

October 3, 2008

TO: Teresa Parsons
Director's Review Program Supervisor

FROM: Kristie Wilson
Director's Review Investigator

RE: **Tam Snell v Department of Corrections (DOC)**
Allocation Review Request No. ALLO-07-100

On September 18, 2008, a Director's Review meeting took place by telephone conference call concerning the allocation of Tam Snell's position. Present during the telephone conference call were Tam Snell, DOC; Joanne Harmon, DOC Headquarters Human Resource (HR) Office; Roy Murphy, DOC Larch Corrections Center HR Office; and myself.

Investigator Finding

My review finds that Ms. Snell's position is properly allocated as an Administrative Assistant 3 (AA 3).

Background

On June 6, 2007, Ms. Snell submitted a Position Review Request (PRR) to Larch Corrections Center HR Office requesting that her position be reallocated to a Corrections Specialist 3 (CS 3). Mr. Murphy reviewed her request and issued his decision by letter dated October 4, 2007. In his letter (Exhibit A-3) Mr. Murphy outlined the reasons and basis for his denial. On October 29, 2007, Ms. Snell filed a request for a Director's review.

Summary of Ms. Snell's perspective

Ms. Snell explained that she took over the responsibilities of the ATLAS roster management system for Larch Corrections Center in January 2006. This system tracks leave, mandatory and voluntary overtime, shifts, schedules, days off, and vacant positions

for approximately three recreation specialists, nine cooks, and 70 custody staff (10 are on-call).

Ms. Snell contends that she develops the work schedules and enters the information into the ATLAS system for each of the relief officers, ensuring coverage is available so they are not short staffed causing overtime. Ms. Snell states that she monitors employee overtime by running reports and breaking down why the overtime occurred and reporting this information to her supervisor for GMAP reporting. Ms. Snell contends that she also monitors the post assignments by reporting leave, overtime, and vacancy rates.

Ms. Snell states that all DOC facilities use the ATLAS roster management system but because Larch Corrections Center is not funded like other DOC facilities, she has taken on this extra work to avoid hiring additional staff.

Ms. Snell agrees that the position description form (PDF) (Exhibit A-4) is accurate but feels the percentage of her primary job duties working in the ATLAS roster management system has increased from 35% to 65%. Therefore, Ms. Snell feels her position should be allocated to a CS 3.

Comments from Arnold Hoag (Correctional Lieutenant)

Mr. Hoag stated in email (Exhibit A-8) that the oversight and responsibility of the ATLAS Roster Management process falls upon both the Captain and himself. The responsibilities of the system have been delegated to the Captain's clerical staff, Ms. Snell, with oversight by Mr. Hoag.

Mr. Hoag explained that Ms. Snell met with custody staff, A/C cooks, and recreation staff to schedule vacation leave for the upcoming year. Ms. Snell conferred with Mr. Hoag throughout this process. The overall approval and data entry was done by Ms. Snell. If issues arose, they were discussed between Mr. Hoag and Ms. Snell.

Mr. Hoag asserts that Ms. Snell performs the roster management functions which include:

- ATLAS entries
- Provide leave and overtime data to the Business Office
- Provide information and data to HR

DOC's Rationale

DOC agrees that Ms. Snell's PDF, signed November 2006 (Exhibit A-4), is accurate. DOC asserts that the oversight of the ATLAS roster management system falls upon the Captain and Mr. Hoag. The system responsibilities are delegated to Ms. Snell with Mr. Hoag's oversight.

DOC states that CS 3 positions in other facilities have full oversight of the ATLAS roster management system. Their entire focus is the management of this system. These positions have the authority to delegate duties to other staff. DOC states that CS 3 positions do not provide administrative support duties similar to Ms. Snell's duties. DOC asserts that Ms. Snell's position prepares information and enters the schedules into the system.

According to DOC's Customer and Roster Management Policy directive, each facility must have a full-time customer roster manager that has final approval authority. This authority falls upon the Captain and Mr. Hoag, not Ms. Snell.

DOC emphasized that Ms. Snell's position does not focus full-time on the roster management system. Ms. Snell has other support duties assigned by the Captain. In addition to the roster management system, Ms. Snell provides secretarial support and office managerial services for the Captain. Some of these duties include:

- Making travel arrangements
- Scheduling meetings
- Taking notes and transcribing
- Providing the Captain with research and information
- Composing written responses for correspondence
- Typing, transcribing, proofreading, and editing office correspondence
- Ordering supplies

DOC asserts that Ms. Snell is a great asset to the department and the Captain is very lucky to have her. DOC contends that Ms. Snell is delegated responsibility for the roster management system, however; her PDF states 35% of her duties include assisting roster management responsibilities, not overseeing the program itself.

DOC feels that the AA 3 classification best fits Ms. Snell's current job duties.

Reason and Basis for Finding

The definition for Corrections Specialist 3 states:

This is the senior, specialist, or lead worker level of the series. Within the Department of Corrections, develops, coordinates, implements and/or evaluates various correctional program(s) as assigned. Prepares comprehensive reports and makes recommendations for management, identifies and projects trends, and monitors program expenditures for adherence to budgeted allocations. Positions in this class perform professional level duties covering one or more of the following correctional program areas: institutional training, CORE, COACH, offender grievances, institutional hearings (e.g., disciplinary, intensive management, administrative segregation), roster management for major institutions; administers

an investigative/intelligence operation at a major institution, which may include other regional and community involvement

Ms. Snell described her duties as maintaining the ATLAS roster management system. She has been delegated these duties and is not primarily responsible for this system. In addition to these duties, Ms. Snell provides administrative support to the Captain.

DOC stated that CS 3 positions in other facilities are solely responsible for the ATLAS roster management system and do not provide administrative support. The CS 3 positions have authority to delegate roster management duties to lower classifications such as Administrative Assistants. Ms. Snell's supervisor asserts that the roster management system has been assigned to him and he has delegated this responsibility to Ms. Snell.

The definition for Administrative Assistant 3 states:

Positions perform varied administrative and secretarial support duties or positions are responsible for one or more major program activities under a second line supervisor.

Although Ms. Snell's position has been delegated the ATLAS roster management system, I believe her position still falls within the AA 3 classification. Ms. Snell performs high level administrative functions to support a second line supervisor. Ms. Snell may be responsible for the ATLAS roster management system, which would be considered a major program activity; however, the system is assigned to her supervisor and delegated to her.

The duties identified in Ms. Snell's positions do not reach the level of complexity envisioned in the CS 3 job classification.

As previously noted by the Personnel Resources Board (PRB), the guidance provided in the Department of Personnel's Classification and Pay Administrative Guide establishes that the following standards are primary considerations in allocating positions:

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

After reviewing the documentation and comments from all parties with regard to Ms. Snell's assigned duties and responsibilities, I conclude the AA 3 classification best describes Ms. Snell's position.

Appeal Rights

RCW 41.06.170 governs the right to appeal. RCW 41.06.170(4) provides, in relevant part, the following:

An employee incumbent in a position at the time of its allocation or reallocation, or the agency utilizing the position, may appeal the allocation or reallocation to the Washington personnel resources board. Notice of such appeal must be filed in writing within thirty days of the action from which appeal is taken.

The address for the Personnel Resources Board is 2828 Capitol Blvd., P.O. Box 40911, Olympia, Washington, 98504-0911.

If no further action is taken, the Director's determination becomes final.

c: Joanne Harmon, DOC Headquarters HR Office
Roy Murphy, DOC Larch Corrections Center HR Office
Lisa Skriletz, DOP Classification and Pay Manager

Enclosure: Exhibit List