

March 18, 2010

TO: Teresa Parsons, SPHR
Director's Review Program Supervisor

FROM: Kristie Wilson
Director's Review Investigator

SUBJECT: Thomas Boyd v. Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Allocation Review Request ALLO-09-041

On January 7, 2010 a Director's Review meeting took place by telephone conference call concerning the allocation of Thomas Boyd's position. Present during the telephone conference call were Thomas Boyd, DNR; James Grimsey, WPEA; Shea Richardson, DNR Human Resource (HR) Office; Deb Naslund, DNR (Mr. Boyd's supervisor); and myself.

Director's Determination

This position review was based on the work performed for the six-month period prior to April 10, 2009, the date DNR's HR office received the request for a position review (Exhibit A-5). As the Director's review investigator, I carefully considered all of the documentation in the file, including the Position Description form (PDF) dated April 3, 2009 and the exhibits and written responses submitted by both parties. Based on my review and analysis of the assigned duties and responsibilities, I conclude Mr. Boyd's position is properly allocated to the Cartographer 3 classification.

Background

On April 10, 2009, DNR's HR Office received Mr. Boyd's request for a review of his Cartographer 3 position. Mr. Boyd believes his position should be reallocated to an Information Technology Specialist 3 (ITS 3). On May 6, 2009, Senior Human Resource Consultant, Shea Richardson, sent her memo denying the allocation. Ms. Richardson determined the typical work performed by Mr. Boyd's position did not reflect the level of responsibilities of the ITS 3 classification. As a result, Ms. Richardson determined the Cartographer 3 was the appropriate classification for the work assigned to Mr. Boyd's position.

On June 5, 2009, the Department of Personnel received a request for a Director's review of DNR's allocation determination.

Summary of Mr. Boyd's Comments

Mr. Boyd asserts that his position provides GIS support to the Forest Practices Division. He states that 75% of his time is spent as a technical data steward for the Landslide Hazard and Zonation (LHZ) project. The LHZ project data is compiled from many sources and for users including Forest Practices and State Lands Divisions, Federal Agencies, Tribal Agencies, Counties, private timber companies, and the public. Mr. Boyd explained in Exhibit A-31 his duties performed as a Technical Data Steward. These duties include:

- Independently perform professional support for LHZ databases and use of ArcGIS software.
- Responsible for all data going in and out of the statewide data sets.
- Conducts needs assessments and consults about LHZ databases with supervisor, team, geologists, external advisory groups, and the public.
- Make recommendations and help prioritize requirements.
- Design, maintain, and provide quality assurance on the database.
- Use innovative approaches to complete assignments.
- Identify documentation needs and create documentation of LHZ GIS process.
- Coordinate code changes with LHZ staff.
- Assess training needs, determine training approach, develop course material, and instruct LHZ geologists on proper digitizing and ArcGIS procedures.

Mr. Boyd states that 91% of his work is at an ITS 3 level, some of those duties include:

- Independently design and maintain specialized database
- Conduct needs assessments.
- Create database for tracking LHZ status and other reporting and analysis purposes.
- Maintain statewide databases and design changes to the databases for ArcGIS conversion.
- Maintain statewide Landslide Inventory (LSI) and Hazard Zonation datasets in coverage format until converted into ArcGIS feature classes.

Mr. Boyd feels the Position Description Form (PDF) dated September 2008 (Exhibit A-8) and Exhibit A-31 should be used when determining his position's allocation.

Mr. Boyd asserts that in the past year that 93% of his time has been spent under the ITS 3 job classification.

Summary of Shea Richardson (HR Office) and Deb Naslund (Boyd's Supervisor) Comments

Both Ms. Richardson and Ms. Naslund agree that the signed PRR dated 3/16/04 (Exhibit A-5) is accurate. In addition, Ms. Richardson used Exhibit A-31 for the review.

Ms. Naslund describes 75% of Mr. Boyd's duties as:

- Updating the landslide data
- Entering changes made by Geologists
- Performing quality control of data submitted
- Editing documents for the database and updates if necessary
- Providing compiled data
- Creating maps after geologist completes a project
- Main point of contact for technical questions on data

Ms. Richardson explained that the majority of Mr. Boyd's work (75%) is inputting data into the GIS system and producing custom maps and reports. In addition, Mr. Boyd tracks data in spreadsheets and database and performs quality control checks of the data in the spatial database. Ms. Naslund states that Mr. Boyd does not work with the project manager and ITD to convert LHZ spatial database to new ArcGIS GeoDatabase technology as noted in Exhibit A-8.

Ms. Naslund asserts that Mr. Boyd is the technical data steward for the project. In Exhibit A-8 Mr. Boyd indicated that he worked as a project manager in the efforts to convert the LHZ databases into ArcGIS Geodatabases, Ms. Naslund explained that this specific project was canceled and Mr. Boyd did not perform this duty. In addition, it was explained that database design is not part of Mr. Boyd's responsibility.

Both Ms. Richardson and Ms. Naslund assert that the unsigned position description that was submitted by Mr. Boyd has a different description of duties. In the unsigned one, Mr. Boyd describes his position as the LHZ data steward, as a project manager on the LHZ ArcGIS Migration and Enhancement Project, and he also includes the data and map responsibilities submitted in the PRR. Ms. Naslund confirmed that this PDF was drafted as a proposal at one point in time and many of the duties reflected in this draft PDF were never assigned to Mr. Boyd. The unsigned PDF is not an accurate reflection of Mr. Boyd's duties.

Reason and Basis for Finding

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).

Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the position's duties and responsibilities. See Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

The class series concept for the Information Technology series reads as follows:

Positions in this category perform professional information technology systems and/or applications support for client applications, databases, computer hardware and software products, network infrastructure equipment, or telecommunications software or hardware.

This category broadly describes positions in one or more information technology disciplines such as: Application Development And Maintenance, Application Testing, Capacity Planning, Business Analysis and/or Process Re-Engineering, Data Base Design And Maintenance, Data Communications, Disaster Recovery/Data Security, Distributed Systems/LAN/WAN/PC, Hardware Management And Support, Network Operations, Production Control, Quality Assurance, IT Project Management, Systems Software, Web Development, or Voice Communications.

Positions which perform information technology-related work to accomplish tasks but are non-technical in nature would not be included in this occupational category.

The definition for ITS 3 states:

In support of information systems and users in an assigned area of responsibility, independently performs consulting, designing, programming, installation, maintenance, quality assurance, troubleshooting and/or technical support for applications, hardware and software products, databases, database management systems, support products, network infrastructure equipment, or telecommunications infrastructure, software or hardware.

Uses established work procedures and innovative approaches to complete assignments and coordinate projects such as conducting needs assessments; leading projects; creating installation plans; analyzing and correcting network malfunctions; serving as system administrator; monitoring or enhancing

operating environments; or supporting, maintaining and enhancing existing applications.

The majority of assignments and projects are moderate in size and impact an agency division or large workgroup or single business function; or internal or satellite operations, multiple users, or more than one group. Consults with higher-level technical staff to resolve complex problems.

Mr. Boyd is considered the technical data steward for the LHZ project. Mr. Boyd inputs data into the GIS system and produces custom maps and reports. In addition, Mr. Boyd tracks data in spreadsheets and databases and performs quality control checks of the data in the spatial database. Mr. Boyd did not have responsibility for database design. Mr. Boyd had indicated that he oversees an agency critical database that is used by multiple divisions within the agency; Ms. Naslund confirmed that this is the data component of the map making process. Mr. Boyd uses computerized methods to produce maps and therefore, the data for the maps must be input into databases and checked for quality. Although Mr. Boyd performs information technology-related work to accomplish tasks, the scope of his assignments fall within the Cartographer 3 classification, which is defined as follows:

Performs professional cartography projects and/or activities providing geographic products, services and/or information using conventional and/or computerized methods.

Further, the distinguishing characteristics indicate that Cartographer 3 positions perform as follows:

Performs journey-level work. Independently produces custom maps or map/data products or develop procedures when accuracy requirements are subjective or data involves a large number of variables. Seeks assistance or guidance from higher-level professionals for unusually complex or unique map/data products.

While examples of typical work identified in a class specification do not form the basis for an allocation, they lend support to the work envisioned within a classification. The Cartographer 3 typical work examples that closely align with the work performed by Mr. Boyd include designing, compiling, and producing maps from various source material through the use of computerized equipment; developing computer instructions to meet requirements of specific mapping projects; editing mapping data for input; planning map layouts and techniques for mapping projects; and developing standards for special maps.

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 Mr. Boyd's assigned duties and responsibilities, I conclude the Cartographer 3 classification best describes Mr. Boyd'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 mailing address for the Personnel Resources Board is P.O. Box 40911, Olympia, Washington, 98504-0911. The physical location of the Personnel Resources Board is 600 South Franklin, Olympia, Washington.

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

cc: Thomas Boyd, DNR
James Grimsey, WPEA
Shea Richardson, DNR Human Resource (HR) office
Lisa Skriletz, DOP Classification and Pay Manager

Enclosure: Exhibit List

A. Thomas Boyd Exhibits

1. Letter of Request from WPEA dated June 5th, 2009
2. Director's Review Request form
3. Explanation of duties
4. Agency Allocation determination letter dated May 6, 2009
5. Position Review Request form. No date or signature
6. Email from April 10, 2009 – Subject: Position Review Questionnaire
7. Letter dated 4/3/2009 to Shea Richardson; upgrading my position
8. Position Description form: no date
9. Examples of ITS3 work
10. Email dated April 2, 2009 to Tom Boyd from Doretta Collins – his position upgrade.
11. Class specification for Information Technology Specialist 3
12. Class specification for Cartographer 3
13. Classification Questionnaire received HR March 11, 2004
14. PDP showing work as data steward as early as 2003
15. CQ for 2003 showing requests for upgrade to ITS3
16. CQ for 2004 showing change in roll on the LHZ project
17. Presentation to the Geological Society of America in 2004 showing the long history of full involvement in the LHZ project.
18. GIS migration pilot document showing data steward work.
19. LHZ statistics spreadsheet.
20. Geologists' spreadsheet showing data steward work.
21. LSI and LIS_DATA Deliverables checklist showing ITS level work.
22. Protocol for sharing local knowledge and GIS data with the State Uplands Viewing Tools document showing GIS knowledge and data steward work.
23. SHARED_FP.HAZONE document showing data steward work.
24. SHARED_PF.LSI_POLY document showing data steward work.
25. Spreadsheet showing number of edits per employee.
26. LHZ GIS data production process flow chart
27. Multiple spreadsheets showing ITS level work
28. Diagram showing LHZ organization to convert to ArcGIS.
29. LHZ startup Product descriptions
30. Tom Boyd's accomplishments.
31. Updated "Tom's Role in the LHZ project" – two documents.
32. Various e-mails showing work at the ITS level.