

1 On May 19, 2015, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the director's determination. In her
2 exceptions, Appellant indicated the scope of her work best fits the duties of the Parks Interpretive
3 Consultant job class. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

4
5 Appellant works at the Cama Beach State Park, NW Region. As summarized in the director's
6 determination, Appellant develops methods of interpreting historical data, natural history and
7 natural settings. She performs professional interpretive work, consulting services and/or
8 presentations for workshops, conferences, events and organizations. Appellant serves as a liaison
9 between Parks and local groups regarding interpretation of historical, archeological and natural
10 areas and coordinates programs with other state, federal and county agencies as well as private or
11 non-profit groups. Appellant also develops educational and interpretive displays, brochures and
12 signage, coordinates the volunteer program and maintains all artifact collections.

13
14 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that the scope of her work has significantly
15 changed since 2010 when she oversaw sites only at Camano Island and Cama Beach. Appellant says
16 the definition of PI Specialist speaks to a singular functional area, or site, whereas the PI Consultant
17 speaks to multiple areas of responsibility. Appellant says her work now reaches the level of the PI
18 Consultant job class after developing and maintaining the statewide geocaching program and serving
19 as the program's official representative and contact. Further, Appellant argues that where the PI
20 Consultant class specification, last updated in the 1970s, states in the definition, "confers with
21 architects, display fabricators, and contractors," that technological advances now incorporate the
22 definition into virtual sites (online) rather than just brick and mortar. Appellant argues that the online
23 geocaching program involves over 100 parks incorporating around 16,000 visitors and that her work
24 is ongoing in this area.

25
26 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that that although Appellant has taken
27 on some duties consistent with the PI Consultant, the overall scope and preponderance of work best
28 fits her current job class, the PI Specialist. Respondent agrees that some of the work with geocaching

1 has reached the level of PI Consultant but her primary focus and majority of work remains with
2 Cama Beach and Camano Island. Respondent argues that Appellant does not have full scope
3 authority over the geocache program, as would a PI Consultant, and that the majority of her work is
4 not spent providing consultation to other parks and agencies. Other than the 54% of duties listed on
5 the PRR, Respondent argues that the rest of the duties describe work best fitting the PI Specialist
6 level, such as developing educational and interpretive displays, brochures and signage; creating
7 traveling displays; and serving as volunteer program coordinator. Respondent says within the 54%
8 category of duties on the PRR, the preponderance is not at the higher level. Respondent says that
9 this, together with the remaining 46% of duties listed on the PRR, renders the majority of work at
10 the PI Specialist level.

11
12 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination should be affirmed in that Appellant's position
13 should remain at the PI Specialist job class.

14
15 **Relevant Classifications.** Parks Interpretive Consultant, job class code 260T; Parks Interpretive
16 Specialist, job class code 260Q.

17
18 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
19 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
20 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
21 work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
22 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
23 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position.
24 See *Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University*, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

25
26 The definition for the Parks Interpretive Consultant classification states:

27 Develops methods of interpreting historical data, natural history and natural
28 settings for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. Confers with
29 architects, display fabricators, contractors, and field staff to assure compliance with
the desired theme and specifications. Provides consultative services to other State,

1 county, and municipal agencies. Plans, researches, develops, and implements site
2 interpretive master plans and programs.

3 The definition of a Parks Interpretive Specialist states:

4 Researches, develops and implements site interpretive master plans and programs.

5 The difference between these two classes is the scope and level of work performed. Most
6 positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than one
7 classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position,
8 the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position
9 must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall **for the majority of the**
10 **position's duties and responsibilities.** (Emphasis added). *Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and*
11 *Industries*, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

12
13 We have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted during the director's review and
14 considered the arguments presented by the parties at the hearing before the Board. We find the
15 position is not responsible for consultative services to other State, county, and municipal agencies
16 over 50% of the time. Nor is the purpose of this position and preponderance of work to confer
17 with architects, display fabricators, contractors, and field staff to ensure compliance with themes
18 and specifications and to plan, research, develop and implement site interpretive master plans and
19 programs. We agree with the director's determination that, while Appellant performs reoccurring
20 work statewide with the geocache and other programs, the majority of work, primary focus and
21 responsibility remains around Cama Beach State Park. As such, the Parks Interpretive Specialist
22 classification provides the best fit for the overall functions, scope of responsibility and purpose of
23 Appellant's position.

24
25 The best fit concept is used when, for lack of a better fit, the duties and responsibilities of a
26 position do not encompass the full breadth of the duties and responsibilities described by the
27 classification but the classification best describes the level, scope and diversity of the overall
28 duties and responsibilities of the position. See for example, *Salsberry v. Washington State Parks*

1 *and Recreation Commission*, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-06-013 (2007) and *Allegrì v. Washington*
2 *State University*, PAB Case No. ALLO-96-0026 (1998).

3
4 The scope of duties and level of responsibilities assigned to Appellant's position best fit the
5 scope, intent and level of responsibility found in the Parks Interpretive Specialist classification.

6
7 Since classification revisions are outside the Board's jurisdiction, we strongly encourage Parks
8 and Recreation Commission to work with the Classification and Compensation staff at State
9 Human Resources to update the Parks Interpretive class series to better reflect technological
10 advances in the work performed.

11
12 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant
13 has failed to meet her burden of proof.

14
15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Christina Dinzl-Pederson
17 is denied and the director's determination dated April 20, 2015, is affirmed.

18
19 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2015.

20 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

21
22 _____
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair

23
24 _____
SUSAN MILLER, Vice Chair

25
26 _____
VICKY BOWDISH, Member