BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ANNE GESSINI ET AL, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-04-0012 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, BUSSE NUTLEY, Vice Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Member, on Appellants' exceptions to the director's determination dated August 17, 2004. The hearing was held at the Personnel Appeals Board, 2828 Capitol Boulevard, Olympia, Washington, on February 10, 2005.

Appearances. Appellants Anne Gessini, Maria Pimentel, and Ellen Rice were represented by Julie Sakahara of the Washington Federation of State Employees. Bob Swanson, Human Resource Manager, represented Respondent Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

Background. Appellants Gessini and Pimentel submitted Classification Questionnaires (CQs) in December 2003, and Appellant Rice submitted a CQ in January 2004, to DSHS Human Resources requesting that their Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager (DDCRM) positions be

reallocated to the Social Worker 3 (SW 3) classification. By letters dated December 23, 2003, and January 29, 2004, Tess Sample, DSHS Region 4 Human Resource Consultant, notified Appellants that each position was properly allocated as a Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager. Ms. Sample determined that Appellants' duties were within the job specifications of the DDCRM classification and that the DDCRM classification was specifically established to encompass the types of duties performed by Appellants.

Each Appellant appealed the agency's decision to the director of the Department of Personnel, and on April 21, 2004, Paul L. Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, held an allocation review. By letter dated August 17, 2004, Mr. Peterson notified Appellants their positions were properly allocated to the DDCRM classifications because it both includes and best describes the duties performed by Appellants. On February 10, 2004, Appellants filed an appeal with the Personnel Appeals Board.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellants assert they perform the same work, have the same responsibility, and use the same programs and assessment tools to work with people on their caseloads that SW 3's do. Appellants argue they perform the duties listed under the Aging and Adult Services section of the SW 3 class specification but contend that Aging and Adult services as an entity no longer exists and has merged under the Aging and Disability Services Administration. Appellant further contends that SW 3's do perform work within the Aging and Disability Services Administration. Appellants assert there is inequitable treatment between the two job classifications and argue their duties best fit the Social Worker 3 classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent does not dispute that there are some levels of duties and responsibilities that are similar for both the Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager and Social Worker 3 classifications. Respondent, however, argues the positions do not

actually perform the same duties. Respondent asserts the SW 3's who work with developmental disabilities transferred as a result of a voluntary placement, and they perform very specific duties and are out of the office considerably more than the DDCRM's. Respondent contends the department is consistently reviewing these classifications and the DDCRM classification was specifically designed to encompass the duties performed by Appellants. Respondent argues Appellants' duties best fit the definition for the Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellants' positions are properly allocated to the Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager, class code 35610; Social Worker 3, class code 35220.

The definition for the class of Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager states:

> Within the Division of Developmental Disabilities, provides advanced level of social services, specialized case and/or resource management for people who have developmental disabilities and their families.

The definition for the class of Social Worker 3 states:

> Within the Department of Social and Health Services, functions as a lead worker or sole case manager in a remote location in either Aging and Adult Services or Economic and Medical Services; or performs advanced level of specialized case management in Children and Family Services or Aging and Adult Services. All positions at this level receive little supervision – employees are responsible for devising their own work methods.

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. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. 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 which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Appellants' duties, as reflected on their CQs, are consistent with the Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager class specification. While there are similar duties in the Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager and Social Worker 3 classifications, Appellants' positions were created for the purpose of doing Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager work. Although the department restructured the former Developmental Disabilities Division, creating a subdivision under the Aging and Disability Services Administration, the record supports that Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Managers remained under that subdivision, while social workers went primarily to the Home and Community Services Division under the same administration. Furthermore, a position's duties must meet the definition of the classification specification.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellants should be denied, and the Director's determination dated August 17, 2004, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellants is denied, and the attached Director's determination, dated August 17, 2004, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2005.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____

Busse Nutley, Vice Chair

_____

Gerald L. Morgen, Member