BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

JANE GOLSON, et al., Appellants, v. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-01-0019 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, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair; GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair; and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellants' exceptions to the Director's determination dated June 26, 2001. The hearing was held in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington, on October 10, 2001.

Appearances. Appellants Jane Golson and Teresa Paulson were present and were represented by Sherri-Ann Burke, Area Representative for the Washington Federation of State Employees. Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC) was represented by Robert Swanson, Human Resource Consultant.

Background. Appellants requested a review of their Community Corrections Assistant positions. Mary Gallagher, Human Resource Manager for the West Central Region of DOC, reviewed the positions and by letter dated January 11, 2001, informed Appellants that their positions were properly allocated.

Appellants appealed DOC's decision to the Department of Personnel (DOP). On April 10, 2001, the Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of Appellants' positions. By

letter dated June 26, 2001, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellants' positions were properly allocated. On July 6, 2001, Appellants filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellants' exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellants work in the Lakewood Offender Minimum Management Unit and report to a lead Community Corrections Officer 3. Appellants are assigned a caseload of offenders who have completed their sentences but have legal financial obligations remaining. Appellants monitor offenders to assure that they are fulfilling their financial obligations and if they are not, forward the information and their recommendation to a Community Corrections Officer for action. The majority of Appellants' face-to-face contact with offenders involves completing the intake process in the Lakewood OMMU office.

Summary of Appellants' Argument. Appellants argue that their positions should be allocated to the Community Corrections Officer (CCO) 2 classification. Appellants contend that they manage an active caseload of adult felony offenders who have not finished their sentences and have not been released by the courts from their court ordered obligations. Appellants concede that the level of supervision they provide to offenders is not as intensive as other levels of offender supervision within DOC's active cases, but assert that nonetheless, the offenders on their caseloads are still under the jurisdiction of DOC and still require supervision. Appellants contend that they function independently and when necessary, write critical incident reports and violation reports, make recommendations for further action, refer offenders to community services, and participate in offender reviews. Appellants agree that the main goal of their positions is to monitor compliance with financial obligations but assert that they also perform many of the same duties performed by CCO2s.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellants' positions fall within the Community Corrections Assistant (CCA) classification. Respondent asserts that Appellants do not have the full scope of responsibility or level of authority encompassed by the CCO 2 classification. For example, Appellants do not have proactive involvement with offenders, do not contact offenders on a continuous basis, and do not establish sanctions, assist in arrests, or make home or workplace visits to offenders. Appellants do not utilize risk management and intervention strategies, meet with community groups, contact offenders in jail, have the authority to impose conditions on offenders, or participate in search and seizure activities. Furthermore, Appellants do not hold hearings or prepare discovery packets for offenders. Respondent asserts that Appellants work in the office and perform technical administrative tasks that primarily deal with the legal financial obligations of offenders and that their positions are properly allocated to the CCA classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellants' positions are properly allocated to the Community Corrections Assistant classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Community Corrections Assistant, class code 39680; and Community Corrections Officer 2, class code 39710.

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 CCO 2 classification encompasses positions that manage "a caseload of adult criminal offenders including specialized case management for sex offenders, drug offenders and inmates placed in the community." The distinguishing characteristics indicate that incumbents independently plan, organize, and complete assignments and "may be assigned a full range of cases including minimum service, community placement, out-of-state offenders, and criminally insane, as well as pre-sentence investigations and court liaison work." The typical work statements for the class provide clarification of the level and scope of duties assigned to the CCO 2 classification. CCO 2s make home and field visits, conduct investigations of parole, probation and sentencing violations, conduct searches and assist in arrests. Appellants do not perform the breadth and scope of duties or have the level of responsibly encompassed by the CCO 2 classification.

The definition of the CCA classification encompasses positions that perform technical and/or administrative casework functions under the direction of a Community Corrections professional. Appellants' positions fit this definition.

The distinguishing characteristics for CCA classification indicate that incumbents in this classification are restricted from making any decisions regarding offenders that would result in a significant change being made in the case, including any decision that would invoke a loss of liberty, search or seizure. Appellants do not have authority to make decisions resulting in significant changes to a case; rather they provide information and make recommendations to CCOs who exercise this level of decision making authority. Appellants' positions are described by the distinguishing characteristics for the CCA classification.

Furthermore, the first typical work statement for the CCA classification specifically describes Appellants' duties and responsibilities. It states, "[c]onducts Legal Financial Obligation (LFO) payment reviews to include: monitoring of cases, recoupment actions, reporting, makes payment schedule determinations, conducts client intakes, generates LFO correspondence, Court orders/ requirements, updates address changes, produces reports (special/violations), prepares notice of payroll deductions."

Appellants' positions are properly allocated to the Community Corrections Assistant classification.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellants should be denied and the Director's determination dated June 26, 2001, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellants is denied and the Director's determination dated June 26, 2001, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504