## BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND	)
RECREATION COMMISSION,	) CASE NO. R-ALLO-09-024
Appellant,	)
VS.	ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
CARMYN SHUTE,	
Respondent.	

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came before the Personnel Resources Board, LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair, and DJ MARK, Member, for a hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated June 19, 2009. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on January 21, 2010.

**Appearances.** Appellant Parks and Recreation Commission (Parks) was represented by Jose Vidales, Human Resource Consultant. Respondent Carmyn Shute was present and was represented by Kathy Andruss, Classification Director for the Washington Federation of State Employees.

**Background.** Ms. Shute's position was allocated to the Customer Service Specialist 2 (CSS2) class. Her position is located at the Fort Worden Conference Center. On April 25, 2008, Ms. Shute submitted a Position Review Request (PRR) to Park's Human Resources. Steve Shively, Ms. Shute's second-line supervisor, and Kate Burke, Fort Worden Area Parks Manager, signed the PRR as the supervisor and unit head, respectively. However, Susan Strizic-Thomas was Ms. Shute's first-line supervisor. Ms. Thomas did not sign the PRR.

The classification questionnaire (CQ) for Ms. Shute's position included a single entry describing 85% of her duties. To gain better understanding of the duties, by e-mail dated January 22, 2008, Mr. Vidales asked Ms. Thomas for a further breakdown of the duties. Ms. Thomas responded

with a revised CQ on March 5, 2008. Ms. Shute did not sign this CQ but she did review it and provide clarification of the duties described.

By letter dated March 11, 2008, Mr. Vidales notified Ms. Shute that her position was properly allocated as a Customer Service Specialist 2 and denied her request for reallocation to the Customer Service Specialist 3.

On April 7, 2008, Ms. Shute, submitted a Request for Director's Review form and noted that the Conference Coordinator 3 class best described her position. By letter dated June 19, 2009, the director's designee concluded that Ms. Shute's position was best described by the Conference Coordinator 3 classification and that her position should be reallocated.

On July 17, 2009, Parks filed exceptions to the director's determination. Parks' exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Ms. Shute processes reservations for the Fort Worden Conference Center, coordinates a variety of services for events held at the Conference Center such as weddings and family reunions, and monitors, processes, prepares and reconciles invoices and payments. As described by Parks in their March 11, 2008, letter, the majority of Ms. Shute's time is spent performing reservation duties, coordinating events, processing payments and performing office duties. Her duties include independently resolving client/customer service problems, providing information and assisting clients/customers with event planning, and interpreting and applying laws and regulations regarding facility use.

**Summary of Parks' Arguments.** Parks argues that Ms. Shute works in a customer service unit where the majority of the work involves processing events for large groups and some conferences. Parks asserts that this requires the customer service staff to following established processes and procedures, communicate with program and reservations staff, and at times coordinate services and act as a liaison within the agency. Parks contends that while Ms. Shute coordinates events, she does

ser ser for det ma

not plan, arrange or coordinate conferences. Rather she provides information about the established services available at Fort Worden such as food services. The conference leaders then contact service providers to arrange for services themselves rather than Ms. Shute making the arrangements for them. Parks further contends that Ms. Shute does not establish conference budgets, negotiate or determine fees, select speakers, oversee details such as coffee service or off-site transportation, or make off-site reservations. Rather, Parks alleges that Ms. Shute provides information to conference leaders, processes, monitors, and tracks payments, represents the agency to outside entities, and performs lead duties in the absence of her supervisor. Parks argues that Ms. Shute's duties and responsibilities fit within the Customer Service Specialist 2 classification.

Summary of Ms. Shute's Arguments. Ms. Shute agrees that within the conference center, she makes reservations for conferences and from time to time, for camping and recreational housing. However, she argues that her work goes beyond making reservations. Ms. Shute argues that she also explains the services available at Fort Worden and in the vicinity to conference leaders and talks with conference leaders about overall budgets and the specific allotment funds to budget items such as food budgets for various meals. She explains the level of service offered at Fort Worden and how the conference center can help events to be successful. Ms. Shute asserts that she also talks with conference leaders about details such as the amenities available at the various Fort Worden sites and about rules and regulations within the park such as the use of a fire circle, having alcohol on the premises, and observance of the parks' quiet hours. Ms. Shute contends that she plans, coordinates, organizes, does billing, and provides information for large and small conference and that the majority of her duties fit within the Conference Coordinator 3 classification.

**Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position should be reallocated to the Conference Coordinator 3 classification should be affirmed.

**Relevant Classifications.** Customer Service Specialist 2, class code 102B, and Conference Coordinator 3, class code 111C.

Description
 bes
 me
 that
 part
 det

8

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28 29 **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).

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

When allocating positions, the following standards, in descending order, are the primary considerations:

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

The class series concept for Customer Service Specialist series states:

Positions in this series provide assistance and problem resolution to agency clients/customers and are located in a designated customer service program. The intent of the series is to assist clients/customers in identifying agency processes and procedures, resolving client/customer problems related to agency programs and interpreting agency related laws, policies and procedures. Positions at all levels may be assigned lead or supervisory responsibility over lower level staff.

This series is not clerical in nature. Clerical support duties are incidental to the total work assignment (less than 10%). Clerical support, for the purposes of this

series, includes tasks such as maintaining filing systems, maintaining logs, updating computer or manual data systems, office and telephone reception, completing office forms, compiling and completing recurrent reports, performing routine typing, copy work and preparing mailings.

This occupational category is considered a technical occupational category. Positions assigned to this occupational category have authority to accept, grant or deny agency services or may mediate between the business of the agency and the client (example: Attorney General's Consumer Protection Unit). Some positions may train and provide leadership to volunteers.

Ms. Shute's duties are generally described in the Customer Service Specialist concept. However, when there is a class that specifically includes a particular assignment and there is a general classification that has a definition which could also apply to the position, the position should be allocated to the class that specifically includes the position. Mikitik v. Dept's of Wildlife and Personnel, PAB No. A88-021 (1989); see also, Waldher v. Dept. of Transportation, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-08-026 (2009).

The class series concept for the Conference Coordinator series states:

Positions in this series plan, arrange, and coordinate facility and logistical support for on- and off-site conferences, seminars, and workshops. Incumbents oversee operational detail support services and may have financial responsibility throughout the event including establishing budgets, selecting speakers, lodging, catering, security, publicity, materials, and equipment; negotiating with vendors; determining fees to charge participants; preparing and changing contracts; and collecting and refunding conference fees. Coordination duties are usually complex in nature such as overseeing and monitoring compliance with applicable laws, regulations, policies, emergency procedures, and ADA compliance and making arrangements for large-scale, multi-state regional conferences and simultaneous unrelated conferences.

Incumbents make comprehensive arrangements for conferences and resolve all logistical problems that arise during events. Incumbents work with the latitude to make decisions independent of requesters regarding details such as budgets, charges, lodging, type of facility(ies), equipment, materials, speakers, food service, and additional event support services in on- and off-site facilities.

Incumbents typically establish conference and event budgets and negotiate rental fees and associated costs for on- and off-site events and establish competitive rates with the goal of recouping all costs, including overhead, negotiate revisions to contracts, and make determinations regarding refunds.

1

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

2627

28

29

The Conference Coordinator concept provides a better fit for Ms. Shute's duties and responsibilities. She plans, arranges, and coordinates facility and logistical support for events at Fort Worden Conference Center including operational support services such as:

- assuring ADA needs are addressed
- determining, collecting and refunding conference fees
- overseeing and monitoring compliance with applicable laws, regulations, policies for activities such as fire circles and observance of "quiet time" after 11 p.m.
- making comprehensive arrangements for events and resolving logistical problems that arise during events.

## The definition for the Conference Coordinator 3 classification states:

Positions at this level work independently with limited supervision. Incumbents plan, arrange, and coordinate a wide variety of support services for events such as, complex single-day conferences, multi-day conferences, seminars, and workshops requiring complicated planning and coordination of details. Incumbents represent conference services to outside organizations and the community; plan and coordinate all support services for conferences and conference-related functions, seminars, and workshops; contact speakers, compile conference materials, coordinate registration, make facility arrangements, negotiate services and costs, develop conference budgets, and process billing. Incumbents independently coordinate repeat programs and assist program leader with the development of new programs.

We agree with the director's determination that the majority of Ms. Shute's work time is spent in activities found at the Conference Coordinator 3 level. For example, she develops and supports conferences and anticipates and deals with a large number of conference connected details. In performing her duties, she:

- coordinates with conference leaders to organize accommodations and meeting spaces
- provides information to conference leaders for community vendors to meet specific needs
- assists the in developing conference and food service budgets
- directs group leaders in proper registration areas and methods
- meets with other Fort Worden staff to ensure that facility arrangements, food service/catering and A/V needs are met as scheduled

provides any other needed services to ensure a successful event. 1 2 In addition, she prepares and reconciles invoices and statements, monitors payments, arranges 3 special payment schedules, adjusts fees, and offers discounts in response to clients' concerns. 4 5 In Allegri v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. ALLO-96-0026 (1998), the Personnel 6 Appeals Board noted that while the appellant's duties and responsibilities did not encompass the 7 full breadth of the duties and responsibilities described by the classification to which his position 8 was allocated, on a best fit basis, the classification best described the level, scope and diversity of the overall duties and responsibilities of his position. In this case, Ms. Shute's level of 10 independence and the scope and complexity of her duties, best fits within the Conference 11 Coordinator 3 class. 12 13 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Parks has 14 failed to meet its burden of proof. Therefore, the appeal on exceptions should be denied, and the 15 director's determination, dated June 19, 2009, should be affirmed. 16 17 **ORDER** 18 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Parks is 19 denied, and the director's determination dated June 19, 2009, is affirmed. 20 21 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2010. 22 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD 23 24 25 LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair 26 27 DJ MARK, Member 28 29