BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

CHRIS ANDERSON, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-04-0019 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, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated November 22, 2004. The hearing was held at the Department of Labor and Industries, 12806 Gateway Drive, Tukwila, Washington, on April 15, 2005.

Appearances. Appellant Chris Anderson was represented by Julie Sakahara, Area Representative of the Washington Federation of State Employees. Arturo Haro, Human Resource Manager, represented Respondent Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

Background. Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) in August 2004, to DSHS Human Resources requesting that his position as a Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager (DDCRM) be reallocated to the Social Worker 3 (SW 3) classification. By letter dated August 25, 2004, Tess Sample, DSHS Region 4 Human Resource Consultant, notified Appellant his position was properly allocated to Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager classification. Ms. Sample determined that Appellant's duties were within the job specifications of the DDCRM classification and the classification was specifically established to encompass the

types of duties performed by Appellant, specifically, providing services to developmentally disabled clients.

Appellant appealed the agency's decision to the director of the Department of Personnel, and on November 1, 2004, Paul L. Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, held an allocation review. By letter dated November 22, 2004, Mr. Peterson notified Appellant that his position was properly allocated to the DDCRM classification. On December 14, 2004, Appellant filed an appeal with the Personnel Appeals Board.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant asserts he performs the same duties as a Social Worker 3. Appellant asserts that he uses the same programs, received the same training, and manages his caseload in the same way as other Social Work 3s. Appellant asserts that the Division of Aging and Adult Services no longer exits because it was merged with Development Disabilities under the Aging and Disability Services Administration (ADSA) and that there are Social Worker 3s in ADSA. Appellant asserts it is unfair to classify him to the DDCRM classification when his duties best fit the Social Worker 3 classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent disagrees that Appellant's duties are "nearly identical to those of a SW3 located in Home and Community Services." Respondent argues that the SW 3's who work with developmental disability in HCS work with children 18 years and younger, carry a medically intensive caseload, represent the agency in court as expert witnesses and carry an assigned caseload of 30:1. Respondent asserts that Appellant's duties differ and, more significantly, are specifically addressed in the DDCRM classification specification. Therefore, Respondent argues the director's determination should be affirmed, because position No. SQ40 is properly allocated to the DDCRM classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is 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. ...

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).

After reviewing the CQ submitted by Appellant for position SQ40, we find that Appellant's duties are consistent with the DDCRM class specification. As in our decision in Gesseini et. al v. Dep't.

of Social and Health Services, PAB Case No. ALLO-04-0012 (2005), we continue to hold that while there are similar duties in the DDCRM and SW3 classifications, Appellant's position was created for the purpose of performing Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager work and those duties are specifically addressed in the definition of the class specification. 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. Appellant has not met his burden of proving that position SQ40 should be allocated to the SW 3 classification.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied, and the Director's determination dated November 22, 2004, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied, and the Director's determination, dated November 22, 2004, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2005.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504