BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

CHARLES RATHBUN, Appellant, v. EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DEPARTMENT, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-03-0002 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 BUSSE NUTLEY, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated December 16, 2002. The hearing was held at Eastern Washington University, Pence Union Building, Conference Room 263, Cheney, Washington, on July 15, 2003.

Appearances. Appellant Charles Rathbun appeared *pro se*. Carol Rembaugh, Human Resource Consultant, represented Respondent Employment Security Department.

Background. Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) as part of a class study conducted by the Employment Security Department (ESD) and the Department of Personnel. Effective January 11, 2002, the Personnel Resources Board adopted the new WorkSource Specialist series. Appellant's position as a Job Service Specialist 3 was laterally reallocated to the new WorkSource Specialist 3 classification. Appellant was notified of this decision by letter dated

March 11, 2002. Appellant believed that his position should have been reallocated to the WorkSource Specialist 4 classification, and he requested a review by the Department of Personnel.

On June 26, 2002, Paul L. Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, held an allocation review. By letter dated December 16, 2002, Mr. Peterson advised Appellant that his position was properly allocated to the WorkSource Specialist 3 classification. On January 14, 2003, Appellant filed exceptions to the determination of the Department of Personnel.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant asserts that the director's designee erred when he arbitrarily concluded that he could not be allocated to the WSS 4 level because he has not been designated by management as a specialist. Appellant argues that he was unable to present information to the designee explaining why his duties were more inline at the WSS 4 level, because the review was stopped once the director's designee heard the term "designated." Appellant asserts that he performs WSS 4 level work because he is responsible for obligating funds and other duties that are higher level duties.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent asserts that Appellant is appropriately allocated to the WSS 3 level. Respondent asserts that Appellant does not obligate funds. Rather, Respondent argues that although Appellant has received training on how to obligate funds, his current responsibility is solely to provide claimants with gas vouchers and bus passes, a task not considered as obligating funds. Respondent argues that the agency, through the assistant commissioner responsible for a program, designates positions as "specialists," and that in this case, Appellant has not been designated at the WSS 4 level because the work he performs clearly fits in the WSS 3 classification.

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

Relevant Classifications. WorkSource Specialist 3, class code 30130; WorkSource Specialist 4, class code 30160.

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 question here is whether the work Appellant performs is at the WorkSource Specialist 3 or at the WorkSource Specialist 4 level.

Appellant's CQ indicates that he provides WorkFirst clients, who receive Food Stamps, with employment and training services. Appellant facilitates an orientation for Food Stamp clients in the WorkFirst workshop on a weekly basis, providing information on participation requirements, support services and program completion. Appellant makes job referrals, and he provides employment counseling. Appellant also provides gas vouchers and bus passes to clients who are in need of transportation funds. To perform this task, Appellant uses the agency computer system to issue the vouchers. These duties comprise 60 percent of Appellant's work time. When the voucher is returned to the agency from a vendor, both a supervisor and a manager must sign the voucher.

Thirty-percent of Appellant's duties include initiating supportive service vouchers of approved individual responsibility plans, tracking paid and unpaid vouchers and maintaining weekly contacts with clients. Appellant works independently.

The definition for the class of WorkSource Specialist 4 indicates that the incumbent functions "(1) As a designated specialist, delivers direct core, intensive, and training services to WorkFirst (mandatory TANF) clients ...; OR (2) As a leadworker, delivers direct services to customers and staff." The distinguishing characteristics indicate that the incumbent in the WSS 4 position is a senior-level employee, working independently as either a designated specialist or as a leadworker. The distinguishing characteristics also indicates as follows:

> As a designated specialist, provides the entire range of employment and job training services with authority to approve training funds and authorize supportive services.

We have compared Appellant's duties to the WSS 4 job specification. However, Appellant has failed to prove that he performs duties at the WSS 4 level. Although Appellant is authorized to issue transportation vouchers and initiate support service vouchers, he is not authorized to obligate supportive service or training funds.

The definition for the class of WorkSource Specialist 3 indicates, in pertinent part, that the incumbent, "Delivers direct core & intensive services to ... Food Stamp ... customers. ..." The Distinguishing Characteristics of the WorkSource Specialist 3 state as follows:

> This is the fully qualified professional level. Positions at this level work independently, and spend a majority of time providing intensive services or conducting outreach activities. May issue transportation vouchers or initiate supportive service vouchers, but do not have the authority to obligate supportive services or training funds.

Appellant's overall responsibilities and duties are clearly encompassed by the definition, distinguishing characteristics and typical work of the WorkSource Specialist 3 classification. Therefore, the director's designee's determination that Appellant's assignments are more appropriately allocated to the WorkSource Specialist 3 classification should be affirmed.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's determination dated December 16, 2002, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Charles P. Rathbun is denied and the attached Director's determination, dated December 16, 2002, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2003.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

_____
Busse Nutley, Member