

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

CARMEN PEDERSON,

Appellant,

vs.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-07-014

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, LAURA ANDERSON, Chair; MARSHA TADANO LONG, Vice Chair; and JOSEPH PINZONE, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated August 2, 2007. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on November 29, 2007.

Appearances. Appellant Carmen Pederson was present and was represented by Eric Nordlof, Attorney at Law for Public School Employees of Washington (PSE). Respondent Central Washington University (CWU) was represented by Rachelle Wills, Assistant Attorney General.

Background. Appellant Carmen Pederson was employed as a Program Support Supervisor 1 for Central Washington University's Testing and Assessment Office. By letter dated May 18, 2006, Appellant received notice from Karla Shugart, Associate Director of Employment and Staff Personnel Services, reallocating her position downward to the Secretary classification, effective June 16, 2006. The downward reallocation was the result of a revision to the position description for Appellant's position. On June 13, 2006, Ms. Pederson requested a Director's review of CWU's decision.

On April 30, 2007, Teresa Parsons, the Director's designee, conducted a review of Appellant's position. During the Director's review Dr. Linda Beath, Associate Vice President for

Undergraduate Studies, explained that the reason for Ms. Pederson's revised position description (PD) was due to a reorganization of the Testing and Assessment Office.

Ms. Parsons, by letter dated August 2, 2007, determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Secretary classification.

On August 23, 2007, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant requested that her position be reallocated to Program Coordinator classification, or to the Program Support Supervisor series, or to remand the matter back to the Director for consideration of additional information. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

After reviewing the record and considering the oral arguments of the parties on Appellant's request to remand this matter, the Board orally denied the request. We now confirm our oral ruling and deny the remand.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. Appellant asserts that in spite of change of duties reflected in the revised position description, she continued to perform the work she had performed prior to June 16, 2006. Appellant argues that the employer and the Director's designee failed to adequately review the duties she performs because they did not consider the extent to which she continues to hire, train and supervise student workers. Additionally, Appellant asserts that she continues to serve as a test administrator and continues to perform duties assigned, on paper, to the department's assistant director. Appellant denies that her duties have substantially changed. Appellant contends that based on the level of her duties and responsibilities that the best fit is either the Program Coordinator or Program Support Supervisor 1 classifications.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent acknowledges that Appellant's knowledge of testing and assessment is beneficial to the department and that she is a valued employee. However, Respondent argues that Appellant's downward allocation was due to restructuring her position, as

part of good faith reorganization within the Testing and Assessment Office, effective June 16, 2006. Respondent contends that Appellant's role is primarily limited to supporting the Director and Assistant Director and handling the reception desk by checking in students and getting them set up for various tests. Respondent acknowledges that Appellant occasionally administers testing when the administrator is out, but asserts that this consists of a small part of Appellant's revised PD.

Respondent contends that Appellant's position is in line with the Secretary classification due to her duties supporting the Director and Assistant Director. Respondent describes Appellant's duties as scheduling, reviewing and monitoring invoices, performing office functions, and providing the clerical functions related to test administration such as check-in procedures and scanning tests. Respondent contends that these duties and responsibilities are clerical support activities found in the Secretary classification.

Additionally, Respondent argues Appellant no longer supervises student employees because they report to the Assistant Director. Respondent further argues that Appellant's duties and responsibilities do not rise to the level of work listed in the Program Coordinator or Program Support Supervisor classification. Respondent asserts the scope of duties and level of responsibilities of Appellant's position are best described by the Secretary classification.

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

Relevant Classification. Program Coordinator; class code 2045; Program Support Supervisor 1, class code 2259; and Secretary, class code 100N.

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

1 that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
2 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
3 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the
4 position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

5
6 Here, as in Liddle-Stamper, we are comparing the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position
7 to the available classification specifications. We are considering the relevant classifications that were
8 in effect at the time she requested her review from Respondent and determining which classification
9 best describes the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to her position at that time.

10
11 The Board has carefully reviewed this classification and compared it to the duties and
12 responsibilities of Appellant's position. Due to the revised position description many of the
13 Appellant's previous areas of responsibility have been assumed by the Assistant Director. We find
14 that her duties and responsibility do not rise to the level or scope of Program Support Supervisor, or
15 Program Coordinator classification. Appellant is not a supervisor and her duties support the daily
16 office needs of the Director and Assistant Director rather than a specialized task in support of a
17 program.

18
19 Appellant argues that her duties and responsibilities did not change after her reallocation to the
20 Secretary classification. Appellant contends she does much more than secretarial duties and asserts
21 at least one-third of her time is spent administering a variety of tests. However, Appellant's assertion
22 is not supported by the record.

23
24 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than
25 one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position,
26 the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position
27 must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the
28
29

position's duties and responsibilities. See Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

While some of Appellant's duties fall outside of the Secretary classification, the majority fit within the definition and distinguishing characteristics of the class.

In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has failed to meet her burden of proof. Appellant's position is properly allocated to Secretary.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Carmen Pederson is denied and the director's determination dated August 2, 2007, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2007.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

LAURA ANDERSON, Chair

MARSHA TADANO LONG, Vice Chair

JOSEPH PINZONE, Member