BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

GRETA SORENSEN, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, Respondent.	)	Case No. ALLO-04-0020 FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, BUSSE NUTLEY, Vice 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 Personnel Appeals Board, 2828 Capitol Boulevard, Olympia, Washington, on June 9, 2005.

Appearances. Appellant Greta Sorensen was present and was represented by Sally Farrar of the Washington Federation of State Employees. Human Resources Consultant Lloyd Hoage represented Respondent Department of Social and Health Services.

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

Background. Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) in December 2003 requesting that her Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager (DDCRM) position #RQ31 be reallocated to the Social Worker 3 (SW 3) classification. By letter dated December 23, 2003, Tess Sample, DSHS Region 4 Human Resource Consultant, notified Appellant that her position was properly allocated to the 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 September 22, 2004, Paul L. Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, held an allocation review. By letter dated November 22, 2004, Mr. Peterson notified Appellant that her position was properly allocated to the DDCRM classification. On December 17, 2004, Appellant filed an appeal with the Personnel Appeals Board.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant asserts she performs the same duties as a Social Worker 3. Appellant asserts that she uses the same programs, received the same training, and manages her caseload in the same manner the Social Worker 3s manage their cases. Appellant contends that over time her work has changed and argues that only a small percentage of the duties she performs actually exists in the DDCRM specification. Appellant asserts the job specifications for both the DDCRMs and SW3s are outdated and asserts the Division of Aging and Adult Services no longer exists because it merged with Development Disabilities under the Aging and Disability Services Administration (ADSA). Appellant further asserts that DDCRMs and SW3s working in the ADSA often transfer cases back and forth and perform the same level of work. Appellant

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

asserts the work she performs best fits the Social Worker 3 classification and argues that classifying her position to the DDCRM classification is inequitable treatment.

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 argues that although the reporting structure has changed, the actual functions of the DDCRM positions have not changed and contends Appellant's duties are specifically addressed in the DDCRM classification specification. Therefore, Respondent argues the director's determination should be affirmed, because position #RQ31 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. ...

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

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 #RQ31, we find that Appellant's duties are consistent with the DDCRM class specification. As in our decisions in Gesseini et. al v. Dep't. of Social and Health Services, PAB Case No. ALLO-04-0012 (2005) and Anderson v. Dep't. of Social and Health Services, PAB Case No. ALLO-04-0019 (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. Even though the former Developmental Disabilities Division became 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 her burden of proving that position #RQ31 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.

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Greta Sorensen 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

_____
Busse Nutley, Vice Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504