BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

JEFFREY POTESKY, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-02-0009 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, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated May 2, 2002. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington, on February 6, 2003.

Appearances. Appellant Jeffrey Potesky was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Corrections was represented by John Whitehead, Human Resource Manager.

Background. As a result of a class study encompassing accounting and other fiscal classes, the Washington State Personnel Resources Board adopted a new class series of Financial Analysts 1 - 5. John Whitehead, Human Resource Manager for the Department of Corrections, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated January 2, 2002, Mr. Whitehead informed Appellant that his position was being reallocated from Accountant 4 to the new Financial Analyst 4 classification effective January 1, 2002.

By letter dated January 10, 2002, Appellant filed a request for review to the Director of the Department of Personnel. In his letter of appeal, Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the Financial Analyst 5 classification.

On March 25, 2002, the director's designee, Karl Nagel, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position. By letter dated May 2, 2002, Mr. Nagel determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Financial Analyst 4 classification. On May 20, 2002, Appellant filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board to the determination of the Department of Personnel.

Appellant's position is located at the Department of Corrections, Northeast Region Business Service Center. Appellant reports to the Assistant Regional Business Manager. Appellant fills in for his supervisor in his absence and receives upgraded pay for that duty when it occurs. Appellant is responsible for employee payroll and vendor payments. Appellant's position is the only one in the Department of Corrections that handles two major areas of responsibility (payroll and accounts payable).

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant disagrees with the determination that his position is properly allocated to the Financial Analyst 4 classification. Appellant asserts that his duties clearly fall within the specifications of the Financial Analyst 5, and that his specific duties are not in dispute by the Department of Corrections. Appellant contends that he serves as the principal assistant to an Assistant Regional Business Manager (a Washington Management Service position). Appellant asserts that the allocation decision was inappropriately based solely on the fact that written designation has not been granted by the department. Appellant argues that he has been performing Financial Analyst 5 level job duties in absence of written designation by the appointing authority, and therefore is not compensated appropriately even though he is performing the work.

Appellant states that consideration should be given to the fact that he is performing the duties of the higher level and should, therefore, be compensated at the higher level.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent asserts that Appellant's position was correctly allocated based on the definition of the class of Financial Analyst 4 adopted by the Personnel Resources Board. Respondent states that Appellant's position is unique because he supervises two different areas of accounting, while typically a Financial Analyst 4 is only responsible for one section of accounting. Respondent argues that this unique situation made the allocation decision difficult, and therefore careful consideration was given to make a proper determination. However, Respondent asserts that the distinguishing characteristics of a Financial Analyst 5 require designation in writing by the appointing authority, who has not provided that written designation. Respondent argues that in the absence of such written designation, it is impossible to allocate Appellant's position to the Financial Analyst 5 level.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Financial Analyst 4 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Financial Analyst 4, Class Code 12108; and Financial Analyst 5, Class Code 12109.

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).

Consistent with our decisions in Griffith v. Dep't of Ecology, PAB Case No. ALLO-00-0016 (2000) and Stash v. Dep't of Ecology, PAB Case No. ALLO-00-0001 (1999), when a classification specification requires written designation, we must look for a document that confers such a designation upon the position in question. This written documentation can be a formal agency designation form, an approved CQ, or other written documentation. Furthermore, we find no document that confers, as required in the Financial Analyst 5 specification, written designation to Appellant's position as the agency's chief financial accountant or principal assistant or primary financial advisor to a fiscal manager in Washington management or exempt service. Because Appellant lacks written designation from the appointing authority, the scope of duties and level of independence assigned to his position are best described by the Financial Analyst 4 classification.

There is no dispute that Appellant lacks written designation. After reviewing the exhibits in this case and the work performed by Appellant, we find no document that confers such designation to Appellant's position.

The record supports the decision by the director's designee that Appellant's position does not meet the definition or distinguishing characteristics required for the Financial Analyst 5 job class level.

Conclusion. Appellant's position is best described by the Financial Analyst 4 classification. Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the director's determination dated May 2, 2002 should be affirmed.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Jeffrey Potesky is denied and the director's determination dated May 2, 2002 is affirmed, and a copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2003.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504