BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

CYNTHIA BURTON, Appellant, vs. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Respondent.	)))))))))	CASE NO. R-ALLO-15-020 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, SUSAN MILLER, Vice Chair. The hearing was held on November 12, 2015, at Capitol Court, Olympia, WA. NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair, heard the appeal recording following the hearing.

Appearances. Appellant Cynthia Burton was present and was represented by Tawny Humbert, Teamsters Local 117. Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC) was represented by Tina Cooley, Classification, Pay and HRIS Manager.

Background. Appellant is a Correctional Records Supervisor (CRS) at Airway Heights Correctional Center (AHCC). Appellant requested reallocation of her CRS position on July 14, 2014, by submitting a Position Review Request (PRR) to DOC Human Resources (HR). In her PRR, Appellant requested reallocation to a Records Management Supervisor (RMS) position.

By letter dated September 11, 2014, DOC notified Appellant that her position was not reallocated to a RMS and remained as a CRS. On October 6, 2014, Appellant submitted a request to OFM State HR for a director's review of DOC's determination.

By letter July 28, 2015, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position should remain in the CRS job class.

On August 24, 2015, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the director's determination. In her exceptions, Appellant indicated the scope of her work best fits the duties of the RMS job class. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

As summarized in the director's review, Appellant is responsible for the management and supervision of two Records Units at AHCC. She is tasked to be custodian of offender records and is responsible to enter, audit and/or interpret the legal documents that hold offenders within DOC facilities.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments.

Appellant argues that the duties of her position are consistent with the RMS job class. Appellant contends her workload has increased significantly since 2012 when she was put in charge of an additional records office at AHCC. Appellant further contends she develops and administers a total records management system evident in such projects as implementing a filing system for AHCC and creating a database for all offenders housed at AHCC. Appellant states she provides input on policy changes that affect the entire agency and further states that final policy decisions are made by the policy holder and overseen by the Records Program Manager, Wendy Stigall.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments.

Respondent contends that since her position description was updated in 2012, Appellant has been assigned significantly more staff, but the increased volume of work does not raise the level of work. Respondent asserts that Appellant does not develop or implement an integrated records program for the agency, as the class specifications for the RMS indicates; rather Appellant's supervisor, Terry Propeck, Correctional Program Manager, is responsible for ensuring records activities comply with all laws, rules and policies.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination should be affirmed in that Appellant's position should remain at the CRS job class.

Relevant Classifications. Correctional Records Supervisor; Records Management Supervisor.

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).

The definition for the CRS classification states:

> Oversees a correctional records office and supervises Correctional Records Technicians. Performs high level correctional records technical tasks and sentence structure duties.

The definition for the RMS states:

> Develops, implements, and administers a totally integrated records management program in a large agency.

Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall **for the majority of the position's duties and responsibilities**. (Emphasis added). *Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries*, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

We have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted during the director's review and considered the arguments presented by the parties at the hearing before the Board. Allocating criteria consist of the class specification's class series concept (if one exists), the definition and

the distinguishing characteristics. Typical work is not an allocating criterion, but may be used to better understand the definition or distinguishing characteristics. While the Board recognizes Appellant's workload has increased since she was assigned supervisory duties over another records office, volume of work is not an allocating criterion in most cases because increased volume of work does not equal increased level of work.

Appellant works with executive staff to contribute to policy changes, some of which may affect the entire agency; however she is not the one making the decisions, rather providing input based on work related knowledge of the policy at hand. The definition of RMS which states in part: "…records management program in a large agency" points towards agency-wide records management. "Agency-wide" is further illustrated in the second Typical Work statement which states: "Serves as **departmental records officer** administering all activities involving the inventory, retention and disposition of records in conjunction with the State Records Committee and the State Archives (emphasis added)." Appellant does not administer an agency-wide records program, rather administers correctional records within AHCC.

Fitting the definition of CMS, Appellant oversees correctional offices; supervises Correctional Records Technicians; performs high level technical tasks, such as developing and maintaining offender records and filing systems; and performs sentence structure duties, such as ensuring sentence structures are calculated correctly. Appellant does not "develop, implement, and administer a totally integrated records management program in a large agency," as stated in the RMS definition.

The scope of duties and level of responsibility assigned to Appellant's position best fit the scope, intent and level of responsibility found in the Correctional Records Supervisor classification.

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 ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Cynthia Burton is denied and the director's determination dated July 28, 2015, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2015.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair

_____
SUSAN MILLER, Vice Chair