BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LINDA LOMBARD, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-01-0007 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated March 23, 2001. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington, on August 23, 2001. LEANA D. LAMB, Member, reviewed the file, exhibits and the recorded proceedings, and participated in the decision in this matter. GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Linda Lombard was present and appeared *pro se*. Jesse Powell, Classification and Compensation Manager, represented Respondent Department of Social and Health Services.

Background. On March 7, 2000, Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) to DSHS Personnel requesting that her Cost Reimbursement Analyst (CRA) 2 position be reallocated to a CRA 3. By letter dated January 11, 2001, Patty Nutt, Human Resource Consultant, informed

Appellant her position was properly allocated as a CRA 2. By letter dated January 24, 2001, Appellant appealed this determination to the director of the Department of Personnel. On March 7, 2001, Paul Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, conducted an allocation review and by letter dated March 23, 2001, informed Appellant that her position was properly allocated to the CRA 2 classification. On April 2, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board to the determination of the Department of Personnel.

During the time period pertinent to this appeal, Appellant worked as a CRA 2 with the Medical Assistance Administration (MAA) Division, Hospital Reimbursement Section, Division of Operational Support.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that the reallocation of her position to a CRA 3 centers on whether she functions as a leadworker. Appellant asserts that the department erred when it found that she did not have leadworker responsibilities, and she further asserts that the director's designee erred by ignoring duties she performed which are only found in the CRA 3 specification. Appellant argues that she has lead responsibilities for the School Medicaid and Major Trauma programs. Appellant asserts that she has been required to take responsibility to initiate and lead reimbursement activities of the trauma and SCR teams and to ensure that tasks are properly completed. Appellant argues that management never challenged her tasks and responsibilities and therefore, this constitutes an "assignment" of lead work. Appellant asserts her assignments came directly through her manager. Appellant asserts that there was an expectation that she was functioning as the leadworker on the two programs because her duties were expanded and "given" to her by her direct supervisor. Appellant requests that her appeal be granted and that she be treated in a fair and equitable manner.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that although Appellant stated in her CQ that she performed leadworker duties, her supervisor disagreed with this statement. Respondent asserts that Appellant provided no evidence to support her assertion that she performs lead work. Respondent argues that to be a leadworker, the duties assigned must be in accordance with the definition of a leadworker, and that there is no indication or evidence to support that Appellant performs leadworker responsibilities. Respondent argues that Appellant does not meet any of the criteria necessary to be reallocated to the CRA 3 level. Respondent argues that after comparing Appellant's duties to the definitions of CRA 2 and 3, the agency properly concluded that her position was properly allocated to the CRA 2 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Cost Reimbursement Analyst 3 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Cost Reimbursement Analyst 2, class code 12280; Cost Reimbursement Analyst 3, class code 12290.

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).

The CRA 3 classification specification lists the follow three criteria necessary for allocation to the class:

- Within the Division of Developmental Disabilities or the Division of Mental Health, develops a variety of reimbursement payment systems, establishes vendor rates, and coordinates the audit and settlement function;
- Within Aging and Adult Services, manages the Research and Settlement Unit and acts as the Nursing Home Rate Program Manager in the absence of the manager or manages the Provider Financial Analysis Unit or the Regulatory and Legal Analysis Unit;
- Functions as the leadworker in the Rate Analysis Section with the [Medical Assistance Administration], [Division of Operation Support Services], within the [Hospital Reimbursement Section].

Appellant does not work in the Division of Developmental Disabilities, Division of Mental Health, or in the Aging and Adult Services Division. Therefore, her position cannot be reallocated under the first or second criteria. Because Appellant works within the MAA, we must determine whether Appellant can be reallocated to a CRA 3 under the third criteria. The question here is whether Appellant is assigned leadworker responsibilities. Appellant contends that she is a leadworker because the nature of her duties and responsibilities requires that she perform "lead work" over two programs. WAC 356-05-211 defines a leadworker as follows:

> An employee assigned responsibility by management to receive and convey directions to fellow employees, take the lead in performing assigned tasks and ensure that such tasks are properly completed. ...

Appellant's manager disagreed that Appellant held leadworker responsibilities. Instead, he asserted that Appellant held lead responsibility for two assigned programs: the School Medicaid and the Major Trauma programs. Although it appears that Appellant provided leadership and guidance to staff regarding the development and implementation of these programs, there is no evidence that she held a leadworker role over other coworkers where she received, conveyed, monitored or assigned day-to-day tasks, assignments or activities to other employees.

The definition of the CRA 2, in relevant part, indicates that the incumbent "represents the [Medical Assistance Administration] regarding hospital reimbursement administration or management of provider contracts and associated reimbursement schemes." Appellant's duties include primary responsibility for representing the division on the development and implementation of the School Medicaid and Major Trauma programs.

The typical work of a CRA 2 includes providing guidance to staff in the application of a variety of accounting, auditing, cost allocation and cost reimbursement standards; making recommendations for adjustments or exceptions; leading staff on preparation of comprehensive, formal written determinations; drawing technical conclusions; preparing analysis of comprehensive reports; and developing procedures, instructions for the operations and maintenance of reimbursement systems and cost reporting guidelines. Appellant provides guidance to other employees, however, her duties do not meet the definition of leadworker as provided in WAC 356-05-211.

As reflected in her CQ, Appellant monitors, reviews and provides quantitative and qualitative analysis of the School Medicaid and Major Trauma Programs; she plans, organizes, reviews and analyzes alternate methods of reimbursement; and she guides staff on the development and implementation of reimbursement. Appellant also serves as the lead contact within MAA and as a liaison with other agencies and providers on all aspects of reimbursement; she develops and analyzes documentation related to the Prospective Payment System hospital reimbursement methodology; and she monitors compliance with state and federal law and regulations regarding rate reimbursement. These duties are reflected in the typical duties described in the CRA 2 classification specification. Therefore, Appellant's duties and responsibilities are best described by the CRA 2 classification.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's determination dated March 23, 2001, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Linda Lombard is denied and the attached Director's determination dated March 23, 2001, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member