

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

JEFFREY EVANS,

Appellant,

vs.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-07-001

ORDER OF THE BOARD  
FOLLOWING HEARING ON  
EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Resources Board, LARRY GOODMAN, Chair and MARSHA TADANO LONG, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated February 26, 2007. The hearing was held by telephone conference call on June 19, 2007.

**Appearances.** Appellant Jeffrey Evans was represented himself *Pro Se*. The Department of Corrections (DOC) was represented by Georgia Knowlen, Human Resource Consultant.

**Background.** Appellant's position was allocated to the class of Warehouse Supervisor 2. Effective January 1, 2005, the Department of Personnel (DOP) implemented Group 2 and 3 of the classification system consolidation plan. As a result of the consolidation effort, DOC transitioned Appellant's position into the new Warehouse Operator 4 classification in the Warehouse Operations Occupational Category.

By letter dated January 4, 2006, Appellant requested a review of DOC's decision by the Director of the Department of Personnel. At the request of the DOP, DOC conducted a review of Appellant's position using the Classification Questionnaire (CQ) that was on file for his position at the time of the implementation of the new Warehouse Operations Occupational Category. By letter dated November 22, 2006, DOC determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Warehouse Operator 4 classification within the new Warehouse Operations Occupational Category.

1 Following DOC's decision, Teresa Parsons, the Director's designee, conducted a review of  
2 Appellant's request. The review was based on written documentation. By letter dated February  
3 26, 2007, Ms. Parsons determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the  
4 Warehouse Operator 4 classification.

5 On March 21, 2007, Appellant filed exceptions to Ms. Parson's determination. Appellant's  
6 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

7  
8 At the time of his request for reallocation, Appellant was responsible for the daily management  
9 of the Northeast Region Offender Store that serviced Airway Heights Corrections Center and  
10 Pine Lodge Pre-Release. He supervised staff and offenders engaged in general warehouse  
11 activities such as picking, bagging, scanning, and distributing orders. He evaluated workers'  
12 performance, assured the security and control of tools, conducted tool inventories, oversaw  
13 inventory purchasing, oversaw inventory control and maintenance, and monitored daily sales.  
14 Appellant met with managers and department heads to identify inventory requirements,  
15 budgetary guidelines, and agency procedures and policies. He made recommendations for  
16 improvements and developed methods and procedures to improve warehouse operations. He was  
17 responsible for records and files pertaining to warehouse operations and the cleanliness of the  
18 work unit.

19 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** First, Appellant argues that based on references in the  
20 Director's determination, the DOP investigator appears to have reviewed a position other than his in  
21 making her determination. For example, the DOP decision references the Warehouse Worker 4  
22 classification which he has never been in, and makes reference to a reallocation letter for Jennie  
23 Adkins.

24  
25 Secondly, Appellant argues that his position is similar to other positions in DOC who supervise  
26 offenders using tools, yet the other positions are compensated for this responsibility while he is not.  
27 Appellant asserts that the warehouse classifications used by DOC and other agencies were created  
28 before offenders were allowed to work in warehouse areas and therefore, those classifications do not  
29 recognize this added responsibility. Appellant further asserts DOP erred in not considering the

1 added responsibilities required to supervise offenders when the new Warehouse Operations  
2 Occupational Category was created. Appellant believes he should received additional compensation  
3 for working in the correctional department, supervising offender work crews, and working in  
4 dangerous conditions.

5 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent asserts that based on the duties and  
6 responsibilities in the Classification Questionnaire (CQ) that was on file for Appellant's position  
7 when the new Warehouse Operations Occupational Category was implemented, his position was  
8 placed in the Warehouse Operator 4 classification. Respondent argues that positions must be  
9 allocated to classifications that already exist. Based on the available classifications and the duties  
10 and responsibilities assigned to Appellant's position, Respondent contends his position is  
11 properly allocated Warehouse Operator 4 classification.

12  
13 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
14 to the Warehouse Operator 4 classification should be affirmed.

15 **Relevant Classification.** Warehouse Operator 4, class code 117L.

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

25 In regard to Appellant's assertion of errors committed by the Director's designee, we have carefully  
26 reviewed the exhibits in this matter and have concluded that the errors were typographical errors.  
27 These errors are not reflected in the Director's determination or rational for determination and did  
28 not influence or impact the outcome of the Director's determination or our decision in this matter.  
29

1 For example, Appellant took exceptions to the designee's use of Exhibit B. Our review of the  
2 document shows that this exhibit was a letter dated December 9, 2005, from Jennie Adkins to  
3 Appellant. This letter informed Appellant that his position would be reallocated to the Warehouse  
4 Operator 4 classification effective January 1, 2006. It was appropriate for the designee to consider  
5 this exhibit. In addition, Appellant takes exception to the designee's reference to the Warehouse  
6 Worker 4 classification. Based on the exhibits in this case and the Director's determination and  
7 rational for determination, we find that this reference was a typographical error. Rather than stating  
8 Warehouse Worker 4, the reference should have stated Warehouse Supervisor 2 which was  
9 Appellant's position prior to the implementation of the Warehouse Operations Occupational  
10 Category.

11 Appellant admits that no classification exists which encompasses his warehouse responsibilities as  
12 well as his responsibility for supervising offenders. Yet, Appellant is requesting that he be  
13 compensated for supervising offender work crews who work in the warehouse. The allocation  
14 process is not the proper forum to address additional compensation beyond that which is assigned to  
15 a classification. The allocation process is not the proper forum to address the creation of a new  
16 classification. Furthermore, resolution of these issues is not within the Board's jurisdiction.

17  
18 Appellant has failed to show that director's determination is incorrect. Based on the available  
19 classifications, Appellant's position is properly allocated to Warehouse Operator 4.

## 20 **ORDER**

21 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Jeffery Evans is  
22 denied and the Director's determination dated February 26, 2007, is affirmed and adopted.

23  
24 DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.

25 **WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD**

26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 **LARRY GOODMAN, Vice Chair**  
29

MARSHA TADANO LONG, Member