BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ALLEN ROZEBOOM, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, Respondent.	)	Case No. ALLO-00-0015 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATIONS OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member. The hearing was held on May 2, 2001, in Room 100 of the Airport Ramada Inn in Spokane, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Allen Rozeboom was present and represented himself *pro se.* Respondent Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) was represented by Pam Pelton, Classification and Compensation Manager.

Background. Appellant requested a review of the allocation of his Social Worker (SW) 2 position. He asked that his position be reallocated to the SW 3 classification. By letter dated December 7, 1999, Respondent determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On December 20, 1999, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel.

On April 20, 2000, the Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position. By letter dated April 24, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the SW 2 classification. On May 18, 2000, Appellant appealed

the Director's determinations to the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works for the Economic and Medical Services Division located in the Spokane North CSO. Appellant is the sole Social Worker responsible for Temporary Aid to Needy Families and assigned as the Social Security Income Facilitator in the Spokane office. Appellant is not assigned lead responsibilities and is not assigned to a remote location.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant contends that he does indepth assessments of high risk clients, refers them to other units and services, performs screenings for referrals to shelters, locates subsidized housing, refers clients for medical or psychological assessments, and provides vouchers to pay for support services. In addition, Appellant attends staffings for Child Protective Services and has been subpoenaed to appear in court. Appellant contends that he performs advanced specialized duties, risk assessments and specialized case management and that the clients he serves are at high risk of serious problems, require intensive case management and are the most fragile, challenging and difficult clients to serve. Appellant asserts that his level responsibilities and duties are described by the SW 3 classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellant does not meet the definition of the SW 3 classification because he is not a assigned lead responsibility, he does not report to an off-site supervisor, and he is not assigned sole responsibility for social services in a remote location. Respondent contends Appellant does not perform advanced or specialized work, does not perform direct intake activities, and is not assigned to provide services to protect children, reconcile families, court involvement to provide ongoing protection to children, or emergent intervention. Respondent asserts that Appellant's position is best described by the SW 2 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Social Worker 2 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Social Worker 2, class code 35210, and Social Worker 3, class code 35220.

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).

The definition of the Social Worker 3 classification states, in relevant part:

> Within the Department of Social and Health Services, functions as a lead worker or sole case manager in a remote location in . . . Economic and Medical Services. . . . All positions at this level receive little supervision - employees are responsible for devising their own work methods.

In Uhlinger v. Dept. of Social and Health Services, PAB Case No. ALLO-99-0012 (1999), the Board concluded that the distinguishing characteristics for Social Worker 3 require that in the Economic and Medical Services unit, incumbents either: (a) serve as the lead worker reporting to an off-site supervisor, or (b) are solely responsible for the full scope of social services in a remote office.

Here, Appellant is not a lead worker. His office is located in the Spokane North CSO. The Spokane North CSO is not considered a remote location. Furthermore, Appellant is not solely responsible for the full scope of social services at the Spokane North CSO. Therefore, his position is not comparable to those intended to be encompassed by the Social Worker 3 classification.

The definition for the Social Worker 2 classification states, in relevant part, that incumbents provide "professional level social services to the clients of . . . Economic and Medical Services. Positions in this classification receive little supervision - employees are responsible for devising own work methods . . . ."

The Social Worker 2 distinguishing characteristics require that in the Economic and Medical Services unit, incumbents "[p]rovide case management for clients with varying degrees of vocational, social, cultural, and/or medical impairments hindering economic independence. . . . Assess and determine employability, job readiness, and vocational education and training needs. Create, implement, monitor, and modify case plans for achieving client economic and social self-support. . . ."

Appellant provides professional level case management for specialized, high-risk clients. He functions independently, screens referrals, determines the appropriate services to provide to clients and refers them to others as needed. Appellant's duties and responsibilities are encompassed by the Social Worker 2 definition and distinguishing characteristics and are characteristic of the typical work statements for this classification.

Conclusion. Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the Director, dated April 24, 2000, should be affirmed.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination, dated April 24, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504