclical group A—the professionals—had received a revision only a few months before

only made matters worse. Civil Servants had no difficulty convincing themselves that they were being "taxed" to make up the government's mounting deficit, and were bearing an inequitable share of the austerity measures. Any private employer would quickly have had a strike on his hands. Talk mounted of a slow-down after the fashion of the "work-to-rule" method used in the United Kingdom Postal Service. Mass meetings were held and paid newspaper advertising was used to take the case of Civil Servants to the public. In the announcement of its pre-election platform, the Liberal opposition supported collective bargaining for the public service, and a few months after its victory in the election of April, 1963, it announced the formation of the Preparatory Committee.

The Committee has not yet reported, and so it is difficult to predict what form collective bargaining might take in the Civil Service. However, the fact that collective bargaining in one form or another has been virtually decided upon has important implications for personnel administration. The moment that pay determination becomes the subject of bargaining between the government and its employees, the agency which bargains on behalf of management must control the entire pay determination process. This must include position classification, which is now a responsibility of the Civil Service Commission. That is not to say that the classification of individual positions would be the subject of bargaining. It is the over-all classification structure which will be the concern of collective bargaining, and since the Civil Service Commission is responsible to Parliament, and not to the government, it could hardly be the agency of government in this phase of the bargaining process. In addition to this, the desirability of having a unified management approach in dealing with Staff Associations suggests the necessity for the government's bargaining agent to be in a position to control those matters which come within the terms of the collective agreement.

To move responsibility for position classification (or whatever methods of job evaluation might replace it) from the Commission to the Treasury Board does not necessarily change the situation as far as the departments are concerned. However, the Board does not now have the staff to cope with this added work load, unless it takes qualified people from the Commission. The Board may well do this. But there are many people in departments who are also qualified to classify positions. In the atmosphere generated by the Glassco recommendation it is likely that consideration will be given to delegating to departments the authority to classify positions, within policies and standards promulgated by the Treasury Board. Delegation would mean the assumption by departmental management of a major operational responsibility in personnel administration, and it might foreshadow delegation in other matters, notably recruitment and selection.

Formal collective bargaining will probably lead to a personnel regime more comparable to industry in other ways. Grievance procedures have been instituted in only a few of the larger departments—notably National Defence, Post Office, Agriculture, and recently in Veterans Affairs. There is at present no firm policy basis in such arrangements, and it is left up to management in each department to take whatever steps it considers warranted. Although the collective agreements will be made with the government as employer, rather than with individual departments, various terms of the agreement which have administrative implications at the departmental level will be the occasion for more active relations between the staff group and departments than has with some exceptions been the case in the past.

The very existence of collective agreements, involving the precision and detail which has become characteristic of union-management relations in industry, will place a heavy load on senior personnel officers who will be looked to by management for advice in interpreting them. Line officers and supervisors will require training, advice and guidance in dealing with staff against the background of more formal labour-management relations. In some departments, industrial relations is

already one of the major responsibilities of the personnel unit, and will become increasingly so in most others. The advisory role of the Personnel Officer will take on broad new significance--provided he is adequately prepared for it.

PART II

THE ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

Having examined the evolution of the functions of the departmental personnel unit, we now turn to an examination of the organizational arrangements through which these duties and responsibilities are carried out. There are two aspects to this subject: first, the occupational structure; and second, the various forms of organization of departmental personnel offices.

A. OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

A description of the occupational structure is a convenient transition between the preceding discussion of the duties and responsibilities of departmental personnel officers, and the description which follows of the organizational framework within which they work in their departments. When we speak of the organizational structure of an occupation in the Civil Service, we mean its classification structure. Position classification in the Civil Service is the basic method of job evaluation, i.e., the determination of the relative worth of jobs. There are various methods of job evaluation, including point rating, factor comparison, the ranking method, and others which combine elements of two or more of these.¹⁰ However, the classification method has been used in the Civil Service virtually without exception for more than four decades. To apply this technique, positions involving similar duties and responsibilities must be segregated into separate classes, and differences in complexity and responsibility recognized by establishing a series of grades in the class. A pay range is then established for each grade. The appropriate class and level of an individual position is determined either by comparing it with others which have already been classified, or by comparing each position to a predetermined standard description of the class and each grade in it. The latter is by far the

¹⁰ A number of standard works on personnel management have good sections on the various methods of job evaluation. See for example: J.L. Otis and R.H. Leukart, Job Evaluation, second edition, (New York, 1954); or P. Pigors and C.A. Myers, Personnel Administration, (New York, 1951), pp. 257 and following.

better method, but it is more difficult because it involves the complex task of preparing a class standard. To do this, there must be an extensive analysis of the jobs in the occupation, general agreement as to common features, the segregation of representative positions into as many distinct levels of responsibility as can be clearly differentiated, and finally the preparation of a composite description which incorporates the common factors of the positions which have been allocated to each level. To achieve all of this, there must be reasonably general accord among those involved in preparing the standard regarding the nature of the duties and responsibilities in the occupation, and the factors which determine both the number of grades and the basis for differentiating between them.

The classification structure of an occupation is a major factor in determining pay and career opportunities, and consequently the ability of the occupation to compete effectively for new recruits to its ranks, particularly when many prospective recruits have alternative career possibilities open to them. Periodically it is necessary to review the classification structure, and the standards on which it is based, to ensure that they reflect accurately the work performed in the class, and the adequacy of its career opportunities. Conversely, class standards can be manipulated, and by incorporating higher performance requirements at each level, they can be used to raise the over-all tone of the class.

The classification structure in departmental personnel administration was for many years centered around the class Personnel Officer 1-6, which was supplemented by several grades of the more general Administrative Officer class to provide for the more senior positions, including Chiefs and Directors of Personnel. In one or two departments, departmental classes such as Postal Officer was used. The Personnel Officer class was established in 1954 in an attempt to provide adequate standards and a suitably attractive career structure. However, the class standards developed at that time were based on an incomplete consensus regarding duties and responsibilities.

and on the kind of rudimentary concept of the functions in personnel administration reflected in the class description prepared by the Public Personnel Institute, (see pages 5 to 9). Various attempts were made over the next few years to incorporate developments in the functions of the occupation, but the result was an unsatisfactory patchwork, made only partially workable by "gentlemen's agreements" and a reliance on "prevailing patterns" of position classification for comparison purposes. Both the Finance Officer class, used by the Treasury Board staff, and the Civil Service Commission Officer class, had been established later than the Personnel Officer class, and because they contained a higher proportion of university graduates to begin with, they were able to secure a classification and pay structure equivalent to professional and scientific classes. The Personnel Officer group, with less than 15 percent university graduates as late as 1963, was prevented from achieving an equivalent structure, and was less able to compete for better qualified people.

The Glassco Commission's emphasis on management's responsibility for its own personnel administration, and the demands that the assumption of such responsibility will make on departmental personnel officers, made it clear that a way had to be found to break out of the vicious circle which kept the classification structure inferior because of poorly qualified staff and which in turn made it difficult to attract and retain better people. Moreover, a re-definition of the duties and responsibilities of the occupation was necessary to take into account the greater demands which had been and would be made on it. The Civil Service Commission therefore established a committee consisting of a senior officer of its Pay and Standards Branch and the Chiefs of Personnel from eight major departments. Representative personnel jobs in these departments were studied, segregated into identifiable levels, and composite descriptions were prepared. From these, a more general description of the occupations' work content was developed. But rather than describe in this way the situation as it was, the committee enriched the job content by laying greater stress on advice to management, participation in the management process, and a number of specific functions such as programme review, manpower

analysis, and staff development. Qualification requirements at each level were stiffened, and university graduation was established as the desired level of academic training. Personal and intellectual qualities and social skills of a higher order were stressed, with a view to demanding knowledge in greater depth, breadth of outlook and comprehension, and the qualities which would make it possible for personnel officers to contribute effectively at senior management levels.

The new class—Personnel Administrator—has six grades. The first is a training grade, followed by junior and senior working levels. Personnel Administrator 4 is the first level of supervision, while 5 and 6 provide for the supervision of progressively larger and more complex programmes. Levels 3, 4, 5 and 6 also provide for functional specialists in activities such as staff development, programme review and manpower planning. Basically, however, this class is designed to structure duties which are embraced in a general personnel service. Positions concerned wholly with specialist activities such as training, job evaluation and organizational analysis are omitted, and will be provided for in separate classes of their own. The class also excludes positions providing for Chiefs and Directors of Personnel, which are currently described in a variety of "one man" classes (e.g., Superintendent of Civilian Personnel, Department of National Defence; Director of Organization and Personnel, Department of Agriculture) or the upper levels of the more general Administrative Officer class.

The class standards in general, and the grade descriptions in particular, provide a picture of the personnel activities which the committee felt that management now requires to be performed. The following are the basic elements of personnel programme content described in the class standard.¹¹

1. Recruitment, selection and placement (analysis of jobs and writing of job specifications; new appointments; promotions; transfers).

¹¹

Canada. Civil Service Commission Classification Standard for class "Personnel Administrator".

2. Staff development and manpower planning (induction; career development; performance evaluation; assessment of training needs; staff rotation; counselling; provision for re-training and relocation of displaced personnel).
3. Group employee relations (formal and informal relations with employee representatives and employee groups).
4. Individual employee relations (appeals; grievances; discipline; counselling).
5. Staff services and controls (administration of staff benefits, pay, allowances and records; hours of work; housing, food and recreation facilities, particularly in isolated areas; safety; advice in the areas of health and welfare).
6. Analysis, evaluation and development of personnel programme (review of policies, procedures, methods; development of new policies, procedures, methods; studies of problem situations e.g., high turnover, lack of applicants, absenteeism, low morale).
7. Information (two-way) and advisory services in all of the above areas, both verbal and written, using such communication media as directives, circular letters, manuals, bulletin boards, house organs, new sheets, interviews, meetings, conferences, visual aids, joint committees.
8. Training, organization and classification functions may be found in some positions in combination with the functions listed above, but, in this class, they are not primary functions.

Here are "characteristic duties" of a Personnel Administrator 3—the senior working level:¹²

- Provides advice and assistance on the application and implementation of various approved personnel policies, practices and procedures.
- Reviews unusual or problem cases in such areas as employee performance, discipline, absenteeism, grievances, health, welfare, working conditions, and initiates remedial action, in conjunction with the line supervisor concerned,

12. *ibid*

using the resources of service agencies where appropriate.

- Advises line officers on problems of organization and classification.
- Represents the department, or advises the departmental representative, on selection boards; interviews candidates for exempt positions and either selects or advises the line officer on the selection, using trade tests and other devices, of those to be appointed.
- Keeps abreast of changes in prevailing rates, securing wage data for particular areas and initiating action to have similar changes authorized for the department.
- Conducts studies in areas of personnel administration where difficulties are being encountered; identifies the nature of the problem and recommends remedial action. Examples of such studies would be; analysis of turnover (using turnover statistics, exit interview reports; of accidents on duty; of absenteeism; of overtime; of grievances and appeals; of working conditions.
- Determines the manner in which lay-off policy and procedures can be applied in a particular situation and devises a detailed plan for putting it into effect.
- Under direction of a senior specialist undertakes specific assignments in the areas of staff development, staff welfare or personnel research, e.g. makes an inventory of jobs and job relationships to determine lines of promotion; determine training needs by reference to performance reports, interviews with supervisors, etc.; conducts attitude surveys.
- Provides information and advice to line officers in connection with the development of first aid and safety programmes.
- May act as advisor to, or member of, performance review committees and advise supervisors in planning development programmes for their staff.
- May conduct the annual review of local establishments in the field and prepare the recommendations, a) for changes in organization and classification and b) for the addition or deletion of positions.
- May arrange for supervisory training courses, particularly in the field.

- May draft material required for the production, or revision, of a personnel manual.
- May draft instruction leaflets, circular documents or handbooks for particular groups of employees.

The following are situations characteristic of Personnel Administrator 6—the senior level in the class:

- (1) provides a general personnel service to a moderately large (9,000. - 15,000.) segment of a department in which operational complexities of a high order are present;
- (2) acts as second-in-command of a personnel service in a medium size department (2,000. - 9,000.);
- (3) directs a functional segment (e.g. staff development, employment, etc.) of a personnel programme in a moderately large department.

These examples illustrate that throughout the class, but more particularly at the senior levels, the responsibility for advising management on the effective utilization of human resources has become the primary characteristic of personnel administrators.

The salary structure provided for the Personnel Administrator class was designed as a transitional phase to full parity with other professional classes. The maximum rate for each level in the class is equal to corresponding levels in the scientific and professional classes, but the Personnel Administrator class has lower maximum rates, smaller annual increments, and more of them. Moreover, the Personnel Administrator class is in group B of the cyclical salary review, whereas other professional classes, including Civil Service Commission Officer and Finance Officer are in group A. Consequently every two years there will be a period of up to six months during which the rates for group A classes are higher than the Personnel Administrator rates. It is planned to consider the Personnel Administrator for group A but until this is done the present salary policy affects the classes in

this way:

Personnel Administrator 3	\$6,990	\$7,200	\$7,440	\$8,040	\$8,400
Civil Service Commission Officer 3 (prior to revision announced in February, 1964)		7,320	7,680	8,040	8,400
Civil Service Commission Officer 3 (revised)		7,560	7,920	8,280	8,640

It is anticipated the future revisions of the rates in the Personnel Administrator class under the biennial salary review procedure will bring about full equality. In certain other respects, however, the Personnel Administrator class is still at a disadvantage, and will remain so, unless other changes are made. Its principal competitors for talent are the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Board. These agencies have distinct advantages which have been built into the classification structure of the classes Finance Officer and Civil Service Commission Officer. In the Personnel Administrator class, the senior working level is Personnel Administrator 3 (maximum \$8,400);¹³ in the Civil Service Commission Officer class, it is level 4 (maximum \$9,300); in the Finance Officer class, the senior working level is also level 4, but this grade has a higher salary range (maximum \$10,300) than either Civil Service Commission Officer 4 or Personnel Administrator 3. Similarly, the first level of supervision in these classes is Personnel Administrator 4 (maximum \$9,300), Civil Service Commission Officer 5 (maximum \$10,300), and Finance Officer 5 (maximum \$11,800).

The creation of the Personnel Administrator class has at best mitigated but certainly not removed the competitive advantage of the control agencies in attracting and retaining talent. Fortunately, the staffing demands of the Treasury Board have never been high, and the Commission's will be reduced substantially as its present activities pass from its jurisdiction altogether or are delegated to the departments. Yet the anomalies remain, and if the Treasury Board, which in future will control

¹³ Salaries quoted are those applicable before the cyclical revisions of 1964. As already mentioned, the Civil Service Commission Officer and Finance Officer classes are in cyclical group A, and were revised early in 1964. At the time of writing, revisions for group B have not been announced. Comparison of salaries is distorted unless this "lag" is discounted, although as mentioned, the lag accentuated the problem described.

both classification and pay, takes seriously the role which departmental personnel Administrators are expected to play, it must use its powers in this field to create a classification structure which will facilitate rather than impede the interchange of staff between the central agencies and the departments, and cease to offer the artificial inducements which now exist for top quality people to eschew the departmental field. In short, it must restrain itself from using its authority to its own advantage.

The creation of the Personnel Administrator class was a deliberate attempt to improve personnel administration by building into the class structure higher standards of performance and higher qualifications as the basis for achieving them. Once the class was established, it was necessary to measure those currently employed in personnel administration against these new standards. In co-operation with the departments, the Civil Service Commission carried out an appraisal of over 300 personnel officers, and over 200 of them were interviewed as a part of the appraisal programme. It was found that fewer than a third were qualified for the new class. Most of the remainder represent the results of years of selection against much lower standards, and wholly inadequate training. It is doubtful that many of these employees will ever be able to demonstrated the intellectual and social skills which modern personnel administrator demands. Some will be accommodated in the administrative support class which is now under study, and which will embrace non-clerical activities which do not involve advice to management. Until this class is defined, its content would be difficult to predict accurately, but it will probably include the management of the administrative activities associated with pay, leave and attendance, records, and employee benefits; the duties concerned with obtaining, manipulating and presenting personnel statistics; the development of systems and procedures, etc. Finally, there will remain people who will simply have to be carried until they find other lines of work or retire. This attrition will make it possible to replace them with better qualified people--mostly university graduates. It will be a slow process, and the achievement of a higher overall level of performance in personnel administration will

be correspondingly delayed. Better qualified people in the occupation will be overburdened, and management will receive something less than the kind of service it will require in the next few years. The occupation will have to grow up at an accelerated pace to meet the demands which will shortly be placed upon it, and this period of accelerated growth will be one of crisis because too few well qualified people will be available to do the jobs which management will require to be done.

B. ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL UNITS

We turn now to an examination of the manner in which the human resources of the personnel occupation, and in particular the generalist Personnel Officers, are deployed in their departments. This involves the problems of organizing personnel services, and will cover the following aspects:

1. The place of the personnel division in the total organization structure of the department—its position in the managerial hierarchy;
2. Division of responsibility for the personnel programme;
3. The internal organization of personnel units;
4. Supporting clerical services;
5. Centralized versus decentralized personnel services.

1. THE PERSONNEL DIVISION IN THE DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

Managerial activity involves the use of two basic resources: money (and the command it provides over materials, property and equipment) and people. The Glassco Royal Commission pointed out in its report that, in industry, considerations involving plant, equipment, and materials have a relatively greater prominence than they do in the Public Service, where "the effective use of people is the primary determinant of success in fulfilling its obligations to the citizens of Canada".¹⁴ Moreover, whether in government or industry, the human resource is the most expensive, the most complex, and potentially the most useful one available to management. Many

¹⁴ Canada, Royal Commission on Government Organization, I p. 245.
R.H. Leukart, Job Evaluation; or P. Pigors, and C.A. Myers;
Personnel Administration, pp. 257 and following.

writers on the practice of management believe that in the future, the achievement of higher levels of productivity will depend to a greater degree on the more effective use of human resources than on technological advances. Chris Argyris, in particular, believes that most people work far below their capacity, and he discusses the great reserves of "psychological energy" which must be tapped if work is to be not only more productive, but of even greater importance, more satisfying to human beings.¹⁵ Our society is learning to demand from the work situation not merely a source of livelihood, but an environment in which the creativity and mental capacities of the individual can find a satisfying expression and room for growth. Management and the worker are making greater demands on one another: on the one hand, for performance in keeping with the demands of an increasingly complex technology, and on the other, for an organization of the work processes which satisfies the higher human needs. A management policy which emphasizes one at the expense of the other will be relatively less effective, and will involve the waste of resources. In the terminology of Blake, who developed the concept of the management grid, neither "production-oriented management", nor "country club management" can survive.¹⁶

Given the importance attached to the effective use of human resources, the policies, plans and actions of top management should be constantly subject to the influence of the best advice available on sound personnel administration. To achieve this, the personnel unit should be located as close as possible to the top of the organization structure. Each level which is interposed between the responsible executive head of the organization and his personnel specialists reduces their effectiveness by lengthening lines of communication and distorting the information they carry. The executive head's advice on personnel management will come primarily from those who are directly accessible to him, and if these people are not well informed or are relatively unconcerned with personnel administration, the advice they give will be less than fully effective.

¹⁵ Chris Argyris "Integrating the Individual and the Organization", Chapter II.

¹⁶ Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid, (Houston, Texas, 1964).

Judging by this standard, a cursory examination of departmental organization structures might support the conclusion that personnel units in most departments are well placed to fulfill an effective advisory role. Sixteen out of twenty-five personnel divisions report to one of the two top levels in their departments; the Deputy Minister, or an executive immediately below him. Seven of the remaining nine report to the third level. There are only two which are so low in the organizational hierarchy that it would be difficult to ascribe an effective advisory role to them. A more detailed examination indicates, however, that this situation is not as good as it looks. In only four departments--Citizenship and Immigration, Post Office, National Health and Welfare, and Mines and Technical Surveys--does the Chief of Personnel report directly to the Deputy Minister. Such an arrangement will be implemented in a re-organization now under way in Forestry, and is provided for in the emerging organization of the personnel division which will serve jointly to Departments of Defence Production and Industry.

In the group reporting to the second level, only two personnel divisions--Defence and External Affairs--report to an officer of Assistant Deputy Minister status. The others report to an executive with the title of "Director of Administration" or "Director of Administration and Personnel", who, as the title implies, has responsibility for a number of administrative and other services.

Sometimes this group of administrative functions is very comprehensive indeed. Two examples illustrate this:

1. Department of Transport

2. Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources

In some cases, the interposition of another level between the Chief of Personnel and the Deputy Minister has little effect in curtailing the direct access of the former to the latter. Some Directors of Administration tolerate, if they do not encourage, being by-passed. Alternatively, they may subscribe to arrangements under which the Chief of Personnel keeps his nominal senior informed about matters in which he deals directly with the Deputy Minister. However, this arrangement is a source of confusion and potential conflict.

From the standpoint of the personnel division, the greater danger is that a nominal "Chief of Personnel" may become effectively only the second-in-command of the personnel organization. When the personnel division is combined with other administrative services under a director who combines a strong personality with an active interest in personnel matters, he tends to be recognized both within and outside his department as the "de facto" Chief of Personnel. This has happened in certain of the largest departments, and in several smaller ones. The nominal Chief of Personnel tends to be regarded as a rather shadowy, unauthoritative figure, and the status and effectiveness of the personnel specialists under him suffers accordingly. If the Director of Administration is competent, senior levels of management will be capably advised, but one man alone cannot carry the responsibility for advising all levels, and the intermediate levels of management tend to be poorly served. The Director of Administration may, at worst, have little knowledge of personnel administration, but by insisting on his prerogatives, may block the access

to senior management of those better qualified to advise them.

The deputy minister is the key figure in determining the quality of personnel administration in his department. As the Glassco Report pointed out: "His attitude and his example establish the standards for dealing with personnel problems....."¹⁷ His attitudes and example will, to an important degree, depend on the quality of advice he receives. If the advisory role of the personnel specialist is to have optimum effect, it must be focussed upon and directly accessible to the deputy minister. The fact that, in over three quarter of the departments in the Civil Service, the Chief of Personnel reports to a lower level in the organization indicates that the organization structure has not yet been adequately adapted to his advisory role.

2. DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PERSONNEL PROGRAMME

The total personnel programme of a department comprises all of the activities having to do with the selection, training, compensation and effective employment of staff. It would seem logical for all such activities to be the concern of a single unit of the department. There are, however, cases in which the personnel programme is fractured into several units which report separately to a higher level of management. The "breakway" activities tend to be those having to do with job evaluation, organization, and establishment control. However, in the Department of Transport, reference to the chart on page 36 shows that there are three separate "personnel" units reporting to a Director of Administration and Personnel: personnel services, training and welfare, and the organization and research unit. The latter division is concerned with job classification, pay studies, and the study of organization structure. In the Comptroller of the Treasury's Office, Customs, and Income Tax, the personnel division and the establishment and classification division report separately to a Director of Administration or equivalent. In Post Office, the establishment and classification unit is the responsibility of the Operations Branch

¹⁷ Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on Government Organization, I, p. 364

The appointment of specialists in organization was a much later development than was the case with personnel officers. This newest group of advisors to management also tended to be drawn from different disciplines: engineering, time and motion study, and the operations and methods function. As a result, their interests tend to be centered more in things and structures rather than people and their motivations. The more highly expert they become, the less they find a generalist-oriented personnel unit congenial to them. They tend to operate rather independently in any case, and there is a noticeable trend toward breaking off into separate units. Because of the intimate connection between organization and classification—i.e., the definition of jobs and the pricing of them—the two functions have tended to move together. Since pay determination will not be negotiable at the departmental level, it is unlikely that collective bargaining will affect this trend one way or the other. However, it is very probable that an increased emphasis on programme budgeting, and a genuine measure of departmental responsibility in financial administration, will accelerate the separation of personnel and organization. Manpower is the biggest single cost of operation in most departments, and it is felt by some authorities that the unit concerned with programme planning from a financial point of view should also have the responsibility for organization and manpower planning.¹⁸

In only one department so far has training been separated from personnel administration: the Department of Transport. It will be recalled that in this Department, there are three personnel divisions (personnel services, training, and establishments and organization) which, together with an administration branch, report to a Director of Administration and Personnel Services. It is interesting to note that

¹⁸ Separation of the "staff control" unit from the personnel unit is recommended by the Civil Service Commission's Organization Division. See "Organization Guide on the Staff Control Function in the Internal Organization of Departments and Agencies" Civil Service Commission of Canada Organization Division Memorandum no.6, April 1963

the administrative divisions have been united in a separate branch, whereas the personnel divisions have not. The close interest of the director in the personnel side of his division has caused him to be regarded as the de facto chief of personnel, and there has been neither the need for nor encouragement of the development of a single individual to unify the personnel programme. This situation illustrates clearly the effect of a single strong personality on the organization structure which develops around him.

Training specifically related to the development of operational skills (e.g. meteorology) has generally been recognized as the responsibility of the operating branches in all departments. However, the more effective training officers attached to personnel units have provided valuable assistance even in this area, as well as—providing for more general needs, including the development of managerial skills and training in effective supervision, safety, report writing, etc. When, as is the case in Defence Production, effective staff development programmes result from a sound appraisal of staff which is linked to an assessment of manpower requirements, the training unit can come to overshadow the personnel services group and become the source of the most valuable advice on personnel management.

3. THE INTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF PERSONNEL DIVISIONS

As might be expected, there are many variations in the structural arrangements through which personnel functions are carried out. A convenient starting point for an examination of these arrangements is the pattern proposed by the Public Personnel Institute in its 1956 report.¹⁹ The following chart is reproduced from that report:

¹⁹ Op. cit., Appendix D.

It will be noted that there are four main divisions, and that the Staff Services Division is in turn broken down into five units. This is an arrangement by functional specialization. In fact, few departments have ever organized exclusively along such lines, although functional specialization has usually been the case in connection with some activities. It is generally true that, where the personnel division is responsible for this activity, organization and classification is the function of a specialist unit. Training has also generally remained separate wherever it has developed to a reasonably sophisticated level. However, staff services and group relations have generally been combined, and together provide the sphere of activity of the generalist personnel officers. The activities having to do with group employee relations, employment and promotion, counselling, grievances and appeals, and employee health and welfare are assigned to sections which service a particular branch or group of branches in the department. Normally, a single officer is in charge of such a section, with subordinate officers to the extent required by work load. The following are examples:

1. Department of Public Works

denotes generalist personnel service

2. Mines and Technical Surveys

denotes generalist personnel service.

Although it is a widespread practice in private industry for the personnel division to have responsibility for the supervision of facilities to provide emergency medical care, and for advising management on health standards and safe working conditions, this practice has not yet developed in the Civil Service. A Civil Service Health Division has been organized under the Department of National Health and Welfare, and provides consultative service, emergency care and health education facilities for employees at Ottawa. No such provision is made for employees at other centres. Little at all is done in connection with programmes to develop safety consciousness, largely because the responsibility for this function has never been clearly established. The Government Employees Compensation Branch of the Department of Labour provides liaison with the provincial Workmen's Compensation Boards through which employees are compensated in the event of accidents on the job. This division also produces a limited amount of safety literature. However, there is no well developed programme of inspection of work premises, and although some departments do some safety training, most personnel officers devote little or no attention to this activity. Fortunately, most civil servants do not work under particularly hazardous conditions, and it is therefore probable that the lack of an urgently felt need is primarily responsible for the neglect of the safety function.

The supervision of the day-to-day activities in personnel administration involves a great deal of detail. No matter how well trained the subordinate personnel officers may be, there are numerous exceptional cases which must be handled at a higher level. If the Chief of Personnel handles these matters himself, he tends to become so enmeshed in detail that many important activities related to policy formulation, and the maintenance of close working relationships with top management, tend to suffer. Some departments have sought to answer this problem by establishing a position of Assistant Chief of Personnel. The duties of this officer tend to be organized in one of two ways. In some departments, he is responsible only for the general supervision of the generalist personnel activities; that is, the personnel officers who provide services to the various branches of the department report to him. Under this arrangement, the specialist activities--training and development, and establishments and classification--report separately to the Chief of Personnel. This is the case in Mines and Technical Surveys, Comptroller of the Treasury, Fisheries, Forestry, and until recently, the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources. In a number of other cases, however, the Assistant Chief is responsible for all of the day-to-day activities in personnel administration, including both the generalist and specialist activities. This gives him considerably broader responsibilities, although it does not preclude the Chief of Personnel from dealing directly with any unit or officer in the division in connection with a particular project or problem. This arrangement is perhaps ideally suited to the objective of relieving the Chief of Personnel from direct involvement in the details of day-to-day administration. He can then concentrate more effectively on policy review and development, and working closely with top management. The sketches on page 42 of the organization of the Personnel units in Public Works and Mines and Technical Surveys illustrate these alternatives.

An effective advisory role in personnel administration presupposes a specialized knowledge of the personnel field, and it also requires a good knowledge

of the functions and problems of the unit of organization serviced. The most effective service will be provided by a personnel officer who has a good general knowledge of his own field, who can consult with more specialized members of the personnel staff, and who has developed a good working relationship with the management of the unit he services. Line managers tend to prefer such an arrangement to one in which they have to deal constantly with an array of specialists. The situation invites drawing a parallel with medicine, in which, despite the growing importance of the specialist, the general practitioner provides the closest, most effective link between the patient and the profession. In their internal organizational arrangements, therefore, departmental personnel units appear to have struck an effective balance between generalist and specialist. The fact that the generalist group has been the first to be organized into a "professional" class by the Civil Service Commission not only underlines the importance of this group, but will help to offset the inevitable tendency towards increasing specialization.²⁰

4. SUPPORTING CLERICAL SERVICES

The activities of every personnel unit include a great amount of paper work in connection with appointments, pay and allowances, leave and attendance records, superannuation, the administration of employee benefits such as group hospital-medical plans, and sometimes the maintenance of establishment records. The proper functioning of these activities is of vital importance to the personnel unit, for they include services which touch upon the welfare of all of the employees of the department. Errors can mean that a pay cheque is late, or not properly calculated, leave credits are granted or withheld improperly, or information required for managerial decisions is inaccurate. The clerical unit tends to create an image for the personnel division, and if that image becomes unsatisfactory, it is most difficult for personnel officers to gain this confidence on the part of management without which they cannot assume effectively the broader responsibilities of the advisory role.

²⁰

See F.A. Nigro, "Public Personnel Administration", pp. 78-80, on the roles of the generalist & specialist; also, D.E. Watters, "Generalist & Specialist", Personnel Administration. XVII, no. 1 (January, 1954).

Most departments have a single clerical unit under the supervision of a senior clerk or administrative officer who reports to the Chief or Assistant Chief of the personnel unit. This officer is frequently referred to as an "office manager". One exception to this pattern is the Department of Northern Affairs, in which the supervision of related clerical services is the direct responsibility of the generalist personnel officer who services a given portion of the Department. Under this system, no one person is designated as having responsibility for the total clerical operation, and there is a marked tendency for personnel officers to become involved in clerical details. Fortunately, most personnel divisions have avoided this arrangement.

Within the clerical unit, two quite different methods of organization are evident. One may be termed a "functional" or "specialist" system, under which each clerk deals with a single subject—pay, leave and attendance, superannuation, establishment records, etc. Each member of the staff becomes highly expert in his own field of subject matter, but they are interchangeable only to the extent that special training is provided.

The second method is the "cell" or "unit" system, under which each clerk is responsible for all of the clerical activities for a given portion of the department. This system requires each employee to become conversant with a much broader range of regulations and procedures, and makes training more difficult. At the same time, the staff is more flexible because they can interchange with or replace each other on short notice. Peak work loads can thus be divided more readily, with the result that the numbers of employees required to perform these services is kept to a minimum. Not the least of the advantages of this arrangement derives from the fact that it has made the work more interesting and challenging for the employees concerned. They now handle a more complete and integrated work process, in which the impact of their endeavours on the welfare of employees in the section of the department for which they are responsible is directly evident. Probably without realizing it, the originators of this system have applied the techniques of "job

enrichment" suggested by Argyris²¹ and other writers who are concerned with the stultifying affects on human personality of job simplification--i.e., the rationalization of the work process into simplified, one-or two-step processes which can be performed with little or no training. Departments which have adopted the unit system for their clerical activities in personnel administration have been uniformly satisfied with the results obtained. Departments which have not adopted this system recognize its merits, but point out the difficulties involved in changing existing procedures, and of obtaining suitably qualified staff. They are probably more pessimistic than they have a right to be regarding the capacities of their present employees, and have not recognized the fact that they will never develop a better qualified staff with their existing organization of work.

5. CENTRALIZATION VERSUS DECENTRALIZATION OF PERSONNEL SERVICES

Comparative examination of the organization structure for personnel services in the various departments indicates a rather interesting anomaly. Personnel service to the various branches of the department at headquarters is provided by a central unit which either reports independently to the Deputy Minister, or through a Director of Administration who is also in a staff relationship to the operating branches. The sole exception to this arrangement is the Department of Agriculture which will be discussed later. By contrast, in the field personnel officers tend to be responsible to the head of the field establishment, and only functionally responsible to the personnel organization at headquarters. Thus, it may be said that at headquarters, personnel services are centralized, in that personnel officers service the operating branches, but are not under the direct control of the heads of these branches; whereas in the field, personnel services may be said to have been decentralized not only in the sense that the personnel officers are physically located in the field, but also that they are directly responsible to the head of the field establishment.

²¹ See particularly "Personality and Organization".

Before proceeding to examine the implications of this situation, certain exceptions should be noted. In the Departments of Citizenship and Immigration and National Revenue (Customs and Excise), field personnel officers are directly responsible to the personnel division at headquarters, and their relationship to the local operating units is exactly the same as at headquarters. The reason for this arrangement appears to be that in both departments, the field staff serviced are composed of elements of two headquarters branches which operate quite independently of each other, and which are not linked organizationally at the field level. Since neither group, even in the largest field offices, is large enough to have its own personnel officer, and neither wishes to be serviced by a personnel officer who is under the administrative control of the other, there is no solution but to have the personnel officer directly responsible to the headquarter's personnel division.

It was stated that the Department of Agriculture is an exception to these arrangements, and this is so in two senses. First, personnel services have been decentralized to the operating branches at headquarters, and second, despite its size, there are no field personnel officers in the strict sense of the term.

The following diagram illustrates the organization arrangements for personnel services at headquarters:

The Departmental Directorate of Organization and Personnel, which reports through the Director-General of Administration, is responsible for broad personnel policy and procedures, and for the administration of certain personnel activities, such as professional recruitment and selection, which are department-wide in scope. The Organization Section is responsible for advising management on matters of organization structure,²² for reviewing classification recommendations from the branches, and for maintaining central establishment controls. The Personnel Section, under a "chief personnel officer" is responsible for the general supervision of departmental recruitment and selection activities, training directed toward the development of managerial talent, and for assisting branches in the handling of more difficult personnel problems, notably those requiring counselling or involving appeals. Each of the two main branches--Research, and Production and Marketing--has its own personnel unit, the head of which reports to a branch Director of Administration. None of the field establishments has a local personnel officer, although in the Research Branch, whose field establishments tend to concentrate employees in larger numbers in one location, limited personnel service is provided by an administrative officer who reports to the head of the establishment, and is also responsible for finance, purchasing, and frequently for the direction of non-research farming operations through a farm foreman. The Board of Grain Commissioners, which has its headquarters at Winnipeg, has its own personnel officer, but this should not be regarded as an exception to the pattern described above. The Board has always operated to a large degree independently of whatever department it happened to be attached to, and despite its location, it must be regarded as part of the headquarters complex of the department, rather than of its field operations. It is noteworthy that, although Winnipeg is the only location at which the department has a personnel officer outside

²² A Management Services Division entirely separate from the Organization & Personnel Division, has recently been established with overlapping jurisdiction in matters of organization. Its creation suggests the possibility of a shift in responsibility for organization matters away from the Organization & Personnel Division.

Ottawa, this officer does not provide personnel services for other components of the departments in the same locality.

It is ironic that the reasons for both the decentralization of personnel services at headquarters and the complete absence of field personnel services may be traced to the same source. The two main branches--Research, and Production and Marketing--have always had a greater degree of autonomy from central departmental control than is the case in most other departments, and because of the dissimilarity of their functions, they have little contact at the field level. The autonomy of these branches has been the reason, at one and the same time, for decentralized personnel services at headquarters, and for the failure to find sufficient common ground to provide the basis for a department--wide personnel service at the field level.

The Civil Service Commission's recent experience, as a result of the implementation of the new Personnel Administrator class, tends to indicate that field personnel operations in most departments are relatively ineffective. A much higher proportion of the field personnel officers failed to qualify for the professional class than was the case with those at headquarters. Personnel operations in the field have a tendency to be largely clerical in nature, and there is little evidence to suggest that they are looked upon as sources of advice to management on personnel matters of major consequence. However, there is a significant exception to this rule: the Department of National Defence. This Department has a two-tiered field personnel operation: the command level, which in turn is broken down into component units--areas, camps and stations. Personnel officers are responsible to the Commanding Officer of the field unit, although the headquarter's personnel group maintains a close and effective functional control. Field personnel officers in the Department of National Defence, particularly at the command level, have a much more effective role than in most other departments. The probable reason is that military administration is based on a relatively extensive delegation of authority in local

matters, and consequently Commanding Officers have the authority to take action in a wider range of personnel matters than is the case with field officers in other departments. The high degree of effectiveness of the decentralized personnel operation in the Research Branch of the Department of Agriculture is similarly accompanied by a significant delegation of authority to the branch level.

If the current emphasis on the assumption by management of its proper role in personnel administration continues, it may be assumed that not only will departments undertake more responsibility in personnel management but they will delegate more responsibility to the operating branches. Should this come about--and there are many signs to suggest that a process of this kind has already begun--decentralization of personnel services to the branch level will be necessary if personnel officers are to provide effectively the kind of service which branch management will require. Thus the current anomaly of centralization at headquarters with decentralization in the field will at least be less pronounced even if it is slow in disappearing altogether. Consistent with this approach, field administrators should be given more responsibility in personnel management, and accordingly will have to have available to them more effective advice on personnel matters than is now the case.

The Civil Service Commission has written into the standards for the Personnel Administrator class the assumption that a group of fewer than 200 employees in a single field jurisdiction (whether at one location or distributed over several) is too small to warrant the appointment of a full-time personnel officer. This staffing criterion may require some revision with further experience, but even if the number is reduced somewhat, there will remain departments with too few employees in one field jurisdiction to warrant a full-time personnel officer. Nevertheless, the employees of such departments taken as a group constitute significant numbers. It is no answer to suggest that a field personnel officer be given a large enough geographical area to provide the required number of employees. In the case of some departments, this area would be so large that it would have little advantage over the provision of personnel

service directly from headquarters. One department--Income Tax--is endeavouring to bring together two or more districts into regions, each of which would be serviced by a personnel officer. However, there is no corresponding regional administrative organization, and it will be necessary to attach the personnel officer to one of the districts while having him service the others, or alternatively, have him responsible directly to headquarters as is the case in Customs and Citizenship. The grouping of districts may be a viable arrangement, since Income Tax employees are concentrated in groups of one hundred or more in the larger centres of population. It will be interesting to determine, after a period of trial, whether district administrators are prepared to use to advantage a personnel officer who is administratively responsible to the head of a neighbouring district.

A further possibility was suggested by the Glassco Royal Commission. It was proposed that smaller departments "attach" themselves to larger ones, which would provide their administrative services. For example, the regional personnel office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission could provide personnel services for local units of the Department of Labour, Trade and Commerce, and the Comptroller of the Treasury. Judging from the experience of the Department of Agriculture, which has not yet been able to find sufficient common ground among its own branches and divisions for the sharing of field personnel services, it is difficult to see how the smaller departments could be brought to acquiesce in such an arrangement. If a common personnel service for the smaller departments is feasible at all, the Civil Service Commission might effectively fulfill this role. The Commission has at least one district office in each province, two district offices in Ontario, and sub-district offices in six of the ten provinces. Its field officers are frequently consulted by local departmental officers on a range of personnel matters which exceeds the Commission's jurisdiction, because their advice is more readily available and often regarded as more accurate than could be obtained from departmental headquarters. The Commission's delegation of its authority in recruitment and selection to departments

will mean that it will tend to be seen more as a service agency than a control agency, and might help to create the kind of atmosphere necessary at the field level for its officers to assume, on a more regular basis, a role more like that of a departmental personnel officer. This arrangement would have the effect of broadening the experience of the Commission's field staff, and help the Commission to keep in touch, through its field offices, with a wider range of personnel matters.

CONCLUSION

In less than a generation, departmental personnel administration has passed through several phases of evolution which, as in the case of living organisms, has left vestigial evidence by which its course can be plotted. We find the clerically-oriented personnel officer, obsessed with paper work; the fadist who cloaks his ignorance by seizing upon the latest techniques and gimmicks; the administrative myope, who cannot see beyond rules and regulations; and the personnel parlourmaid, who listens quietly while management decides what it wants to do, but is either too well-bred or too awe-stricken to offer suggestions. However, these are representatives of evolutionary "blind alleys", and the mainstream of progress is in the role of the personnel advisor, competent to guide management in the use of human resources, aware of the importance of doing so, and possessed of the personal qualities necessary for playing a fully effective part in management circles. The full implications of the advisory function, and the qualifications required to fulfill it are not yet fully understood, but at least there is consensus on the broad lines of future development. The new role raises certain ethical questions arising out of relationships with management and staff, and the proper use of the considerable influence which the personnel officer can exert. These questions are complicated by the suggestion of the Classco Commission, to the effect that the careers of senior personnel officers should be controlled to a considerable degree by the Treasury Board.

A number of problems must be resolved if the full potential of the personnel officer's role is to be realized. The classification structure of the occupation must be further improved to provide career opportunities fully equal to

those available to the staff of the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Board. The Personnel Administrator class does not go far enough in this direction. Both the Commission and the Board claim to recognize the importance of better qualified personnel officers in departments and they are jointly responsible for creating the occupational structure by which this can be accomplished. But rather than provide adequately for the best elements in the occupation, they have held back for fear of over-paying the poorest. As a result, departments cannot compete for talent equal to what the Commission and the Board demand for themselves.

Personnel units may be said to exert influence, other things being equal, in direct proportion to their access to the Deputy Minister. In the majority of departments, the formal organization structure inhibits a close working relationship. There is, however, a clear trend toward direct reporting to the Deputy Minister, and failing this, the development of informal arrangements by which intervening levels in the hierarchy are by-passed. These informal arrangements are in one sense not "good organization" but in another sense they are a means whereby the otherwise stultifying effects of hierarchy can be minimized, and if the resulting relationships prove to be effective, they may be formalized later.

Two products of the evolutionary process seem to be particularly well suited to the new role of the departmental personnel unit. One is the apparent success of the generalist over the specialist, as the primary source of advice to management. This is not to denigrate the specialist, but only to suggest that line management gets better service from a generalist who can become familiar in greater depth with the functions and problems of a particular segment of the department, than from a specialist who tends to evaluate problems from a more circumscribed point of view. The specialist is needed, but more as a consultant---a secondary source of advice---or where the problem can be defined largely in terms with which he is familiar. At the clerical level, too, the "generalist" has demonstrated an advantage over the specialist, both in terms of service to the department, and in

terms of job interest and personal fulfillment.

The assumption by departments of more responsibility for personnel management--the result both of delegation from the central agencies and a more enlightened management attitude--will tend to increase the personnel officer's importance in management. The word "tend" is used advisedly, for his potential will only be realized if he has a genuine contribution to make. A great deal of knowledge about personnel management has accumulated, the mastery and application of which is akin to the recognized professions. But there is still a tendency for some managers to regard personnel people as more or less competent amateurs, and their positions capable of being filled by people brought in from other lines of work. It would be a mistake to consider the concept of the personnel expert firmly established and generally accepted. Personnel people must devote more time to formal training, to up-dating their knowledge, and developing greater insight into problems in their field. At the same time, they must not lose sight of the fact that personnel administration is not an end in itself, but rather a means of helping management to do its job more effectively, and of helping people to obtain greater fulfillment in their jobs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper & Co., 1957
- . Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing, 1964.
- Canada. Organization of the Government of Canada. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1963 Edition.
- . Report of the Royal Commission on Administrative Classifications in the Public Service. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1964.
- . Report of the Royal Commission on Government Organization. Vol. I Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1962.
- Civil Service Commission. Personnel Administration in the Public Service. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1958.
- . Organization Guide on the Staff Control Function in the Internal Organization of Departments and Agencies. Organization Division Memorandum No.6, 1963.
- Drucker, P.F. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Hodgetts, J.E. and D.C. Corbett. Canadian Public Administration. Toronto: MacMillan Co., 1960.
- McFarland, D.E. Co-operation and Conflict in Personnel Administration. American Foundation for Management Research, 1962.
- National Joint Council. Report on the Role of the Departmental Personnel Officer. 1962.
- Nigro, F.A. Public Personnel Administration. New York: Holt and Co., 1959.
- Otis, J.L. and R.H. Leukart. Job Evaluation. Second Edition, Englewood Cliffs, N.Y.: Prentice Hall, 1954.
- Pigors, P. and C.A. Myers. Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw Hill, 1951
- Public Personnel Institute. Committee Report on Personnel Programmes in Government Agencies. Ottawa: 1956.

Rodger, L.J. The Role of the Departmental Personnel Officer. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the Institute of Public Administration of Canada. 1957.

Stahl, O.G. Public Personnel Administration. Fourth Edition, New York: Harper and Bros. 1956.

Watters, D.E. Generalist versus Specialist. Personnel Administration, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1954.

Ward, Norman. The Public Purse. Toronto: 1962.