

**BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD**  
**STATE OF WASHINGTON**

|   |   |                               |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, | } | CASE NO. R-ALLO-08-017        |
| Appellant,                                | } |                               |
| vs.                                       | } | ORDER OF THE BOARD            |
|   | } | FOLLOWING HEARING ON          |
| JANET HAYES,                              | } | EXCEPTIONS TO THE             |
| Respondent.                               | } | DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR |

---

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Resources Board, MARSHA TADANO LONG, Chair; JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair; and LAURA ANDERSON, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated June 27, 2008. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on October 16, 2008.

**Appearances.** Appellant Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) was represented by Pam Pelton, Classification and Compensation Manager. Respondent Janet Hayes was represented by Amy Achilles, Senior Field Representative with the Washington Federation of State Employees.

**Background.** Ms. Hayes is employed by DSHS at the Rainier School. Her position was allocated to the Supply Control Technician classification. Ms. Hayes requested a reallocation of her position on June 7, 2007 by submitting a request for review to Rainier School's human resource office. Ms. Hayes asked that her position be reallocated to the Supply Officer 1 classification.

Rainier School's human resource staff does not have authority to allocate positions. Therefore, Rainier School forwarded Ms. Hayes' request to DSHS's centralized Classification and Compensation Unit. The Classification and Compensation Unit received the request on July 3, 2007. By letter dated July 10, 2007, DSHS provided a response to Ms. Hayes' request and denied the reallocation of her position.

1 On August 6, 2007, Ms. Hayes filed a request for review with the director of the Department of  
2 Personnel (DOP). On June 18, 2008, Teresa Parsons, the director's designee, conducted a review of  
3 Ms. Hayes' request. By letter dated June 27, 2008, Ms. Parsons determined that Ms. Hayes' position  
4 should be reallocated to the Supply Officer 1 classification.

5  
6 On July 10, 2008, DSHS filed exceptions to the director's determination. DSHS's exceptions are the  
7 subject of this proceeding.

8  
9 Ms. Hayes plans, coordinates, and performs procurement and inventory functions for her assigned  
10 areas of responsibility at Rainier School. Her assigned areas include the Carpenter Shop,  
11 Upholstery, Locksmith, Electrical, Refrigeration, Fuel, and one half of the Auto Shop. At the time  
12 of her request for review, she shared responsibility for the Auto Shop with a Supply Officer 1  
13 position.

14  
15 At the time of the review request, Ms. Hayes reported to a Supply Officer 2, Kenneth Harper. Mr.  
16 Harper agreed with the duties described in Ms. Hayes' request for review, including the statement  
17 that Ms. Hayes served as his principle assistant. Mr. Harper indicated that Ms. Hayes has the  
18 authority to independently make decisions about reorder points, research inventory discrepancies,  
19 make decisions regarding Best Buy, determine which vendors to request quotes from when items  
20 are not available on contract, work with shop supervisors, and decide day-to-day work priorities.

21  
22 Ms. Hayes performs the full range of technical duties necessary to perform her duties and she  
23 participates in purchasing control, maintains inventory levels, and performs contracts and  
24 correspondence work connected with tracking and expediting orders in the large-scale warehouse.  
25 In addition, Ms. Hayes determines what stock items need to be purchased, asks vendors to  
26 provide quotes for supplies and equipment, either orders materials consistent with a contract or  
27 obtains three quotes and selects the vendor with the best purchase price, makes a recommendation  
28 to her supervisor, and prepares requisitions for her supervisor's approval and signature. After her  
29

1 supervisor signs the requisitions, the paperwork is forwarded to the Chief Accounting Officer  
2 who has final signature authority for Rainier School.

3  
4 **Summary of DSHS's Arguments.** On July 1, 2007, DOP's consolidated classification plan became  
5 effective. Ms. Hayes filed her request for review with Rainier School's human resource office prior to  
6 the class consolidation. However, her request was not forwarded to DSHS's Classification and  
7 Compensation Unit until after the class consolidation. Because Rainier School does not have  
8 allocation authority, DSHS asserts that the director's designee should have considered the class  
9 specifications in place when DSHS's Classification and Compensation Unit received the request.  
10 DSHS contends that the director's designee should have considered the Procurement and Supply  
11 Support Specialist 2 and the Procurement and Supply Specialist (PSS) 1 and 2 classifications in  
12 her analysis and determination.

13  
14 As part of the class consolidation effort, positions were cross-walked from the previous  
15 classifications into a new class. DSHS contends that by allocating Ms. Hayes' position to a pre-  
16 consolidation classification, the designee's determination resulted in her position "cross-walking"  
17 into a new classification that does not encompass her level of work.

18  
19 DSHS argues that Ms. Hayes does not perform professional level work as required by the PSS 1  
20 and 2 classifications. DSHS contends that Ms. Hayes performs technical processing, coordination  
21 and "proceduralized" functions a majority of the time which best fits within the Procurement and  
22 Supply Support Specialist 2. DSHS asserts that she does not solicit formal bids, analyze  
23 compliance, develop specifications for services and equipment, award or administer contracts as  
24 anticipated at the PSS 1 and 2 levels.

25  
26 DSHS explained that prior to Ms. Hayes reallocation request, two positions were designated as  
27 principle assistants to Mr. Harper. DSHS asserts that Ms. Hayes does not perform work of a  
28 similar nature.

1 **Summary of Ms. Hayes' Arguments.** Ms. Hayes argues that the director's designee correctly  
2 determined that her reallocation requested was submitted on June 7, 2007 when it was received by  
3 Rainier School's human resource office. Ms. Hayes contends that this interpretation is consistent with  
4 the language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Ms. Hayes further contends that the director's  
5 designee appropriately considered the classifications that were in place at the time that she submitted  
6 her request for review.

7  
8 Ms. Hayes asserts that she performs professional level duties and that her duties are the same as those  
9 performed by the other two Supply Officer 1 positions at Rainier School. Ms. Hayes contends that her  
10 request is supported by her supervisor and by the Superintendent of Rainier School. Ms. Hayes  
11 acknowledges that she does not solicit formal bids in the sense of contracts but she asserts that  
12 performance of this duty is not required for allocation to the Supply Officer 1 classification.

13  
14 Ms. Hayes argues that the director's designee considered the appropriate time frame and classifications  
15 and that the designee correctly determined that she was performing duties described in the Supply  
16 Officer 1 classification.

17 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position should be reallocated to  
18 the Supply Officer 1 should be affirmed.

19  
20 **Relevant Classifications.** Supply Control Technician, class code 77950 (subsequently renamed and  
21 renumbered Procurement and Supply Support Specialist 1, class code 115E ) and Supply Officer 1,  
22 class code 77960 (subsequently renamed and numbered to Procurement and Supply Specialist 2, class  
23 code 114F).

24  
25 **Decision of the Board.** The director's designee considered the appropriate classifications for this  
26 review. Regardless of whether Rainier School's human resource staff has allocating authority, the  
27 Rainier School human resource office is still the local human resource office. The director's designee  
28 correctly determined that the classifications in effect on June 7, 2007 were relevant to the request.  
29

Events that occurred after the request for review, such as the classification consolidation and cross-walking of positions to the new classes, are outside of the scope of this review. Whenever a position is in a classification that no longer describes the work performed, an employer may initiate a position review and reallocate the position as provided in the applicable collective bargaining agreement or civil service rules.

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

The definition for Supply Control Technician states:

Performs the full range of technical duties under the supervision of the individual responsible for the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment for an agency, institution, major subdivision, or major operating location of an agency. Supervises and/or participates in purchasing control, maintaining inventory levels, contract and invoice billing, and correspondence work connected with tracing and expediting orders.

The distinguishing characteristics for Supply Control Technician state:

Positions at this level support an individual responsible for the purchasing of supplies, materials, and equipment for an agency, institution, major subdivision, or major operating location of an agency, by handling the purely technical aspects of purchasing and inventory control.

Ms. Hayes performs duties and responsibilities encompassed by the Supply Control Technician class. However, this class does not encompass the primary focus her position or the level of her responsibilities and delegated authority.

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

8  
9 The definition of the Supply Officer 1 classification states the position “[p]lans, coordinates, supervises  
10 or performs procurement and inventory functions for Department; or serves as principle assistant to  
11 higher level supply officer.”

12  
13 Ms. Hayes plans, coordinates and performs procurement and inventory functions as a principle  
14 assistant to Mr. Harper, who was a Supply Officer 2. Her duties include planning and  
15 coordinating her own work regarding purchasing and inventory; soliciting and analyzing quotes  
16 and procurement of products; working with maintenance technicians to formulate specifications  
17 for equipment and products; collecting and evaluating supply usage data; working with  
18 maintenance shop supervisors to project departmental supply needs and determining optimum  
19 stock levels, maximum authorizations, standard unit pack, and reorder points; ensuring master  
20 inventory records are updated; examining and determining the need for requested items; arranging  
21 for demonstrations by vendors so maintenance staff can test and evaluate products and meeting  
22 with staff to discuss the results; checking state contracts and contacting new vendors; identifying  
23 surplus items and working with vendors to return items; and contacting other institutions about  
24 surplus and transferring items to other warehouses. Ms. Hayes breadth of duties and level of  
25 responsibility are best described by the Supply Officer 1 classification.

26  
27 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. DSHS has failed  
28 to meet its burden of proof and the appeal should be denied.  
29

1 **ORDER**

2 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by DSHS is denied  
3 and the director's determination dated June 27, 2008, is affirmed and adopted.

4  
5 DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2008.

6 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

7  
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
MARSHA TADANO LONG, Chair

9  
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair

11  
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
LAURA ANDERSON, Member