

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LARRY DUDLEY,

Appellant,

vs.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND  
INDUSTRIES,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-07-007

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; LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair; and MARSHA TADANO LONG, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated April 19, 2007. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on August 1, 2007.

**Appearances.** Appellant Larry Dudley was present and was represented by Bob Keller, Senior Field Representative for the Washington Federation of State Employees. The Department of Labor and Industries (L&I) was represented by B.J. Matthews, Human Resource Consultant.

**Background.** Appellant's position was allocated to the Office Assistant 2 classification. On April 18, 2006, he submitted a Position Description Form asking that his position be reallocated to the Office Assistant 3 classification. By letter dated May 9, 2006, L&I determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 26, 2006, Appellant requested a director's review of L&I's decision.

On December 7, 2006, Teresa Parsons, the director's designee, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated April 19, 2007, Ms. Parsons determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Office Assistant 2 classification.

On May 17, 2007, Appellant filed exceptions to Ms. Parson's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

1 At the time of his request for reallocation, Appellant provided clerical support to the Crime  
2 Victim's Compensation Program in the provider accounts unit. Appellant reviewed new provider  
3 application forms and billing/claim forms for completeness to assure that required information  
4 was provided. If information was missing, Appellant would return the form with a letter  
5 indicating what additional information was required. Sometimes, Appellant could locate the  
6 missing information in existing L&I records. The unit's Customer Service Specialist was  
7 primarily responsible to answer questions and inquires from providers, but Appellant also  
8 occasionally responded to questions and inquires from providers. Appellant entered claim  
9 information into the L&I claims computer system, printed and distributed reports, and  
10 maintained and order supplies for the unit.

11 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that the majority of his duties and  
12 responsibilities exceed the routine assignments found in the Office Assistant 2 classification.  
13 Appellant asserts that many of his duties are similar to the more complex duties performed by  
14 Customer Service Specialists. Appellant argues that he researches information, distributes  
15 information, responds to provider calls, and returns applications and issues letters seeking additional  
16 information which are duties that are complex in nature and best described by the Office Assistant 3  
17 classification.

18  
19 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent acknowledges that some of Appellant's  
20 duties are higher level duties found in the Office Assistant 3 classification. However, Respondent  
21 asserts that Appellant's duties and responsibilities were reviewed in depth and a "line item" review  
22 was performed. As a result of this review, Respondent determined that the majority of Appellant's  
23 duties were recurring, routine and conducted in accordance with established work processes and  
24 procedures. Respondent argues that Appellant's overall duties and responsibilities best fit within the  
25 Office Assistant 2 classification.

26  
27 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
28 to the Office Assistant 2 classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Office Assistant 2, class code 100I, and Office Assistant 3, class code  
2 100J.

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

10 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more  
11 than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific  
12 position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and  
13 the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the  
14 majority of the position's duties and responsibilities.  
15

16 It is clear from the record and the arguments of the parties that Appellant is a conscientious  
17 employee who shows initiative and takes pride in doing his work well. However, a position  
18 review is not an evaluation of an employee's expertise or the quality of his or her work.  
19

20 The distinguishing characteristics for Office Assistant 3 state:

21 Under general supervision, independently perform a variety of complex clerical  
22 projects and assignments such as preparing reports, preparing, reviewing, verifying  
23 and processing fiscal documents and/or financial records, composing correspondence  
24 such as transmittals and responses to frequent requests for information, establishing  
25 manual or electronic recordkeeping/filing systems and/or data base files, and  
26 responding to inquiries requiring substantive knowledge of office/departmental  
27 policies and procedures. Positions may perform specialized complex word  
28 processing tasks in a word processing unit or complex rapid data inquiry and/or entry  
29 functions.

Assignments and projects are of a complex nature. Independent performance of  
complex clerical assignments requires substantive knowledge of a variety of  
regulations, rules, policies, procedures, processes, materials, or equipment.  
Problems are resolved by choosing from established procedures and/or devising

work methods. Guidance is available for new or unusual situations. Deviation from established parameters requires approval. Work is periodically reviewed to verify compliance with established policies and procedures.

Positions typically provide work direction to lower level staff and may assist in training new staff.

When performing work independently, an incumbent is expected to make decisions without supervisory approval regarding the work processes and methods which will be used. He or she can modify procedures as long as such changes conform to agency/institutional and departmental policies and regulations. Complex duties require the use of substantive knowledge of a variety of rules, processes, materials, or equipment and application of specialized knowledge or skills. Complex duties require independent decision-making in regard to which rules, processes, materials or equipment to use in order to effectively accomplish work assignments. Appellant provided no evidence to show that a majority of his work required him to independently perform complex work. Rather, he follows established processes and methods to complete his work and his work is recurring in nature.

The distinguishing characteristics for Office Assistant 2 state:

Perform a variety of routine clerical duties such as processing documents and records, extracting and compiling records or data, responding to routine inquiries concerning office/departmental services and procedures, maintaining and monitoring established record keeping, filing and data base systems, and producing forms, letters, record entries and other material. Positions may perform data retrieval and modification and enter data on numerical or alphabetical data entry equipment.

Duties and assignments are of a routine nature. Routine duties are recurring and accomplished by following established work methods or procedures. Within established guidelines, independently organizes, prioritizes, and initiates work activities. Decision making authority is limited to choice of appropriate methods or procedures. Guidance is provided in new or unusual situations. Deviation from established methods, procedures, or guidelines requires approval. Work is periodically reviewed to verify compliance with policies, procedures, or standards.

Positions may occasionally help and/or provide work direction to lower level staff.

1 Routine work generally involves the performance of several related and repetitive tasks which  
2 require some judgment in respect to the rules, procedures, materials, or equipment that will be  
3 used. As described in his Position Description Form and during his presentation before the  
4 Board, the majority of Appellant's duties are routine in nature. When performing the majority of  
5 his work, he follows established work processes, procedures and methods and uses established  
6 guidelines. The majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities fit within the Office Assistant  
7 2 classification.

8  
9 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has  
10 failed to meet his burden of proof.

11 Appellant submitted his request for review in April 2006. The Board's analysis reflects the time  
12 period prior to April 2006. If Appellant believes his duties have changed or expanded since that  
13 time, he may request a review of his current duties and responsibilities in accordance with L&I's  
14 reallocation procedure.

15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Larry Dudley is  
17 denied and the Director's determination dated April 19, 2007, is affirmed and adopted.

18  
19 DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.

20 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 LARRY GOODMAN, Chair

24  
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair

27  
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
29 MARSHA TADANO LONG, Member