

July 17, 2007

RE: Melissa Stone
Examination Results Review Request EXAM-06-001

Dear Ms. Stone:

On October 31, 2006, we received your request for a Director's review of your exam results for the Revenue Auditor 2 classification.

In your request for review, you specified your concerns about the exam, including questioning the process used to automatically score the exam, challenging the questions included in the exam and specifically challenging the question regarding leases.

WAC 357-16-170, adopted effective July 1, 2005, provides, in relevant part, that "(a)n applicant or candidate may request a review of his/her examination results. . ." The rule does not allow an applicant or candidate to challenge the process or the content of the exam itself.

By letter dated May 2, 2007, you were informed that the Director's review of your exam results would be conducted based on written documentation. You were informed that if you wished to submit any additional materials, you must do so before May 30, 2007. Neither you nor the Department of Personnel provided additional information.

Background

A test score notice dated August 2, 2006, was sent to you. The notice stated that you had received 40.0 points out of a possible 62.0 points on your Revenue Auditor 2 examination. The Department of Personnel conducted the examination and the exam was scored mechanically by Scantron. You requested a review of the results.

The Department of Personnel reviewed your exam and conducted a manual scoring of your exam. Two staff persons reviewed your exam and their rescoring of the exam was consistent. You were sent a new test score notice dated October 11, 2006. The notice stated that you had received 41.0 points out of a possible 62.0 points on the exam. A passing score for the exam was 42.0 points.

Director's Determination

As the Director's designee, I carefully reviewed all of the documentation in the file including your October 31, 2006 letter requesting a Director's review. Based on my review of the documents, I find that DOP correctly responded to your concerns and manually rescored your exam. The October 11, 2006, test score notice contained the correct accurate results of your rescored exam.

Rationale for Determination

The applicant or candidate has the burden of proof to show that the results received on the exam were incorrect.

Your exam was scored both mechanically and manually. You received one additional point through the manual scoring process and the higher score is the final result of your exam. You provided no information to show that any of the answers you provided to the exam questions should have been given a higher score. DOP staff addressed your first concern by manually scoring your exam rather than relying on the initial mechanical score.

Your remaining concerns are outside of the scope of the Director's review process. As stated above, the merit system rules do not allow an applicant or candidate to challenge the exam process or the content of the exam itself.

Pursuant to WAC 357-49-010, the Director's review decision regarding an individuals examination results is final and not subject to further review or appeal.

Please note that subsequent to your review request, the examination process was decentralized and agencies may now conduct recruitments themselves rather than relying on DOP. You may wish to contact your agency's human resource office if you have further questions about applying for positions or completing exams under the new system. In addition, you may wish to enter your data into DOP's e-recruit system so that your name can be included in the candidate pool and accessed by other agencies as well as the Department of Revenue. Here, too, your agency's human resource office should be able to assist you with any questions in this area.

Sincerely,

Holly Platz
Director's Review Investigator

cc: Tom Rawlings, DOP

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. Email string from Tom Rawlings to Teresa Parsons dated October 27, 2006, RE: Auditor Exam Score Results with the notation from Mr. Rawlings “Here’s what I send to Sharon Williams at the Department of Revenue.”
2. Email string from Marlys Mitchell to Teresa Parsons dated October 27, 2006, RE: Appeal the Auditor 2 Exam and Scores. The string begins with an email dated October 19, 2006 from Melissa Stone to Sandra Maple.
3. E-3 Email from Teresa Parsons to Melissa Stone dated October 27, 2006, RE: Auditor Exam Score Results
4. E-4 Faxed copy and hard copy of review request received from Ms. Stone on October 31, 2006 including:
 - a. Request for Director’s Review form
 - b. October 31, 2005 letter from Ms. Stone to Director’s Review Program
 - c. Test Score Notice dated October 11, 2006
 - d. Test Score Notice dated August 2, 2006
5. November 17, 2006 letter from Karen Wilcox to Ms. Stone acknowledging receipt of her review request
6. May 2, 2007 letter from Karen Wilcox to Ms. Stone confirming the review would be based on written documents and notifying her that documents must be submitted before May 30, 2007