BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

JULIE HEDIN, Appellant vs. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Respondent.	CASE NO. R-ALLO-16-013 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came before the Personnel Resources Board, NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair; SUSAN MILLER, Vice Chair (by phone); and VICKY BOWDISH, Member, for a hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated October 18, 2016. The hearing was held on January 19, 2017, at Room 110 Capitol Court, 1110 Capitol Way, in Olympia, Washington.

Appearances. Appellant Julie Hedin was present and represented by Sarena Davis, Representative, Teamsters Local 117. Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC) was present and represented by Amy Meirhoff, HR Consultant, DOC.

Background. On September 30, 2015, Appellant's supervisor submitted a Position Description (PD) to DOC's Human Resources Office requesting reallocation from Office Assistant (OA) 3 to the Correctional Specialist 2 classification.

By letter dated March 22, 2015, Respondent notified Appellant that her position was reallocated to the Administrative Assistant (AA) 1 classification.

On April 19, 2016, OFM State HR received Appellant's request for a written Director's review of DOC's allocation determination.

The director's review specialist conducted a review of Appellant's position based on written documentation and a telephone conference. By letter dated October 18, 2016, the director's review specialist determined the most appropriate allocation for Appellant's position was the AA 1 classification.

On November 16, 2016, Appellant filed exceptions to the Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works at the Washington Correctional Center (WCC) in Shelton, WA, and reports to Lt. Jeffrey Sanders. The majority of Appellant's duties entail coordinating the statewide transport of offenders.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments.

Appellant agrees her position's allocation should be in the Administrative Assistant series, but argues the AA 1 job classification does not capture all of her responsibilities. Appellant asserts she acts in the absence of the lieutenant, making independent decisions concerning offender transports. Appellant further asserts she independently coordinates mass transports and minimizes dangerous scenarios and prison liability by preventing certain gang members from riding together.

Appellant states she must coordinate with and assign prison officers to handle the transports and must ensure local law enforcement are aware of the transports. Appellant asserts she participates in deciding who will transport youth offenders and organizes the clearing of prison areas to comply with youth safety protocols. Appellant contends she arranges for ADA van transport when needed.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments.

Respondent contends Appellant's duties are consistent with the AA 1 definition which states, "provides for para-professional administrative and staff assistance…or performs technical work…"

Respondent argues that that transport duties are not exclusive to Appellant, since others in the office may perform this work. Respondent further argues that, inconsistent with the AA 2 classification, Appellant does not have delegated authority to act in the absence of the lieutenant and neither she nor the lieutenant may implement high-risk transportation without the approval of the superintendent or designee.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination should be affirmed and whether Appellant should remain allocated to the Administrative Assistant 1 classification.

Relevant Classifications. Administrative Assistant 1; Administrative Assistant 2

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. 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 that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See *Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University*, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Administrative Assistant 1

There is no **class series concept** for Administrative Assistant

> **Definition**
>
> Provides para-professional administrative and staff assistance to a professional supervisor by reviewing, controlling, prioritizing and coordinating the work of the supervisor's professional staff; or performs technical work, which is directly delegated from a professional position.

Distinguishing Characteristics

Administrative Assistants can be distinguished from clerical positions by the formal delegation and regular exercise of the following responsibilities:

- reviewing the work of professional staff for completeness, to assure that input-output is in compliance with laws, rules, policies, procedures and standards;
- controlling the professional staff's work by directing changes, corrections and authorizing exceptions to ensure compliance with the supervisor's schedules and priorities;
- prioritizing the professional staff's workload within established guidelines; and
- coordinating the professional staff's work within an agency, between agencies, with the public and/or other governmental entities.

<u>OR</u>

The technical work addressed in the definition is distinguished by a professional position fully delegating a technical portion of the position's duties, which in turn encompasses the majority of the Administrative Assistant's work and can be traced to originate directly from a professional position's duties and responsibilities.

Administrative Assistant positions do not report to a Clerical Supervisor. Their work is not clerical or secretarial as stated in those class specifications. However, only positions at this level in the class series may be assigned some clerical and/or secretarial duties not to exceed 25% of the total work.

Administrative Assistant 2

Definition

Provide administrative and staff support services for a section or unit with delegated authority to act in supervisor's absence in areas of substance.

> **Distinguishing Characteristics**
>
> These positions may be distinguished from lower level classes by addition of the delegation of authority to act for or in the regular place of the superior in substantive areas, and/or supervision of some professional or several clerical subordinates and a formal reporting alignment identifying the position as the principal administrative assistant to the superior who is at the first professional supervisory level or above.

The definition of the AA 2 specifies incumbents have "…delegated authority to act in supervisor's absence in areas of substance." The duties assigned Appellant do not include acting in her supervisor's absence. Her assignments include routine, recurring tasks around offender transports and she performs these duties whether or not the supervisor is present. Similarly, the distinguishing characteristics for the AA 2 specify this job class is different from the AA 1 "…by addition of the delegation of authority to act for or in the regular place of the superior in substantive areas…"

Appellant's assigned tasks around prioritizing and coordinating statewide offender transport may be described as technical in nature, consistent with the definition of the AA 1. Given Appellant does not act in a superior's absence in areas of substance, the Administrative Assistant 2 job class does not provide the best fit for her assigned duties.

In a hearing on exceptions, the appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has failed to meet her burden of proof.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Julie Hedin is denied and the director's determination dated October 18, 2016, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2017.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair

_____
SUSAN MILLER, Vice Chair

_____
VICKY BOWDISH, Member