**MANAGEMENT
OBJECTIVE(S)**

To group and assign authority and responsibility for entity functions and tasks in a manner consistent with the entity's mission, goals, and objectives.

BACKGROUND

Organization structure expresses managerial, administrative, and operational relationships within the entity. It also embodies authority, responsibility, and accountability. Organization structure groups activities for the purposes of administration and control and combines duties and responsibilities into jobs. Entity structure is the result of and a tool for implementing operational, financial, human resource, and strategic plans. It influences the entity's ability to communicate, coordinate its functions, and respond to environmental changes. The structure of an entity must simultaneously facilitate planning, problem-solving, policy-making, communications, operations, resource allocation and use, and performance assessment in order to meet the demands placed upon it.

Organization structures are seldom, if ever, entirely rational. They reflect not only objective factors, such as the entity's environment, mission, size, resources, and technology, but also the knowledge and preferences of the entity's leaders and the compromises through which internal power struggles have been resolved. Because of this, they can also be very difficult and costly to change.

DEFINITIONS
(in alphabetical order)

Accountability is the responsibility to complete a job, either personally or by delegation, along with the duty to report that the job has been completed.

Authority is the right to take actions in performing one's job and the power to direct or delegate to subordinates the tasks to be performed.

Centralization occurs when authority is closely held at the top.

Chain of command is the unbroken hierarchy of authority within an entity that links superiors and subordinates.

Decentralization occurs within an entity when authority is delegated throughout the structure.

Delegation is the process of distributing authority and responsibility among entity personnel.

Departmentation is the grouping of entity jobs according to a plan that provides a system of coordination.

Division of labor is the distribution of the components of an entity function among different persons, groups, or machines.

A **job** is the smallest unit of division of labor and consists of the tasks to be performed and the responsibilities associated with such tasks (Bittel, p. 99).
Line activities are those functions performed in direct fulfillment of an entity's primary mission (Bittel, p. 114). The end result of these line activities is usually some kind of client interface.

Matrix organizations group employees according to their technical expertise (their "base area") and then assign them to individual projects and project managers according to project needs. This allows a project manager to utilize specially skilled entity staff for a limited period of time. These employees return to their base areas when the project is completed.

Organizing is the intentional design and structuring of tasks and roles to accomplish entity mission, goals, and objectives.

Responsibility is the obligation to perform a task.

Span of control refers to the number of activities, persons, or departments a manager oversees and coordinates.

Staff activities furnish advice to or support services for the line activities.

Unity of command means that no person within an entity has more than one immediate supervisor.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS

The basic phases of organizing an entity are:
- **Define tasks required to accomplish entity's mission, goals, and objectives.**
- **Group similar tasks into spheres of work (work units).**
- **Distribute authority and responsibility for carrying out tasks.**
- **Determine the extent to which entity activities will be centralized or decentralized.**
- **Determine functional and authority relationships between advisory/support and line staff.**
- **Document entity structure and communicate it in writing to entity staff.**
- **Monitor, evaluate, review, and, if necessary, adjust organization structure.**

PROCEDURES

Suggested procedures, organized according to the elements of a finding, are listed below. They should be expanded or tailored to fit the specific entity being reviewed.

Note: The following procedures and the process described above are normative, rather than prescriptive. That is, they represent "average" or baseline thinking since they assemble information which repeatedly appeared in the various resources used to prepare this module. Do not be too hasty or literal in applying a given criterion or procedural step to a specific entity. While omissions or variations may be obvious, judgment must still be used to determine whether such omissions or variations are material.

Specific criteria   The criteria related to the basic phases of the process of organizing an entity are
                                  as follows:

                                  Define tasks required to accomplish entity's mission, goals, and objectives
                                  Management must determine the division of labor for the entity and its operating
                                  functions.   See the discussions of job analysis in the Planning and
                                  Recruitment/Selection modules in the human resources section.

                                  Organization structure should follow, both logically and chronologically, the
                                  establishment of goals and objectives; that is, form should follow function,
                                  structure should follow strategy (Sawyer, p. 14; Famularo, p. 7).

                                  Group similar tasks into spheres of work (work units)
                                  Each work unit should contribute to overall entity goals and objectives. A
                                  hierarchy of objectives should exist, and members of a work group should share
                                  the same goals and objectives (Sawyer, p. 14; Bittel, pp. 108-109).

                                  Once an entity's work is divided, the jobs must be grouped together according
                                  to a plan (operations plan) that provides a system of coordination
                                  (departmentation). Departmentation can be achieved in several ways:
                                  ●   Departmentation by function groups similar tasks within their own
                                          function, with subfunctions, as appropriate. Divisions may also be
                                          made by occupational categories. Dividing an entity into human
                                          resources, accounting, planning, information systems, and policy-
                                          making is an example of departmentation by function. Advantages of
                                          departmentation by function are that areas are specialized, and
                                          coordinating and monitoring similar tasks is more convenient. The
                                          major disadvantage is that specialized attention to different customers
                                          of products or services may be constrained.
                                  ●   Departmentation by product or services groups tasks according to the
                                          product or service the entity provides. This structure is common to a
                                          product or service organization, such as a machinery manufacturer or
                                          tax-collection entity. Subgroupings (functional subgroups) may also
                                          occur. The advantage of this structure is that each department can
                                          achieve expertise and react quickly to changes in the environment. A
                                          disadvantage is that duplication of subdepartments may occur.

                                  ●   Departmentation by customer or location segments the entity by either
                                          the different customers served or the different geographical locations in
                                          which the entity operates. Subgroupings of functions may occur. For
                                          example, the Department of Human Services has both a central location
                                          in Austin and offices in each of the State's ten health and human
                                          services regions. The advantages and disadvantages of this structure are
                                          similar to those of departmentation by product or services (Bittel, pp.
                                          103 - 106).
                                  ●   Matrix departmentation is used by entities with short-term unique

projects. Project managers use specialized personnel for a specific period of time. Specialists are supervised by both their regular supervisor and their current project manager. The advantage of this structure is that it supports the development of specialized technical expertise while distributing this expertise to the most appropriate operational areas. A disadvantage of this structure is that it violates unity of command because the specialists have multiple bosses for a period of time. Furthermore, specialists may not have a strong commitment to temporary assignment (Bittel, pp. 116 - 117).

●   <u>Process departmentation</u> occurs when activities are grouped into sequential stages. For example, a clerical operation would separate its organization into intake, processing, and closeout. The advantages of this structure are similar to those of departmentation by function. The disadvantage is that the process area may become highly specialized and may not interface well with the next stage in the process.

An entity may be structured according to function, product, services, customer, location, matrix, process, or some combination of these plans.

Distribute authority and responsibility for carrying out tasks
Once an entity determines its structure, appropriate management staff must delegate tasks and the authority and responsibility to complete them. Delegation should include the following elements (Bittel, p. 109):
●   Identify the tasks to be performed.
●   Specify the responsibilities associated with the tasks.
●   Provide authority over resources required to perform the tasks and discharge the responsibilities.

Two key concepts are involved in delegation of authority: unity of command and chain of command. Unity of command implies that no one has more than one supervisor. This eliminates conflict and confusion about implementing tasks. Chain of command refers to the hierarchy of authority linking those at the top of the organization to those at the bottom. Chain of command provides authority to issue commands to those lower in the hierarchy.

Taken together, these concepts imply both that in a traditional organization employees are prevented from going over their supervisor's head with various actions, and managers cannot circumvent intermediate departments with direct orders to those more than one level below. The disadvantages of chain of command are that it may take more time to move through proper channels, and supervisors may be too removed from events occurring down the line (Bittel, pp. 108 - 110).

The chain of command should be as short and direct as possible. Decision-making should be delegated to the lowest point at which employees are capable of making a decision that is consistent with the objectives of the organization

and its related units (Sawyer, p. 14; Famularo, p. 8).

Roles and reporting relationships should be well-defined and understood (Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, p. 3).

Accountability, authority, and responsibility, especially for supervisory personnel, should be clearly aligned and understood (Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, p. 2; Sawyer, p. 14; Famularo, p. 7; Bittel, p. 109).

Determine the extent to which entity activities will be centralized or decentralized
The number of activities over which a manager has authority depends on the nature of the activities. The span of control can be broad or narrow. The span can be broader if:
●   Subordinates function well without close supervision.
●   Subordinates are competent and highly trained.
●   Tasks requiring supervision are relatively routine.

The span of control should be narrower if:
●   Activities are physically located far apart.
●   Operational standards and procedures are few.

Centralization is appropriate when close control of entity processes is important to entity success. With centralization, more managers may be required, and the entity may react more slowly to changes in the policy environment because communications may move slowly through the hierarchy.

Decentralization results in fewer levels of operations and may reduce costs by requiring fewer mid-manager positions. This structure should respond more quickly to changes in the policy environment. Possible loss of control is the greatest disadvantage of decentralization since management decisions lower in the hierarchy may not reflect entity goals or objectives. Therefore, decentralization is most appropriate when initiative and responsiveness to the policy environment are necessary and when the absence of close control will not compromise the entity's mission. A decentralized regulatory entity would allow its regulators in regional offices to make binding decisions about their clients' compliance with regulations. Close control is generally not appropriate in managing professionals (Bittel, pp. 111 -112).

Determine functional and authority relationships between advisory/support staff and line staff
Chain of command does not consider the relationships with entity activities which provide advice or support to line activities. Such activities may not appear on an organization chart. Thus, it is important to delineate the authority of staff activities, whether the area gives advice, requires the line manager to get approval for an action, or has full authority to determine policies for work within

its special area. To prevent conflict between line and staff, the entity should clearly define the roles of line and staff relative to each other (Bittel pp. 114 - 116).

Managers must have access to quality information sources within the entity to facilitate optimal decision-making. This requires building of lateral networks within an entity whose culture supports such relationships. Cross-functional teams or steering committees can network information within the entity to optimize decision-making (Bittel, pp. 114 - 116).

Document entity structure and communicate it in writing to entity staff
An organization chart should be created to show the chain of command and reflect relationships between different areas of the entity. This information should be communicated in writing to all employees.

The organization chart should be logically divided by functions, programs, or activities (Texas Sunset Advisory Committee, p. 2).

The organization chart is a graphic representation of the structural relationships among different parts of the entity. This chart is only a snapshot in time. Actual departmentation and authority relationships may vary from those expressed in the organization chart such that formal and informal relationships may be at odds.

Monitor, evaluate, review, and if necessary, adjust organization structure
At least annually, the entity should review lines of communication, chains of command, unity of command, and spans of control to determine whether the current structure facilitates or impedes decision-making and achievement of entity mission, goals, and objectives.

Staffing patterns should reflect entity mission and priorities. The entity should be balanced, not skewed toward some functions at the expense of others (Sawyer, p. 14; Famularo, p. 8).

The structure should promote sound communication and coordination among different parts of the entity (Texas Sunset Advisory Committee, pp. 2-3).

An organization structure is (Gleim, p. 378):
- effective if it facilitates the contribution of individuals to entity goals and objectives
- efficient if it facilitates entity goals and objectives with minimum resources and fewest unsought consequences

Assess Condition:
  Determine the actual process and structure used

Conduct interviews, observe operations, and identify and collect available documentation in order to gain an understanding of the entity's actual organization structure and the process used to create and adjust it. Included in the actual process/structure are both official/unofficial and formal/informal lines of communication and authority. An official process/structure may exist even if it is not documented. Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Determine where the process of structuring the entity resides in the entity, who participates in the process, and how the participants are selected.

- Obtain and review any manuals, policies, and forms that could document any phase of the process of structuring the entity, including its relationship to entity plans, goals, objectives, strategies responsibilities, and chains of command.

- Determine if and how management consciously selects and employs the assumptions, criteria, methods, processes, and techniques used in the process of structuring the entity. Obtain and review available documentation on the assessment of risks, costs, and benefits.

- Identify mechanisms for linking activities across work units -- regular meetings, standard reports, committees, project teams, quality circles, task forces, user groups, and the like.

- Determine the alignment of accountability, authority, and responsibility and the extent to which entity objectives are understood by persons at lower levels.

- Obtain the organization chart and determine its completeness. Fill in all significant work units on the chart and obtain related staffing reports.

- Extend the organization chart to include interactions with outside parties. Specifically, identify legislative oversight structure, clientele, other entities, and special interest groups (trade or professional associations, for example) and their points of interaction within the entity. (See Policy Environment module for further detail.)

- Based on the complete organization chart and staffing reports (contact the Classification Division for information on how to access some of these):
  - Identify staff-line relationships.
  - Calculate percentage of administrative staff (by job title).
  - Identify the span of control for managers.
  - Count the layers in the organization (chain of command).

- From interviews with managers, briefing books for board or commission members, most recent staffing reports, and other sources, obtain the following for each significant work unit or department:
  - statutory authorization
  - percentage of total entity budget
  - percentage of total entity staffing
  - program(s) administered
  - products or services offered

- clients within and outside the entity
- key activities performed by the work unit
- sequence in work flow for programs/activities that cross unit lines
- dependencies (units on which this unit depends and units that depend on this unit)
- formal objectives if different from those reported in LAR
● Determine the significance of the units according to:
- legislative sensitivity
- the public and the media
- sources of funding (general revenue, user fees, federal funds, etc.)
● Determine what types of transactions the units participate in, including:
- monthly volume of transactions
- complexity of transactions
- visibility of transactions
● Determine what type and quantity of assets, resources, or data the work units handle.

In addition to gaining an understanding of the actual process/structure, also try to find out:
● how the participants view the actual process/structure
● what parts of the process/structure they see as successful or unsuccessful and why
● what they think is important about the process/structure and why
This information may help identify causes and barriers.

Determine the strengths and weaknesses of the actual process and structure

Using the tailored criteria, the understanding of the entity's process and structure gained above, and the procedures in this section, analyze the actual process and structure to determine if it:
●   is designed to accomplish the management objective (this module, page 1)
●   has controls that provide reasonable assurance that the process and structure will work as intended
●   is implemented and functioning as designed
●   is actually achieving the desired management objective(s)

Suggested procedures for each of these four analysis steps are detailed below. In executing these procedures, remember to identify and analyze both strengths and weaknesses.

Identify and review the steps in the process of organizing the entity and the component parts of the resulting structure to determine if the process and structure are designed to accomplish the management objective(s). Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:
●   Determine if all major steps in the criteria are included in the actual process of organizing the entity. If steps are missing, determine if their absence is likely to have a materially negative effect on the process or the product of organizing the entity.
●   Determine if all the steps in the process of organizing the entity appear to add value. If there are steps that do not appear to add value, try to get additional information on why they are included.
●   Review the order of the steps in the process of organizing the entity to determine if it promotes productivity.
●   Review the organization structure to determine if it promotes productivity.
●   Review the level of technology used in the process to organize the entity to determine if it is up to date and appropriate to the task. Besides computer, electronic, communications, and other mechanical technology, you should also consider what kinds of management technology are used (Gantt charts, process maps, decision matrices, etc.).

Identify the controls over the process of organizing the entity and the resulting structure to determine if they provide reasonable assurance that the process and structure will work as intended. These controls should be appropriate, placed at the right point(s) in the process and/or structure, timely, and cost effective. Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:
●   Draw a picture of the process, the controls, and the control objectives (see the graphic of the procurement process in the Introduction for an example). Flowcharts of the process can help identify inputs, processes, and outputs.
●   Determine if the control objectives are in alignment with the overall

management objective(s) (this module, page 1). For example, if the overall mission is based on customer service, organization by function may not be appropriate.

- Identify the critical points of the process/structure (i.e., those parts of the process/structure most likely to determine its success or failure or expose the entity to high levels of risk) and the controls related to them.

  Consider whether the controls are:
  - in the right location within the process/structure (input, operations, output)
  - timely (real time, same day, weekly, etc.)
- Compare the cost of the control(s) to the risk being controlled to determine if the cost is worth the benefit.
- Determine what controls are in place for monitoring and evaluating the overall effectiveness of the process/structure and making sure that changes are made in the process/structure if it does not yield the desired results.
- Identify, describe, and assess the process used to gather input from employees who might reasonably find flaws in the process/structure.
- Use the organization chart as a map and flowchart major controls and major decision-making processes.
- Determine if the structure is susceptible to management override.

Review observations, interviews, documentation, and other evidence and design specific audit procedures, as needed, to determine if the process for organizing the entity, the resulting entity structure, and/or the controls have been implemented and are functioning as designed. Depending upon the objectives of the project, these procedures may include both tests of controls and substantive tests, more information on which is found in *The Hub*, pp. 2-B-8, ff. Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Determine if any evidence of management override exists.
- Walk through the actual process, i.e., follow a transaction through the people and documents involved, and compare to the official process.
- Determine whether the organization chart actually reflects the chain of command and communication patterns. (A large deviation indicates a potential control problem.)
- Compare the organization chart to the entity's program structure as derived from the LAR. General correspondence should exist.
- Compare entity staffing patterns to the most recent staffing report and to the entity's ABEST personnel budget.

Review and analyze any reports used by the entity to monitor the outcome(s) of the process/structure and/or any other information available to determine if the process/structure is actually achieving the desired management objective(s) (this module, page 1). Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Analyze outcome reports over time for trends. For example, determine if there was a change in the productivity of entity functions after the

entity was restructured, e.g., from departmentation by to departmentation by function.

- Discuss any apparently material negative or positive trends with management.

- Determine if and how management acts upon these outcome and/or trend reports and what changes, if any, were made in the process or controls as a result. Some process refinements, especially those affecting entity mission, goals, and outcome measures, may need to wait until the next appropriation cycle.
- Obtain and review a sample of written position descriptions and performance plans for consistency with higher-level objectives.
- Using staffing ratios, span of control, and chain of command calculations made previously, compare staffing patterns for specific activities to those for similar activities in other states or in the non-profit or private sector.
- Based on direct observation, indicate whether the following conditions have been observed during the audit:
  - excessive time spent on noncritical activities
  - the same activity performed in multiple units (redundancy)
  - the same activity performed by multiple individuals (fragmentation)

Determine causes

Determine what circumstances, if any, caused the identified weaknesses in the process of organizing the entity and/or the resulting organization structure. Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Determine if the participants in the process of developing, maintaining, and evaluating the entity's organization structure understand the entity's mission, goals, and values and support them through their management of the entity's organization structure.
- Determine if the participants understand both the purpose of and their role in the process of organizing the entity and the resulting structure.
- Determine if the relationship between the process of structuring the entity and other entity processes is clear. For example, the structure of the entity can affect the ability of a line function to work efficiently and effectively.
- If the process/structure has multiple locations, determine the nature and scope of the communication and coordination among them.
- Determine if the process of developing, maintaining, and evaluating organization structure has adequate human, dollar, time, information, and asset resources. If they appear inadequate, determine if the entity resources have been allocated according to the materiality of each subunit to the whole.
- Determine if the entity has considered using alternative resources such as trade groups, non-profit organizations, academic institutions, or other governmental entities to meet its resource needs.
- Determine if resources available to the process of developing, maintaining, and evaluating organization structure have been allocated and used in a manner consistent with the importance of that resource to the process.
- If there are negative trends in the reports used to monitor the outcome(s) of the organization process/structure, determine if these reports are communicated to and used by the appropriate parties to modify the process/structure.

Determine what internal or external constraints or barriers, if any, must be removed in order to overcome these identified weaknesses. Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Review the applicable entity, state, or federal laws or regulations to determine if any of them prevent the necessary changes from being made.
- Determine if any key employees are unwilling to change the process/structure and why they are unwilling.

Determine effect

Compare the actual entity process/structure to a recommended alternative process(es)/structure(s) and determine if each weakness in the entity is material. Alternatives can be developed by using the criteria contained in this module, applying general management principles to the process/structure, using the processes/structures at comparable entities, etc. Materiality can be measured by comparing the dollar cost, impact on services (either quantity or quality), impact on citizens, impact on the economy, risks, etc. of the actual process/structure to the recommended alternative process(es)/structure(s). Measurements can be quantitative, qualitative, or both. Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Identify performance benchmarks (industry standards, historical internal data, other comparable entities, etc.) for the process/structure in question and compare to actual performance. Measure the difference, if possible. Include the cost of the additional controls or changes in the process/structure. Since changes in an organization structure are difficult to implement and often take a long time, this can be very important.
- Estimate the cost of the actual process/structure and the alternative process(es)/structure(s) and compare.
- Estimate the quantity and/or quality of services provided by the actual process/structure and by the alternative process(es)/structure(s) and compare.
- Identify the risks associated with the actual process/structure and with the alternative process(es)/structure(s). Measure and compare the risks.

Develop recommendations

Develop specific recommendations to correct the weaknesses identified as material in the previous section. In developing these recommendations, consider the tailored criteria, kind of process/structure and control weaknesses identified, causes and barriers, effects, and additional resources listed in the end of this module. Possible procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Identify alternative solutions used by other entities.
- Identify solutions for removing barriers.
- Provide general guidelines as to the objectives each solution should meet; then the entity can tailor the solution to its specific situation.
- Provide specific information, if available, on how each recommendation can be implemented.

RESOURCES
Articles

Bartlett, Christopher A., and Sumantra Ghoshal. "Matrix Management: Not a Structure, A Frame of Mind." *Harvard Business Review* 68:4:138-145, July-August 1990. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Colorado State Auditor's Office. "Structured Productivity Analysis System (SPANS) Methodology." Memorandum, 1993. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Drucker, Peter. "The Coming of the New Organization." *Harvard Business Review* 66:1:45-53, January-February 1988. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Gellerman, Saul. "In Organizations, as in Architecture, Form Follows Function." *Organizational Dynamics* 18:3:57-68, Winter 1990. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Kaestle, Paul. "A New Rationale for Organizational Structure." *Planning Review* 18:4:20-27 July-August 1990. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Lewis, Patricia M., and Pamela S. Lewis. "Organizational Design: Implications for Managerial Decision-Making." *SAM Advanced Management Journal* 54:4:13-16, Autumn 1989. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Miller, Danny. "Organizational Configurations: Cohesion, Change, and Prediction." *Human Relations* 43:8:781-789, August 1990. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Mintzberg, Henry. "The Effective Organization: Forces and Forms." *Sloan Management Review* 32:2:54-67, Winter 1991. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Reid, Gary J. "Perceived Government Waste and Government Structure: An Empirical Examination of Competing Explanations." *Public Finance Quarterly* 18:4:395-419, October 1990. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Texas State Auditor's Office. "Organization Structure: Scoping Program." Developed by Will Hirsch, October, 1991. In *Management Control Audit of The University of Texas System Administration*, Report 93-027. Austin, TX: Texas State Auditor's Office, June 1993. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Books

Bittel, Lester R. "Organizing: Dividing Up the Work in a Structured Framework." In *The McGraw-Hill 36-Hour Management Course*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1989. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Famularo, Joseph. *Organization Planning Manual*. New York, NY: American Management Association, 1971. Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 38 F26)

Gleim, Irvin N. "Organizational Theory." In *CIA Examination Review: Course Outline*, Volume I, 5th Edition. Gainesville, FL: Gleim Publications, 1991. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Sawyer, Lawrence B. *Elements of Management-Oriented Auditing*. Altamonte Springs, FL: Institute of Internal Auditors, Incorporated, 1983. Location: Issued to all SAO auditors.

Texas Sunset Advisory Commission. *Benchmarks: Guidelines for Evaluating Agencies Under Sunset*. Austin, TX: Texas Sunset Advisory Commission, 1983. Location: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders.

Data Bases

ABEST (Agency Budgets & Strategic Plans)

ABEST data are compiled by the Legislative Budget Office and include information on the following:

- budget requests
- input, output, and efficiency measures
- capital expenditures
- budget recommendations
- quarterly and year-to-date performance measures
- classified positions
- entity and statewide strategic plans

ABEST information is maintained dating from 1992 and projecting forward to 1994 and 1995. In-house contacts on ABEST are Dean Duan (4829), Tom Tharp (4912), and Sherry Varnado (4716).

UTCAT (On-Line Catalog of the General Libraries of UT-Austin)

A search of UTCAT using various combinations of "organization(al)/(s) structure" reveals the following holdings at UT-Austin:

- 184 books
- 165 articles in academic periodicals
- 596 articles in business periodicals

Search parameters used to identify these holdings include:

- S (subject) for books
- S (subject) and SK (subject keyword) for periodicals
- T (title) and TK (title keyword) for books and periodicals
- PT (periodical title) and PK (periodical title keyword) for periodicals

An S (subject) search in the books data base or an SK (subject keyword) search in the periodicals data bases lets you scan all subjects related to organization(al)/(s) structure, such as "organization charts" or "organizational effectiveness." This lets you focus the subject of your search.

Regardless of the data base used, a TK (title keyword) search lets you scan bibliographic entries for all books or articles which have some variant of the words "organization(al)/(s) structure" in their titles.

Note: Books, academic periodicals, and business periodicals are accessed in different subsidiary data bases in UTCAT. Access to the periodicals data bases is limited to holders of current identification or courtesy borrower's cards from either UT-Austin, UT-Dallas, or UT-Pan American.

Human Resources   The following staff members have specialized training or ongoing interest in
                                       organization structure:

Employee	Title/Function
Julie Cleveland, CPA Michael Gray, CPA, CFE Will Hirsch, CPA Andrew Knight Kyle Kelly John Swinton	Methodology Project Team UT-Austin and DPS Audits UT System Management Audit DPS, TDCJ, and TYC Audits MHMR and Texas Tech Audits Methodology Project Team
Marcia Carlson Amy Graves, JD Babette Laibovitz, MPA Linda Lansdowne, CPA John Swinton Bruce Truitt	Module Writers/Editors
Barbara Hankins, CPA Jeannie Henderson, CPA Randy Townsend, CPA	Reviewers

Periodicals

Government Executive
Published monthly by National Journal, Incorporated
Location: SAO Library

Group and Organization Management
Published monthly by Sage Periodicals Press, Incorporated
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HM 134 G73)

Group and Organization Studies
Published monthly by Sage Publications
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HM 134 G73)

Harvard Business Review
Published bimonthly by the Harvard Business School
Location: SAO Library

Journal of Policy Analysis and Management
Published quarterly by John Wiley and Sons
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (H 97 J68)

HR Magazine on Human Resource Management
Published monthly by the Society of Human Resource Management
Location: SAO Classification Office

Human Organization
Published Quarterly by the Society of Applied Anthropology
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (572.05 AP58)

Human Relations
Published monthly by Plenum Press, Incorporated
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (H1 H8)

IPMA
Published monthly by the International Personnel Management Association
Location: SAO Classification Office

Journal of Business Strategy
Published bimonthly by Warren, Gorham, and Lamont, Incorporated
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 28 J593)

Journal of Organizational Behavior
Published monthly by John Wiley and Sons
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HF 5548.8 J63)

Journal of Organizational Behavior Management

Published quarterly by the Haworth Press
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 58.7 J682)

Management Decision
Published quarterly by MCB Publications
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 28 M2826)

Management Focus
Published monthly by KPMG Peat Marwick
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 28 M362)

Management Review
Published monthly by the American Management Association
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (658.05 M311)

Management Solutions
Published monthly by the American Management Association
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HF 5549 A2

    S85)

Management Today
Published monthly by the Haymarket Press
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 70 G7 M32)

Management World
Published monthly by the Administrative Management Society
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 28 M413)

Optimum
Published quarterly by the Bureau of Management Consulting (Canada)
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 31 O6845)

Organization Science
Published monthly by the Institute of Management Sciences
Location: SAO Library

Organization Studies
Published monthly by W. de Gruyter.
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HM 131 O6728)

Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
Published monthly by the Academic Press
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (BF 636 A1 O7)

Organizational Behavior and Human Performance

Published monthly by the Academic Press
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (BF 636 A1 O7)

Organizational Dynamics
Published quarterly by the American Management Association
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 28 O76)

Public Administration Review
Published bimonthly by the American Society for Public Administration
Location: SAO Library

Public Management
Published monthly by the International City Management Association
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (352.05 C498M)

Public Manager
Published quarterly by Bureaucrat, Incorporated
Location: SAO Library

Public Personnel Management
Published monthly by the International Personnel Management Association
Location: SAO Classification Office

SAM Advanced Management Journal
Published quarterly by the Society for Advancement of Management
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 28 S622)

Sloan Management Review
Published quarterly by the Sloan School of Management, M.I.T.
Location: The University of Texas, Perry-Castañeda Library (HD 28 S56)

Supervisory Management
Published monthly by the American Management Association
Location: SAO Classification Office

Professional Associations

Academy of Management
Columbia, South Carolina
(803) 777-5969

American Management Association
New York, New York
(212) 586-8100

American Society for Public Administration
Washington, D.C.
(202) 393-7878

Institute of Management Sciences
Providence, Rhode Island
(401) 274-2525

National Institute of Business Management
New York, New York
(800) 543-2053

Related Modules and Reports

Human Resources: Planning
Human Resources: Recruitment/Selection
Mission
Performance Measurement
Policies and Procedures
Policy Environment
Problem-Solving and Decision-Making
Strategic Planning

SAO Management Control Audits, especially those of DIR, DPS, MHMR, Texas Tech, Texas Tech Health Sciences Center, The University of Texas at Austin, and The University of Texas System

Training

Organization
In-house training developed by John Swinton
Location of materials: Methodology Project Information Resources Folders