

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

CAROLYN PETERSEN,

Appellant,

vs.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-09-015

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

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came before the Personnel Resources Board, JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair; LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair; and DJ MARK, Member, for hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated April 24, 2009. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on October 14, 2009.

Appearances. Appellant was present and was represented by Cecil Tibbetts, Council Representative for the Washington Federation of State Employees. Respondent Department of Transportation (DOT) was represented by Niki Pavlicek, Manager of Classification, Compensation and Operations.

Background. Appellant's position was allocated to the Fiscal Technician 2 classification. On December 27, 2007, Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) asking DOT to reallocate her position to either the Fiscal Analyst 2 or the Fiscal Specialist 2 classification. By letter dated June 23, 2008, DOT denied Appellant's reallocation request.

On July 22, 2008, Appellant filed a request for a director's review of DOT's allocation determination. By letter dated April 24, 2009, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Fiscal Technician 2 classification.

1 On May 21, 2009, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are
2 the subject of this proceeding. During the hearing on her exceptions, Appellant clarified that she is
3 requesting reallocation to the Fiscal Specialist 2 classification.

4
5 Appellant works in the DOT Northwest Region Area 5 Maintenance office which covers the area
6 from the King/Snohomish county lines to South Center. There are approximately 83 employees in
7 this unit. The majority of the unit's work deals with road maintenance. Appellant reports to a
8 Secretary Supervisor who reports to the Maintenance Superintendent responsible for supervising
9 the Northwest Region Area 5 Maintenance Shop. Appellant's duties and responsibilities involve
10 purchasing, payroll, and other general accounting areas. She prepares, reviews, records and verifies
11 fiscal record-keeping documents in manual and automated systems and is responsible for
12 computing and calculating financial and numerical data to maintain accounting, budgeting,
13 purchasing, and payroll records and reports for the Area 5 Maintenance Shop.

14
15 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the Maintenance Superintendent is the
16 business manager for the region. She contends that she provides administrative support to the
17 Superintendent by performing accounting functions and producing reports. Appellant explains that the
18 Superintendent comes directly to her when he needs fiscal data or reports; he does not go to the
19 Secretary Supervisor for the information that Appellant provides. Appellant further explains that
20 providing direct assistance to the Superintendent comprises approximately 10 to 15 percent of her time.
21 As a result, Appellant contends that she provides administrative support to a business manager as
22 encompassed by the Fiscal Specialist class series. Appellant further contends that she performs fiscal
23 analyses and produces specialized reports as found at the Fiscal Specialist 2 level.

24
25 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent acknowledges that Appellant's workload has
26 increased but argues that volume of work is not an allocating criterion. Respondent asserts that
27 Appellant performs routine fiscal duties such as recording information in accounting systems, verifying
28 the accuracy of data, collecting information, and reviewing and posting data. Respondent argues that

Appellant's position does not fit the Fiscal Analyst series because while she enters and extracts information, she does not perform fiscal analysis. Rather, fiscal analysis of the information Appellant compiles and provides is done by others. Respondent argues that Appellant's position does not meet the Fiscal Specialist series because the Superintendent's position does not exist to perform fiscal and business management duties. Rather the focus of his position is the performance and oversight of maintenance within the region which includes components of fiscal and business management. Respondent contends that the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position fit within the Fiscal Technician class series and that her position should remain allocated to the Fiscal Technician 2 level.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Fiscal Technician 2 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Fiscal Technician class series including Fiscal Technician 2 (class code 148M); Fiscal Analyst class series; Fiscal Specialist class series including Fiscal Specialist 2 (class code 151F).

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. 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 following standards are 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 class series concept for the Fiscal Analyst series states, in part:

Positions in this occupational group conduct a variety of financial reviews and analysis of fiscal, grants, contracts or other financial data in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principals (*sic*) (GAAP).

These are professional positions which analyze and interpret what the fiscal information means to draw conclusions and trends based upon that data. Positions determine what is the relationship between fiscal variables by generating items, choosing analysis, translating, or explaining their results and taking appropriate action based upon the analysis and interpretation of the financial data.

The majority of work assigned to professional positions does not involve verifying the accuracy of the fiscal data or the routine collection, reviewing and posting of fiscal record keeping tasks according to established procedures as contained in the office, fiscal or budget support group.

Positions throughout this occupational group often lead or supervise office, fiscal or budget support staff. . . .

Appellant's position does not conduct the scope and depth of financial reviews and analysis encompassed in the Fiscal Analyst series. The majority of work Appellant performs involves verifying the accuracy of the fiscal data, collecting routine permit fees, reviewing information, and posting fiscal information. Appellant performs these tasks according to established procedures. The majority of Appellant's work does not fit within the Fiscal Analyst series.

The class series concept for the Fiscal Specialist series states:

Provide administrative support to administrator or manager in the area of fiscal and/or business management. Apply principles of financial management to perform such functions as record keeping, auditing, analysis, budgeting, payroll, travel, purchasing and other types of fiscal operations.

We concur with the director's designee that the Fiscal Specialist class series does not present the best fit for Appellant's position. Allocation to this series requires more than just a reporting relationship to an administrator or manager. Positions allocated to this series also apply principles of financial management

1 in the performance of accounting functions and other types of fiscal operations. This series encompasses
2 a higher level of work than the tasks performed by Appellant's position. Nonetheless, we considered the
3 definition of the Fiscal Specialist 2 class.

4
5 The definition for Fiscal Specialist 2 level states: "[p]erform complex technical fiscal analysis and
6 financial reporting including analysis, planning, interpreting and review of a fiscal operation involving an
7 overlap or combination of disciplines."

8
9 As provided in the Department of Personnel Glossary - Classification, Compensation, & Management
10 terms, an employee who performs complex work "[i]ndependently uses a wide variety of rules,
11 processes, materials, or equipment to complete work assignments that require specialized
12 knowledge or skills. Decisions are made independently regarding which rules, processes, materials,
13 or equipment to use in order to effectively accomplish work assignments."

14
15 The Department of Personnel Glossary provides that an employee who performs routine work
16 "[p]erforms several related and repetitive tasks that require some judgment regarding the rules,
17 procedures, materials, or equipment that will be used."

18
19 As stated above, Appellant's responsibilities involve purchasing, payroll, and other general
20 accounting areas. The record reflects she performs duties such as preparing, reviewing, recording
21 and verifying fiscal record-keeping documents in manual and automated systems. She is
22 responsible for computing and calculating financial and numerical data to maintain accounting,
23 budgeting, purchasing, and payroll records and produce reports by extracting and displaying
24 information. Although Appellant works independently, her duties and responsibilities are best
25 described as routine in nature. Appellant's position does not perform complex technical fiscal analysis
26 and does not perform complex financial reporting. Her duties and responsibilities do not include
27 analysis, planning, interpreting and review of a fiscal operation. Appellant's position does not meet the
28 scope or intent of the Fiscal Specialist 2 classification.

1 The class series concept for the Fiscal Technician series states, in part:

2 Positions perform ongoing, routine and repetitive fiscal tasks in a manual or
3 automated system. . . .

4 Positions prepare, review, verify, and process fiscal, accounting, budget, book or
5 record keeping documents. Performs computing, calculating financial, statistical and
6 numerical data to maintain accounting, budgeting, purchasing, payroll records and
7 reports. Records details of fiscal or business transactions in an increasing automated
8 fiscal computer enhanced environment.

9 This series is not responsible for in-depth analyzing or interpreting fiscal or
10 budgetary data, rules or regulations, or designing automated fiscal systems. This
11 series provides fiscal support to a variety of professional classes found in the fiscal
12 analyst occupational category.

13 Appellant's position fits within the class series concept of the Fiscal Technician series.

14 The definition for the Fiscal Technician 2 class states:

15 This is the journey, occupational or working level of the series. Incumbents work
16 independently or under general supervision and often perform one or more fiscal
17 support functions. Positions provide support in the area of fiscal, budget, or
18 financial business areas. Apply principles of established procedures in recording,
19 summarizing, and reporting fiscal activities in a variety of work areas such as;
20 recordkeeping, auditing, analysis, budgeting, payroll, travel, purchasing, and other
21 types of fiscal operations. Prepare and maintain fiscal records while compiling and
22 ensuring the accuracy of reports. Positions may lead or supervise level 1 staff.

23 Appellant works independently performing ongoing, routine fiscal functions in support of the region.
24 She utilizes established procedures and performs a variety of fiscally related duties. In addition she
25 prepares and maintains fiscal records, compiles data, and produces reports. Her position is best
26 described by the Fiscal Technician 2 classification.

27 In a hearing on exceptions, the appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has
28 failed to meet her burden of proof.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Carolyn Petersen is denied and the director's determination dated April 24, 2009, is affirmed.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2009.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair

LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair

DJ MARK, Member