BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

WILLIAM WELLS, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-00-0014 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 matter came on for a hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated April 28, 2000. The hearing was held on February 7, 2001, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. LEANA D. LAMB, Member, reviewed the record and participated in the decision in this matter. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant William Wells was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Transportation (DOT) was represented by Carol Bogue, Human Resource Team Manager.

Background. Effective July 1, 1999, the Personnel Resources Board adopted the new Human Resource Consultant class series. Respondent reviewed Appellant's position and allocated it to the Human Resource Consultant (HRC) 3 classification.

On July 29, 1999, Appellant appealed Respondent's decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position. By letter dated April 28, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 24, 2000, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's

determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

In his exceptions, Appellant states that the basis for his appeal is that Respondent determined that it would not use the HRC 4 level thereby precluding his position from allocation to that class and that he does meet the criteria of the "expert" level of the HRC4.

Appellant is the labor relations specialist for the DOT Northwest Region. In addition, he performs complex recruitment activities, consults with region management regarding disciplinary actions, and represents the agency at disciplinary hearings and at Unemployment Hearings within his region.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that he is assigned to the largest region of DOT and that impact to one portion of his region has influence over the entire region. Appellant contends that the unique size of his region warrants allocation of his position to the HRC 4 level. Appellant further states that DOT has chosen to place positions that meet the 4 level in Washington Management Service (WMS) and that his position was carved out of a WMS position. Therefore, because his duties were formerly in WMS, Appellant asserts that his position is encompassed by the HRC 4 class and should be reallocated.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellant's position is not assigned responsibility for issues that affect the agency state-wide, such as negotiating a state-wide union contract or preparing and presenting a referendum to the legislature. Furthermore, Respondent argues that Appellant is not assigned supervisory or lead duties. Therefore, Respondent contends that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the HRC 3 classification

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Human Resource Consultant 3 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Human Resource Consultant 3, class code 19104; and Human Resource Consultant 4, class code 19105.

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).

Respondent has chosen to allocate positions at the HRC 4 level to the WMS. However, that does not preclude the Board from allocating a position to this classification. Positions allocated to the HRC 4 classification are assigned as the professional experts in one or more functional HR areas or are supervisors for other HR staff. Appellant is assigned and performs the functions of a generalist. His is not the assigned expert in one or more functional areas nor is he a supervisor for other HR staff. Positions at the HRC 4 level have agency-wide responsibility for the most complex issues, including resolving agency-wide problems and influencing agency-wide changes. The preponderance of Appellant's responsibilities are at the regional level and do not have agency-wide impact. Appellant's position is not assigned the scope of duties or breadth of responsibilities envisioned by the HRC 4 classification.

The HRC 3 classification encompasses positions that work independently performing skilled, professional level HRC duties and responsibilities. Positions at this level function as HR generalists and resolve difficult issues that may have potentially broad impact. While positions at this level may have cross-organizational responsibilities, they do not have responsibility for agency-wide issues. Appellant works in conjunction with other HR staff at the Northwest Region office and he reports to the Northwest Region Personnel Manager. Within the region, Appellant performs a variety of HR functions and resolves a variety of difficult issues within the region. In addition, Appellant works with personnel staff from other DOT Region offices. The scope and breadth of Appellant's duties and the level of his responsibilities fall within the HRC 3 classification.

Conclusion. Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the Director, dated April 28, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination dated April 28, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504