BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

HATTIE CARLSON, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, Respondents.	Case No. ALLO-98-0020 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and NATHAN S. FORD Jr., Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated October 8, 1998. The hearing was held on September 3, 1999, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington.

Appearances. Appellant Hattie Carlson was present and was represented by Michael Hanbey, Attorney at Law, of Ditlevson, Rodgers, Hanbey & Dixon, P.S. Respondent Department of Social and Health Services was represented by Pam Pelton and George Weirich, Classification and Compensation Specialists.

Background. Appellant requested reallocation of her Computer Technical Specialist (CTS) 2 position to the class of Computer Information System Specialist (CISS) 1. DSHS denied Appellant's request. By letter dated July 19, 1997, Appellant appealed this determination to the Department of Personnel. On August 11, 1998, Karl Nagel, Director's Designee, conducted an allocation review hearing. By letter dated October 8, 1998, Mr. Nagel notified Appellant that her position was properly allocated to the Computer Technical Specialist 2 classification. On

November 6, 1998, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that the Director's designee inappropriately used the job specification for the CISS 1 classification that was revised on March 13, 1998, rather than the specification that was in place at the time the reallocation request was made in May 1997. Appellant asserts that while she may not be designated by management as a "senior consultant/advisor" she does, however, perform the work of a CISS 1. Appellant asserts there is no specific criteria of what standard is to be used for this designation, and therefore, ambiguity exists in the specification and that it is important for a measure of reason and equity to be applied when determining whether she should be allocated to the CISS 1 classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that the majority of Appellant's duties fit within the CTS 2 classification and that the only issue here is the word "designation." Respondent argues that in this case Appellant was reporting to a CISS 1 who then reported to management. Therefore, Respondent contends that Appellant is not the designated individual to consult with management and Appellant's position should remain allocated to the CTS 2 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Computer Technical Specialist 2 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Computer Technical Specialist 2, class code 03650 and Computer Information System Specialist 1 and 2, class codes 03260 and 03280.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Position allocations are "based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or performed and other information and recommendations." (WAC 356-20-020). Because a current and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved Classification Questionnaire, the CQ becomes the basis for allocation of a position. Position allocations are made on a best fit basis. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as documented in the CQ.

The definition of the CISS 1 and 2 specification that was in effect when Appellant first requested reallocation of her position states "within a service center or agency's central data processing organization, serves as a designated highest technical specialist . . ." The distinguishing characteristics state, "The CISS is distinguished from the . . . CTS 2 . . . by serving as a designated senior consultant/advisor to senior DP management in at least one of the . . . DP professional specialties. Report directly to an ISM 2, ISAM 3, OSAM 3 or higher."

In this case, the Appellant's supervisor disagreed with Appellant's statement in her CQ that she served as "a senior technical consultant/advisor to senior technology management and senior

technical staff . . . providing consultative services to management/professional staff . . ." Rather, Appellant's supervisor stated that Appellant is a "senior technical consultative specialist."

Appellant does not meet the definition of the CISS 1. Appellant works in the Information System Services Division and reports to an Information Technology Manager 3. Appellant does not report directly to senior management nor has she been designated as a "senior consultant/advisor" to senior management.

The definition for CTS 1 and 2 states, "within a service center or agency's central data processing organization, serves as a technical consultant and specialist to other data processing professionals . . ." The distinguishing characteristics for the CTS 2 state, "the CTS 2 is a senior technical consultative specialist in a large data processing organization . . . and consults on a regular basis to individuals in the data processing professional/technical and data processing management series. Typically reports directly to an ISAM, OSAM, or higher manager class. . . ." The typical work statements encompass duties such as providing consultative support, coordinating installation of support products, developing common routines, coordinating the establishment of product use standards and procedures, and reviewing the use of products for adherence to standards.

Appellant provides senior technical consultative services in support of public assistance and social services data processing programs. She is responsible for designing and coordinating the implementation of interfacing systems and developing, coordinating, implementing, monitoring and maintaining the information process systems used by DSHS staff. These duties and responsibilities are described by the definition, distinguishing characteristics and typical work of the CTS 2 classification.

When viewed in totality, the level and scope of the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position are best described by the CTS 2 class specification, her position is properly allocated and the determination of the Director's designee should be affirmed.

Conclusion. Appellant's position is properly classified as a Computer Technical Specialist 2 and her appeal should be denied. The determination of the Director, dated October 8, 1998, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the attached Director's determination dated October 8, 1998, is affirmed and adopted

DATED this _____ day of _____, 1999.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

_____
Nathan S. Ford Jr., Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504