

KAREN STEPHENS,)	CASE NO. R-ALLO-09-040
Appellant,		
vs.		
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,		ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
Respondent.		

On August 27, 2008, Appellant submitted a Position Review Request to CWU's Human Resources office asking that her LAP 5 position be reallocated to the LAP 6 classification.

1 CWU reviewed Appellant's position and by letter dated October 31, 2008 determined that the
2 position was properly allocated to the LAP 5 classification.

3
4 On November 19, 2008, Appellant filed a request for a director's review of CWU's decision and
5 asked that her position be reallocated to the LAP 6 classification. On October 20, 2009, the
6 director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated.

7
8 On November 17, 2009, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's
9 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

10
11 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that in addition to performing technical
12 service duties, she performs the highest level of complex copy cataloging and original cataloging
13 as described by the LAP 6 class. Appellant asserts that original cataloging is found only at the
14 LAP 6 level. Appellant further asserts that the maintenance she performs is related to authority
15 files and creation of original authority requests which require her to independently make complex
16 decisions. Appellant also asserts that because she supervises staff performing work that requires
17 a very high level of technical expertise, her supervisory responsibilities best fit within the LAP 6
18 class. Appellant argues that she coordinates the day-to-day workflow of the department;
19 participates in developing, documenting and implementing policy and procedures for the
20 department; schedules, implements and monitors projects; and resolves complex problems which
21 are duties and responsibilities found at the LAP 6 level. Appellant contends that she performs
22 duties at the highest expert/supervisor level and her scope of responsibilities and extent of
23 independence is consistent with the LAP 6 level. Appellant argues that her cataloging duties are
24 similar to the professional librarian positions with whom she consults on a peer-to-peer basis.
25 Appellant asserts that the majority of the overall duties and level of responsibilities assigned to
26 her position fit within the LAP 6 classification and therefore, her position should be reallocated.

27
28 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent recognizes that there is a significant amount
29 of overlap in duties between the LAP 4, LAP 5 and LAP 6 classifications and acknowledges that a

1 portion of Appellant's duties and responsibilities fall within the LAP 6 classification. However,
2 Respondent contends that only 10 percent of Appellant's duties fit solely in the LAP 6 class.
3 Respondent asserts that the majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities, including her
4 supervisory responsibilities, fall within the level of work described in the definition and typical
5 work statements of the LAP 5 class.

6
7 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
8 to the Library and Archives Paraprofessional 5 classification should be affirmed.

9
10 **Relevant Classifications.** Library and Archives Paraprofessional 5, class code 262M, Library and
11 Archives Paraprofessional 6, class code 262N.

12
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
14 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
15 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which
16 that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
17 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
18 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the
19 position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

20
21 Appellant argues that her position performs cataloging duties and responsibilities similar to those
22 performed by the professional librarians and that she functions at the highest expert level. While a
23 comparison of one position to another similar position may be useful in gaining a better
24 understanding of the duties performed by and the level of responsibility assigned to an
25 incumbent, allocation of a position must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities
26 assigned to an individual position compared to the existing classifications. The allocation or
27 misallocation of a similar position is not a determining factor in the appropriate allocation of a
28
29

position. Flahaut v. Dept's of Personnel and Labor and Industries, PAB No. ALLO 96-0009 (1996).

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

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

The definition for Library and Archives Paraprofessional 6 states:

This is the highest expert/supervisor level of the series. Performs complex technical library tasks and problem solving involving intensive application of specialized knowledge and skills. Examples include participation in the acquisition, development, and management of library collections, original descriptive and subject cataloging and classification, complex bibliographic and reference searches. Some positions may supervise assigned personnel.)

Many of the duties described in LAP 6 are also contained in the LAP 5 level. When considering the duties and responsibilities assigned to Appellant's position, the primary distinction between the two classes is the performance of original and descriptive subject cataloging and classification found at the LAP 6 level and the performance of complex cataloging of library materials with catalog copy found at the LAP 5 level.

It is undisputed that the portion of Appellant's duties that deal with original cataloging fall within the LAP 6 level. However, in the documents Appellant provided in support of her reallocation, these duties do not constitute a majority of her overall duties and responsibilities.

Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and

1 the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the
2 majority of the position's duties and responsibilities. See Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and
3 Industries, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

4
5 In this case, the overall majority of the duties and responsibilities assigned to Appellant's
6 position do not rise to the LAP 6 level.

7
8 The definition for Library and Archives Paraprofessional 5 states, in relevant part:

9 This is the second expert/supervisor level of the series. Supervises assigned
10 personnel and performs complex technical library tasks and problem solving using
11 intensive application of specialized knowledge and skills, such as search
12 bibliographic or complex reference resources, perform complex cataloging of
13 library materials with catalog copy, analyze and resolve complex order and
14 bibliographic problems, assist clients with reference services including
15 interpreting and conferring on research strategies and assisting the management
16 and preservation of the collection OR, supervises assigned personnel and directs
17 the operations of a large library unit or one or more units, characterized by staff
18 performing a variety of complex technical work or multiple functions.

19
20 The majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities are best described by the LAP 5
21 classification. For example, Appellant:

- 22 • supervises students and classified staff performing complex library tasks and coordinates
23 and directs the workflow of the department
- 24 • performs complex cataloging such as maintaining and creating new authorities and
25 subject proposals and evaluating new volumes to determine the level of cataloging
26 required
- 27 • participates in development and implementation of policies, procedures and projects and
28 implements library automation
- 29 • uses specialized knowledge and skills when resolving complex problems with the online
catalog and with bibliographic and authority records.

These duties and responsibilities are encompassed in the definition of the LAP 5 classification and
further described in the typical work statements of the LAP 5 and the LAP 4 classifications.

1 In a hearing on exceptions, the appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has
2 failed to meet her burden of proof. Therefore, the appeal on exceptions should be denied, and the
3 director's determination, dated October 20, 2009, should be affirmed.

4
5 **ORDER**

6 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Karen
7 Stephens is denied, and the director's determination dated October 20 2009, is affirmed.

8
9 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2010.

10 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

11
12 _____
13 LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair

14
15 _____
16 DJ MARK, Member