BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

TERRY PRILL, Appellant, vs. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Respondent.	CASE NO. R-ALLO-14-002 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, DJ MARK, Vice Chair; and SUSAN MILLER, Member, for a hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated February 12, 2014. The hearing was held on May 14, 2014.

Appearances. Appellant Terry Prill was present and was represented by Stacie Leanos, Counsel Representative with the Washington Federation of State Employees. Jennifer Wagner, Human Resource Consultant, represented Respondent Department of Transportation (DOT).

Background. On October 8, 2012, Appellant submitted a request for a position review to DOT's Human Resources Office. Appellant asked that her Secretary Senior position be reallocated to the Fiscal Analyst 2 classification. On April 16, 2013, Respondent denied Appellant's request.

On May 10, 2013, the Office of the State Human Resources Director received Appellant's request for a director's review of DOT's allocation determination. By letter dated February 12, 2014, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position should be reallocated to the Fiscal Technician 3 classification.

On February 25, 2014, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's designee's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant provides fiscal support to the Facilities and Budget Manager in DOT's Olympia Region. Appellant is responsible for two budgets in Facilities and Maintenance and sometimes performs fiscal transactions for two additional budgets in Traffic and Construction. In brief summary, the majority of her duties and responsibilities include receiving invoices; preparing vouchers; processing payments, including investigating and correcting errors; and administrative purchases for three divisions within the Olympia region. Appellant assures that appropriate purchasing authority has been used and that charges are correctly reconciled. In addition, she maintains and tracks work order logs and charge codes and verifies that payments are processed correctly and enters timekeeping information and tracks leave usage for staff.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. Appellant argues that the agency is recruiting for a Fiscal Analyst 2 position that performs work identical to her position and that the new position supports her argument for reallocation. Appellant further argues that her request is supported by her supervisor and manager and by the regional human resource staff. Appellant questions why human resources staff in DOT's headquarters office did not conduct a desk audit of her position. Appellant explains that she is responsible for 1200 service agreements and for tracking budget information and providing monthly reports to her manager. She also provides information as requested by her manager who then uses the information for budget projections and legislative budget requests and decision packages. Appellant states that the best way to describe her work is as a big checkbook that entails keeping the register, tracking who is spending and where that spending is taking place, reconciling the accounts, and making sure that the accounts balance. Appellant asserts that the majority of her work is described by the Fiscal Analyst 2 classification.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent argues that the majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities involve receiving and processing invoices, reviewing kilowatt usage bills, tracking fiscal information, entering data into a spreadsheet and preparing reports that include summary statements and variance information. Respondent further argues that Appellant performs a substantial amount of procurement work and assures that VISA payments are correctly processed. Respondent contends that the collection and payment of bills and the tracking and summarization of

variances does not meet the level of financial and trend analyses and interpretation of data required for allocation to the Fiscal Analyst series.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position should be reallocated to the Fiscal Technician 3 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Secretary Senior, class code 100T, Fiscal Analyst 2, class code 143J, and Fiscal Technician 3, class code 148N.

Decision of the Board. During the hearing on her exceptions, Appellant expressed concerns about DOT's process for reviewing her reallocation request, specifically the lack of a desk audit. In Petrozzi v. Department of Licensing, Case No. R-ALLO-12-004 (2012), the appellant expressed a number of concerns about DOL's internal practices and the fairness of the allocation process including the department's failure to conduct a desk audit of his position. The Board concluded that these issues were outside of the scope and purpose of a position review. Here, as in Petrozzi, DOT's internal practices are outside of the scope and purpose of a position review.

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).

Appellant argues that DOT recently posted a recruitment bulletin for a position that performs duties identical to the duties she performs. However, in Byrnes v. Dept's of Personnel and Corrections, PRB No. R-ALLO-06-005 (2006), the Board held that "[w]hile a comparison of one position to another similar position may be useful in gaining a better understanding of the duties performed by and the level of responsibility assigned to an incumbent, allocation of a position

must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to an individual position compared to the existing classifications. The allocation or misallocation of a similar position is not a determining factor in the appropriate allocation of a position." Citing to Flahaut v. Dept's of Personnel and Labor and Industries, PAB Case No. ALLO 96-0009 (1996). Therefore, the allocation or misallocation of other positions at DOT is not a determining factor in the appropriate allocation of Appellant's position.

The following standards are primary considerations in allocating positions:

a) Category concept (if one exists).
b) Definition or basic function of the class.
c) Distinguishing characteristics of a class.
d) Class series concept, definition/basic function, and distinguishing characteristics of other classes in the series in question.

The class series concept for the Secretary class series states:

> In support of a supervisor and/or staff members, provides secretarial services and assistance for the purpose of facilitating the supervisor's and/or staff members' own work and relieving the supervisor and/or staff members of day-to-day clerical detail. Applies knowledge of supervisor's and/or staff members' work commitments including status of projects and nature of contacts. Secretarial duties include making travel arrangements, scheduling meetings, taking notes and transcribing minutes, screening calls and visitors, keeping supervisor's and/or staff members calendar(s) and committing supervisor's and/or staff members' time.

The duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position go beyond providing secretarial services and assistance to her supervisor and others. Further, the majority of her work does not align within the secretarial duties described in the class series concept for the Secretary classes. Appellant position does not fit within the Secretarial series.

The class series concept for the Fiscal Analyst class series states, in part:

> Positions in this occupational group conduct a variety of financial reviews and analysis of fiscal, grants, contracts or other financial data in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).

> These are professional positions which analyze and interpret what the fiscal information means to draw conclusions and trends based upon that data. Positions determine … the relationship between fiscal variables by generating items, choosing analysis, translating, or explaining their results and taking appropriate action based upon the analysis and interpretation of the financial data.
>
> The majority of work assigned to professional positions does not involve verifying the accuracy of the fiscal data or the routine collection, reviewing and posting of fiscal record keeping tasks according to established procedures as contained in the office, fiscal or budget support group. . . .
>
> (Emphasis added.)

Appellant's position does not fit within the class series concept for the Fiscal Analyst class series. The scope of her work and her level of responsibility do not encompass professional fiscal functions requiring the depth of analysis and interpretation that result in conclusions and identification of trends envisioned by this series. Further, the majority of her work fits the tasks specifically identified as excluded from the Fiscal Analyst series.

The class series concept for the Fiscal Technician class series states:

> Positions perform ongoing, routine and repetitive fiscal tasks in a manual or automated system. Duties can be assigned in Accounts Receivables, Accounts Payable, Purchasing, Payroll, Grants and Contracts, Student Aid, Fixed Assets, Revenue, or General Accounting.
>
> Positions prepare, review, verify, and process fiscal, accounting, budget, book or record keeping documents. Performs computing, calculating financial, statistical and numerical data to maintain accounting, budgeting, purchasing, payroll records and reports. Records details of fiscal or business transactions in an increasing automated fiscal computer enhanced environment.
>
> This series is not responsible for in-depth analyzing or interpreting fiscal or budgetary data, rules or regulations, or designing automated fiscal systems. This series provides fiscal support to a variety of professional classes found in the fiscal analyst occupational category.

Appellant's position is fully encompassed by the class series concept for the Fiscal Technician class series. The primary focus of Appellant's work entails collecting, reviewing and posting fiscal information and verifying the accuracy of the information. Her work includes basic accounting tasks such as tracking and reconciling budgets and purchasing. In addition, she records staff timekeeping information and tracks leave usage. She also gathers fiscal information

and provides it to management but she does not perform in-depth professional level analysis or interpretation of the data.

The definition for the Fiscal Technician 3 class states:

> Provide fiscal support using independent judgment in the interpretation and application of a variety of rules and procedures in specialized fiscal functions, such as internal control, revolving fund maintenance control, and providing resource data for reports.

Appellant's position fits within the definition of the Fiscal Technician 3 class. Further, while not allocating criteria, the typical work statements for the Fiscal Technician 3 class describe the level and scope of work performed by Appellant. For example, Appellant:

> Maintains accounts and records; authorizes and enters fiscal transactions; compiles and prepares reports.
>
> Assists higher-level staff with summary information and analysis of records and reports.
>
> Prepares, audits, verifies and processes final documents such as vouchers, purchase requests, invoices, receipts, and payroll forms.
>
> Prepares, verifies and controls input being processed, including responsibility for input.
>
> Reviews and verifies fiscal reports for accuracy; investigates and corrects errors to ensure compliance with established procedures and policies.

The duties described above are consistent with the typical work statements and lend support for the allocation of Appellant's position to the Fiscal Technician 3 classification.

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. See Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

The overall duties and level of responsibility assigned to Appellant's position best fit within the Fiscal Technician 3 definition. We concur with the director's designee's determination. Appellant's position should be reallocated to the Fiscal Technician 3 classification.

This decision is based on the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position during the six months prior to October 8, 2012. If she feels that her duties have changed since that time or that her position description does not adequately describe her current duties, she may be able to request a review of her current duties and responsibilities in accordance with DOT's procedures and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between DOT and the Washington Federation of State Employees.

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 Terry Prill is denied and the director's determination dated February 12, 2014, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2014.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair

_____
DJ MARK, Vice Chair

_____
SUSAN MILLER, Member