

1 determination. In her exceptions appeal, Appellant again asked that her position be reallocated to the
2 Program Manager B or the Corrections Specialist 3 classification. Appellant's exceptions are the
3 subject of this proceeding.

4 Appellant works in a high-level administrative support position to the Superintendent of WCCW
5 and serves as a member of the Senior Management Team. Appellant's assignments require her to
6 interpret and explain applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies and procedures and to coordinate
7 and monitor program activities for her assigned program areas. Appellant acts as the legal liaison
8 for the Attorney General's office, coordinates the public disclosure process for the facility and
9 serves as public information officer for the facility.

10
11 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** In summary, Appellant contends that as the WCCW Public
12 Disclosure Coordinator, Legal Liaison Officer and Public Information Officer, she has program
13 responsibility for multiple programs. Appellant asserts these are major programs and that they
14 constitute a majority of her time. Appellant argues that she has not been merely delegated program
15 responsibilities, but asserts that she has been designated to act on behalf of the Superintendent in
16 these areas.

- 17 • In regard to her public disclosure responsibilities, Appellant explains that WCCW is not a
18 centralized facility and as a result, she performs the same duties as the public disclosure
19 specialists at headquarters who are allocated to higher level classes. Appellant acknowledges
20 that she may seek guidance from a public disclosure specialist located at headquarters but
21 asserts that she basically performs the same work. On her position description form,
22 Appellant indicated that she performs public disclosure duties 25% of her time.
- 23
24 • In regard to her Legal Liaison Officer duties, Appellant explains that in consultation with the
25 Assistant Attorney General (AAG) and tort investigator, she manages the discovery process
26 at WCCW by gathering documents from institution staff, labeling documents and preparing
27 documents for the AAG and investigator. Appellant further explains that she speaks with the
28 AAG or tort investigator regularly. No one at WCCW reviews or approves her work before it

1 is provided to the AAG or investigator. On her position description form, Appellant
2 indicated that she performs public disclosure duties 25% of her time.

- 3 • In regard to her Public Information Officer duties, Appellant acknowledges that by policy,
4 media releases are approved by the Superintendent or incident commander but she argues
5 that her job is broader than that. Appellant explains that she provides information to the
6 community and the media regarding the institution and its programs. She also explains that
7 she discusses possible projects such news features and documentaries with perspective media
8 representatives and coordinates with them on issues such as access within the secured
9 perimeter of the facility when the facility is featured in such events. On her position
10 description form, Appellant indicated that she performs public disclosure duties 10% of her
11 time.

12 Appellant asserts that she is responsible for managing three separate programs. Appellant argues that
13 there are three separate policies for her program areas and contends that her program duties
14 constitute a majority of her time. Appellant contends that her program areas are similar to those
15 contained in the Correctional Specialist class and asserts that the Board could add her programs to
16 that class. In closing, Appellant asks that her position be reallocated to a higher level classification
17 based on a majority of her duties and responsibilities.
18

19 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that Appellant's primary responsibility
20 is to act on behalf of the Superintendent to assure that policies and procedures are followed and that
21 her assigned program activities are carried out at WCCW. Respondent asserts that Appellant serves
22 as an assistant to the Superintendent and performs delegated duties such as coordinating, reviewing,
23 disseminating and compiling documents, serving as a liaison between facility staff and the Attorney
24 General's office, and coordinating public records requests and media contacts. Respondent
25 acknowledges that Appellant works with a variety of DOC programs but contends that she works on
26 the program components at WCCW only and not on programs in their entirety. For example,
27 Respondent explains that Appellant's role as legal liaison for WCCW is a component of the work
28 performed as part of the statewide DOC Risk Management Department and that the Risk

1 Management Department acts as the expert for legal issues at the agency. Respondent argues that in
2 her role as legal liaison, Appellant gathers and funnels information between facility staff and outside
3 entities. Respondent also argues that as defined in DOC policy, Appellant's public information
4 officer duties are funneled through and reviewed and approved by the communications staff at
5 headquarters prior to release.

6 Respondent recognizes that Appellant coordinates program functions that affect components of
7 DOC programs but argues that her position does not meet the definition of a Program Manager or fit
8 the Program Manager B classification. For example, Respondent asserts that Appellant is not
9 responsible for key program activities such as developing program goals and objectives, preparing
10 budgets, controlling the allocation of program resources, and evaluating program effectiveness.
11 Respondent contends that Appellant's position does not fit within the Correctional Specialist 3
12 classification because she is not responsible for a DOC correctional program at the institution level
13 within a correctional facility. Rather, Respondent contends that Appellant reports to a head of
14 WCCW which is a major operating location of the agency as described in the AA4 classification.
15 Respondent argues that on a best fit basis, Appellant's position should remain allocated to the AA4
16 classification.

17
18 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
19 to the Administrative Assistant 4 classification should be affirmed.

20
21 **Relevant Classifications.** Administrative Assistant 4, class code 105H; Program Manager B, class
22 code 107S, Corrections Specialist 3, class code 350C.

23
24 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
25 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
26 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
27 work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
28 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a

1 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position.
2 See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

3
4 The following standards, in descending order, are the primary considerations in allocating
5 positions:

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

11 Appellant asks the Board to add her programs to the Correctional Specialist class series. However,
12 the allocation process is not the proper forum to address the modification or creation of a new
13 classification. Furthermore, resolution of this issue is not within the Board's jurisdiction. See,
14 Evans v. Dept. of Corrections, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-001 (2007).

15 The class series concept for the Corrections Specialist classes states,

16 Within the Department of Corrections, is responsible for various correctional
17 programs as assigned, such as community service activities, institutional training,
18 classification and treatment programs, offender grievances, institutional hearings,
19 roster management for major institutions, contracted chemical dependency
20 treatment services, deaf inmate program services, auditing of correctional
21 programs, HQ intelligence and investigations, canine or; administers an
investigative/intelligence operation at a major institution. Some positions may
supervise lower level staff.

22 The definition of the Corrections Specialist 3 class states:

23 This is the senior, specialist, or lead worker level of the series. Within the
24 Department of Corrections, develops, coordinates, implements and/or evaluates
25 various correctional program(s) as assigned. Prepares comprehensive reports and
26 makes recommendations for management, identifies and projects trends, and
27 monitors program expenditures for adherence to budgeted allocations. Positions in
28 this class perform professional level duties covering one or more of the following
correctional program areas: institutional training, CORE, COACH, offender
grievances, institutional hearings (e.g., disciplinary, intensive management,
administrative segregation), roster management for major institutions; administers

1 an investigative/intelligence operation at a major institution, which may include
2 other regional and community involvement.

3 Appellant is not responsible for a correctional program as anticipated by the class series concept
4 for the Corrections Specialist classes. Rather, she coordinates components of various programs as
5 the primary contact for WCCW. While the Appellant works at a correctional facility, the programs
6 she supports are not institutional correctional programs, rather they are programs commonly found
7 outside of a correctional setting. Appellant provides coordination for components of statewide
8 DOC programs. Appellant's position does not fit with the class series concept of the Corrections
9 Specialist class series. The Corrections Specialist 3 classification does not provide the best fit for
10 Appellant's position.

11 The Department of Personnel Glossary of classification terms provides that a program is:

12 A specialized area with specific complex components and tasks that distinguish it
13 from other programs (or the main body of an organization). A program is specific
14 to a particular subject and has a specific mission, goals, and objectives. A program
15 typically has an identifiable funding source and separate budget code.

16 The specific components and specialized tasks involve interpretation of policies,
17 procedures and regulations, budget coordination/administration, independent
18 functioning. Typically requires public contact relating specifically to program
19 subject matter, clients, and participants.

20 Duties are not of a general support nature transferable from one program to
21 another. Performance of clerical duties is in support of an incumbent's
22 performance of specialized tasks. Independent performance of these duties usually
23 requires at least a six-month training period.

24 Appellant coordinates components of DOC programs. Appellant's program duties are supportive
25 of statewide DOC programs and are not distinguished from the main body of the organization.

26 The Department of Personnel Glossary of classification terms provides that the duties of a
27 program manager involve exercising authority over:

- 28 • Developing program goals and objectives.
- Developing timetables and work plans to achieve program goals and objectives.
- Developing program policies and procedures.
- Preparing program budgets, adjusting allotments and authorizing expenditures.

- Controlling allocation of program resources.
- Setting and adjusting program priorities.
- Evaluating program effectiveness.

The definition of the Program Manager B classification states:

Supervise a division of a major administrative department, operating unit or program undertaking relieving the senior official of operating and administrative detail. Plan, coordinate and implement all functions required by the activity.

The distinguishing characteristics of the Program Manager B class state:

Program Managers administer, supervise, direct and advise on activities involved in providing an essential management service within the institution. They are responsible for advising and assisting, with minimal direction, the senior official and other administrators in the organization on matters pertaining to the program. The primary purpose of these positions is to achieve the goals and objectives of the program by providing, obtaining, and/or coordinating activities as they affect the institution.

Positions in this class involve a wide scope of complex duties and responsibilities in the management of a program which may involve a combination of two or more of the following services: Project management, funds management, contract administration, management analysis, property management, space management, program management, budget planning, public information, faculty, administrative, classified staff and student services administration, personnel administration, and staff supervision. Program Managers exercise independent judgement, and have been delegated decision-making authority. . . .

Program Managers at the "B" level are typically second- or third-line supervisors and are distinguished by their responsibility for total control of a program for a particular academic or administrative unit.

Appellant exercises authority for some of the functions typically performed by a program manager. However, she does not perform these functions for programs at the organizational level. Rather, she performs these functions for the WCCW component of statewide DOC programs. As explained by DOC, the DOC Risk Management Department maintains overall responsibility for the legal activities of the agency. Further, Appellant is not assigned budgetary responsibilities. Rather, Appellant oversees program activities and thereby relieves the Superintendent of operating and administrative details for the programs. She does not plan, coordinate and implement all

1 functions of the programs or exercise total control for the programs as required for allocation to
2 the Program Manager B level.

3
4 The definition of the Administrative Assistant 4 classification states:

5 Positions serve as the assistant on administrative matters to the head of a state
6 agency, the head of a major sub-division or major operating location of an agency,
7 or to the chief administrator or head of a major organizational unit such as a
8 school, college, or major academic/administrative department.

9 Appellant serves as the assistant to the head of a major operation location, in this case, WCCW.
10 Her position fits within the definition of the AA4 classification.

11 The distinguishing characteristics of the Administrative Assistant 4 classification state:

12 Positions perform higher-level administrative duties of a substantive nature that are
13 appropriate to be performed by the supervisor, manager, administrator, or
14 professional level employee but have been delegated to the administrative assistant
15 to perform. Positions in higher education may provide direct confidential
16 secretarial support to a unit head or administrator. For general government
17 positions, secretarial or clerical duties are incidental to the administrative functions
18 performed.

19 For those positions in a major organizational unit such as a school, college, or
20 major academic/administrative department, the "unit" will typically have more
21 than 75 full-time equivalent professional and/or classified staff; OR service
22 responsibility for more than 4,000 full-time students or staff, OR in the regional
23 universities, college and community colleges, positions serve as the sole
24 administrative support in an organization that has institution-wide responsibilities;
25 OR positions serve as both sole administrative support and the executive secretary
26 reporting to the organizational head. These positions are assigned to major units,
27 with institution-wide responsibility, that have no assistant directors, deans or
28 managers who would share the administrative duties of the position.

29 Appellant performs higher-level administrative program duties of a substantive nature. These
30 duties and responsibilities have been delegated to Appellant by the Superintendent of WCCW. In
31 performing the functions of her position, Appellant functions as the Superintendent's designee.
32 Appellant's position fits within the distinguishing characteristics of the AA4 classification.

1 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more
2 than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific
3 position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and
4 the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority
5 of the position's duties and responsibilities. See Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB
6 Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

7
8 In this case, Appellant's level and breadth of duties and responsibilities and her reporting
9 relationship best fit within the AA4 classification.

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

12
13 **ORDER**

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Billie
15 Ackerman is denied and the director's determination dated February 2, 2010, is affirmed.

16 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2010.

17 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

18
19
20 _____
LAURA ANDERSON, Chair

21
22 _____
JOSEPH PINZONE, Member