

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Opening

The State Human Resources (SHR) Director's meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 12, 2015 and held in Conference Room 110, first floor; Capitol Court Building; 1110 Capitol Way South, Suite 120; Olympia, Washington 98501-2251.

The results of this meeting are summarized below. Items modified after the printing of the Director's meeting agenda notice (20-Day Notice), were attached to the program as handouts and available at meeting. All other items were adopted as printed on the Director's meeting agenda unless otherwise noted below.

Present

Staff:

- Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM
- Nancy Jacobski, Human Resource Consultant, SHR, OFM
- Franklin Plaistowe, Workforce Performance, Planning, Rules and Appeals Section Chief

Conference Call:

- Staci Sleigh-Layman, HR Director, Central Washington University

Logistics and Information

This publication and related materials are available on the Internet at the following web address: <http://www.hr.wa.gov/more/Meetings/DirectorMeetings/Pages/default.aspx>

Comments and suggestions regarding the meeting process and related publications; requests for alternate formats; or requests for digital, CD, or cassette copy of verbatim meeting proceedings are welcomed and may be forwarded to:

Barbara J. Ursini
Logistics Coordinator
State Human Resources
Office of Financial Management
128 10th Avenue SW
PO Box 47500
Olympia, Washington 98501

Email classandcomp@ofm.wa.gov
Fax (360) 407- 4148
Office (360) 407-4120

Meeting Minutes

Introduction

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: The Director's meeting was called to order by Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director of the Office of Financial Management (OFM), at 8:30 a.m., Thursday, February 12, 2015. Tracy took action on all items.

Previous Minutes – Section A

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: The first item of business was the adoption of the November 13, 2014 Director's meeting minutes. Staff recommended final adoption effective February 13, 2015.

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: Hearing no comments, the November 13, 2014 Director's meeting minutes including the adjustment on page one, line two, correcting the meeting start time from *p.m.* to *a.m.*, was adopted as presented with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Exempt Compensation – Section B

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: Found in section B of the agenda were the exempt compensation exhibit items 1 through 17, with items 9, 10, and 15 reflected in the handouts. Staff recommended adoption as presented with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

- Item(s) 1 B1448 Assistant Director, Medicaid - HCA
- Item(s) 2 B4161 Chief of Staff – DOT/WSF
- Item(s) 3 B4162 Director, Safety Systems – DOT/WSF
- Item(s) 4 B4163 Public Information Officer – DOT/WSF
- Item(s) 5 B4164 Director, Community Services. – DOT/WSF
- Item(s) 6 B4165 Director, Finance and Administration – DOT/WSF
- Item(s) 7 B4166 Director, Marine Operations – DOT/WSF
- Item(s) 8 B4167 Director, Vessel Maintenance – DOT/WSF
- Item(s) 9 B4168 Director, Terminal Engineering – DOT/WSF [Handout](#)
- Item(s) 10 B4172 State Construction Engineer – DOT [Handout](#)
- Item(s) 11 B4173 Director, Maintenance Operations – DOT
- Item(s) 12 B4174 State Traffic Engineer/Traffic Operations – DOT

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 3 of 12

- Item(s) 13 B4175 State Design Engineer – DOT/Dev Div
- Item(s) 14 B4176 Communications Director – DOT
- Item(s) 15 B4177 Director, External Civil Rights – DOT [Handout](#)
- Item(s) 16 B4178 State Route 520 Program Administrator – DOT
- Item(s) 17 B8214 Division Director, Health Care Services - HCA

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: Hearing no comments, items 1 through 17 were adopted as presented and as reflected in the handouts with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: Next were exempt compensation abolishments, items 18 through 21. Staff recommended adoption as proposed with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Abolishment(s):

- Item(s) 18 B0110 Assistant Director, Division of Transportation Services
- B0140 Assistant Director, Administrative Services
- B0190 Executive Policy Analyst - G.A.
- B0200 Legislative Program Manager - G.A.
- B2925 Chief Technology Officer, DOP
- Item(s) 19 B2081 Operating Budget Chief
- Item(s) 20 B4342 Port Captain
- Item(s) 21 B4350 Port Engineer, Marine

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: Hearing no comments, items 18 through 21 were adopted as presented with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Classification – Section C:

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: Moving to section C of the agenda, item 22, Park Ranger 1, was presented for consideration. Staff recommended adoption as proposed with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Guest speakers were given an opportunity to speak to this item before Tracy Guerin, OFM Deputy Director. See speaker header below for summary of testimonies.

- Item(s) 22 389A Park Ranger 1

Speaker(s):

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 4 of 12

Teresa Parsons, WFSE, HR Classification Specialist: The Federation (WFSE) spoke against item 22, Park Ranger 1 (PR1). Upfront, Teresa began her testimony by stating she was against the proposal as it was currently written, and went on to shared there were portions of the proposal the Federation did in fact agree to. The Federation was not opposed to adding duties to the Park Ranger 1 job class; focusing on visitor services, administration, routine maintenance, and so on. The main concern was complete removal of the entry-level and in-training pieces, allowing for training and experience at the Park Ranger 1 level, which were needed to advance a fair number of fully qualified law enforcement positions to the Park Ranger 2 (PR2) job class level. Adding language reflecting an in-training track can only provide better clarification and shouldn't take away from Park's goal and discretion of selecting *some positions* for an in-training plan with the goal of becoming a commissioned to act as a law enforcement officer. The Federation's understanding of the reason behind the language change was for the agency to achieve flexibility, so some positions could work in the capacity of general work such as Discover Pass or Visitor Services-type work as an Assistant Park Ranger (Park Ranger 1). Confusion surrounded the proposed changed to the title and what that would look like for the series; e.g. Assistant Park Ranger, followed by Park Ranger 2, 3, 4 and skipping the PR1 or making it a standalone class. The Federation agreed there was a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in 2012 to staff for the Discover Pass, and so on. The intent was to allow some of the current positions in *non-permanent status* to perform Assistant Park Ranger duties; the language was not meant to modify the job class itself as it stands today.

Responding to Franklin, Teresa went on to explain how the Park Ranger series would look with the proposed changes. She explained there would no longer be a PR1 with the proposed changes. However, the PR1 in-training piece would be used to move the position to a PR2—how could the PR1 be utilized if it did not exist? Mike Sternback interjected stating the *Assistant Ranger* was a working title and not a class.

Teresa was also concerned about the PR2 job class specification language referring to *independent journey-level* and desirables *one year of experience as a Park Ranger commissioned law enforcement officer or equivalent*, stating the PR1 with the in-training component wouldn't come to the PR2 class meeting the qualifications. She wanted to know what job class would be used when using the in-training component, the PR1 job specification does not speak to this in-training component, especially the law enforcement requirement.

Tom Riggs, Park Ranger 3, WFSE, Local 1466 President: Mr. Riggs stated he has been with the State Parks and Recreation Commission for approximately 20 years, and served as a Park Ranger 1, 2, and currently a 3. He spoke as President and representative of Parks Local 1466. He re-iterated Teresa's testimony stating they were not opposed to the *concept* of creating flexibility with the PR1 class. He went onto to describe the career ladder the Park

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 5 of 12

Ranger series provided him and what that looked like historically for the series. However, it was noted more recently with class consolidation, the first level of the series had been compressed allowing the PR1 an in-training component to automatically reallocated staff to the PR2. They would like to see the PR1 position serve many functions in the agency while at the same time create a candidate pool for the PR2. The focus was to maintain an evident career ladder for this class series. There was concern the title change would potentially leave the PR2 being viewed as the entry-level to the series, when currently the PR1 is considered entry-level. He did express support for the concept of having a law enforcement training program, referenced in the collective bargaining agreement (Section 455c), but he was not privy to the details. There was concern filling future PR2 positions if there were no training component which could be a safety issue for the public and Rangers themselves. In conclusion, it was felt the change was good but needed to care with the right language.

Don Hall, Park Ranger 3: Mr. Hall stated he was a Park Ranger 3 (PR3) with the State Parks and Recreation Commission in the Greater Wenatchee Confluence area in Wenatchee, Washington. He added he was a member of the bargaining team that drafted the 2012 MOU, and explained they had asked the agency at that time what was their intent with *this type of position* and they responded by stating it was a “stop-gap, temporary move to keep people to do Discover Pass enforcement parking” which is the law enforcement element the current PR1 class has. He also repeated earlier testimony regarding the entry level component, career path, law enforcement movement, and movement to specialize the position rather than a generalist position. There was concern the proposed changes would result in recruiting lower level folks who may not be qualified, and asked to have further contact and conversations regarding the evolution of the proposal.

Don expressed confusion where the proposed changes would create flexibility for the Parks and Recreation Commission. He stated where PR1 “pools” were created, they had provided greater flexibility. For example, when a PR1 decides after two or three years to become a “cop” in the Park Ranger series, they could exercise the “clause” and attend the academy and perform a polygraph and background check; but if they fail, they have a “soft place” to land back to in their permanent position. In contrast, the appointment authority Parks wants to utilize provides no “soft landing” but rather the employee would be “out the door.”

In response to Scott Nicholson, sections 4.5 of the current collective bargaining agreement states the *type of appointment*, and he felt it was section “C” the agency was aligning with. Stating the agency would pre-announce as an appointment authority and at the end of every six months if a candidate did not qualify, they would be terminated. He went on to state the agency could use the class any time they wanted to tap into the PR1 class to see if an employee would qualify for the academy and graduate, if not, they would fall back into permanent status. If the 4.5-type appointment was created, an employee would go to the academy and fails, they would be fired. This would be the result when utilizing “type of

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 6 of 12

appointment” versus “insertion of language.” He stated they did not want to give back the authority of the agency for the PR1 job class. He pointed out the collective bargaining agreements eventually stop and then need to be re-bargained, so nothing would guarantee the clause would be available the next go-around, whereas the clause in the job classification would be permanently there for the agency to exercise.

Ed Casey, Law Enforcement, WFSE Labor Advocate: Mr. Casey was the law enforcement labor advocate for the Federation (WFSE). He pointed out all their concerns were addressed by others before his testimony. He added there was concern regarding the *structural issues that the proposed constitution change would create*. He referenced the agency intended to exercise the type of appointment under the current collective bargaining agreements (Section 4.5c) *as an in-training appointment*. The issue this brings is the current classification limits the time frame to an 18-month time period; under the collective bargaining agreement, that would extend the in-training program to 36 months. Therefore, the ability to fill existing or new PR2 positions would be severely hindered, and there is the proposal of removing the law enforcement commission powers from the Park Ranger 4s (PR4) as well, thus creating further structural issues. Removing law enforcement commission from the PR4s and removing an entry-level position (Park Ranger 1), would further compress the ladders of opportunity for the employees at the PR2 level. The Federation firmly believes insertion of the proposed language provides the agency the flexibility and *nimble attitudes* down the road to make mid-stream adjustments without having to re-negotiate with the Federation each and every time they would need to create an in-training process. It is the Federations belief the proposed changes would have long-term impacts on safety for the remaining officers in the field as well as the public utilizing the parks.

Last, Ed explained the unanswered question regarding the current circumstances were due to his error. A change notice had been sent to him on December 23, 2014 at 4:24 p.m. but the Federation went into non-operations for three weeks. By the time, he had come back, the timeline was expired.

Becky Daniels, Parks and Recreation Commission, HR Director: The Human Resource Director for State Parks and Recreation Commission, Becky Daniels, responded to the issues the Federation raised. Speaking to the addition of language in the specification, she acknowledged they've had informal conversations about it with the union. Because the Article 4.5c allows the agency to create in-training positions, it is not necessary to add the in-training language to the PR1 job class specification. For example, if recruiting to fill a PR2 with an in-training path from a PR1—thereby making this language clear in the recruitment announcement that the individual would move to a higher level after meeting the in-training requirements. So essentially, the job recruitment would be for a PR2. The point behind the proposed change of course is to allow flexibility with the PR1 job class. So the PR1 job class would have a dual role for the agency as they deem fit: a) serve as an in-training and auto

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 7 of 12

promotion to a PR2, or b) serve permanently and remain a PR1 with no in-training plan to a PR2. The agency stated it was true the 2012 MOU was directed at nonpermanent PR1s, and they provided notice about the classification change to the union but did not receive a response back to *demand to bargain*. There were different issues: a) non-permanent and b) permanent—the latter we did not ask to bargain the issue. There was no formal bargaining, just informal conversations. Becky stated as far as the PR2 looking like the entry-level position, there would still be an Assistant Ranger (AKA PR1) which new title came from the bargaining occurring in 2012. The agency agreed to call the PR1s in non-permanent standing *Assistant Park Rangers* with the intent of using the original bargaining title language to avoid confusion. She stated PR2s were the agency's basic law enforcement positions, and shared there was opportunity for the PR1s to move to PR2s. For example, some of their seasonal PR1s from two years ago are currently enrolled in the law enforcement academies around the state as these positions are *really desirable*. The agency's goal was to give the PR1s and opportunity to get their "feet wet" with the option of enrolling in the academy to eventually qualify for the PR2 level. Becky stated they did not agree with the union about potential impacts of the positions staying open longer and creating burdens on others. Fundamentally, the changes would not really change anything other than create options—a split to leave a selection of PR1s without law enforcement training and another selection Of PR1s with the option to attend the academy and move on to the PR2 as qualified, commissioned staff taking on law enforcement duties.

She shared there was no plan for the agency to keep recruitments open any longer than they already have been in reference to recruiting for PR1s as well as the length of the in-training plan, which can be 14 months to 18 months depending on the hire date. Additionally, she noted the academies were held the same time during the year. The agency holds a different perspective on this issue and does not feel the need to add language as to the length of the in-training piece.

To answer Tracy's question, she stated at the present time the Agency has the ability to create *position-specific qualifications* to include such requirements as the in-training component.

In response to Teresa's question, Becky Daniels responded by referencing Article 4.5c which has been applied to all types of job classes in the state system having no reference in their higher level classifications. She stated in-training classifications are designations that have been used for many different job classes that do not have in-training language and it was done this way prior to the contract.

Mike Sternback, Parks and Recreation Commission, Assistant Director of Operations: Mike referenced the 36-months and stated it was within their capability to shorten the time frame, but pointed out the change would not hinder their ability to fill a PR2 position into a law

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 8 of 12

enforcement position, which the latter has always been a PR2 or above. For those PR2s not qualified yet, they would be moved into an in-training PR1 position—a transitory position. The agency was confident no position would be locked into 36 months entirely. However, there was the concern adding this language could impact the qualifications of the position when hiring, as it wouldn't have the same level of qualifications for someone to become a PR1 as it would for a PR2, the latter including psychological evaluations, polygraph examination, answering questions if you would or would not be willing to take a life. Those requirements would not be needed for someone coming into a PR1 position, not required to have a gun and be fully commissioned. With increased flexibility, the agency felt this would not set them back in any way.

In response to the discussion with Franklin and Teresa, he stated the *Assistant Ranger* was a working title and something the Federation asked for and they agreed to. He also stated the classification had always been titled a PR1.

In response to Tracy's question, he explained the agency's reasoning for the proposed changes as wanting to bring about more flexibility to their (Parks) business model. In the past, when needing to fill PR2 positions, they recruited only for the PR2s and not PR1s to eventually become PR2s, but now would like the ability to do the latter with the proposal. When asked how many PR1s were hired with the in-training component to be a PR2 last year, Mike responded since the 2012 layoffs, they have not had the need to recruit for PR1s with intent of eventually becoming PR2s. Prior to 2012, Parks did use the PR1s to move directly into PR2s.

In response to Franklin, there have been instances in the past where a PR1 with an in-training plan to a PR2, did not accomplish their goals such as successfully completing the Criminal Justice Degree for Corrections (CJCD) and they were "let go" and then they would "revert" back.

In response to Tom Rigg's question, with the proposed changes, if the agency had a vacant PR2, would the agency still have a path to bring in someone to fill the position or would the opportunity be lost. Mike reassured Tom indeed the agency has a number of paths available to fill a vacant PR2. Becky added to this and gave examples of some of the paths the agency would use such, as hiring a qualified person directly into the PR2 either from someone internally or externally.

Franklin Plaistowe, OFM; Workforce Performance, Planning, Rules and Appeals; Section Chief: Franklin pointed out earlier testimony by Teresa from the Federation, who spoke to a "parallel series" and cautioned there was some overlap. He asked for more clarification. Teresa responded by comparing the structure of the current Park Ranger series (PR1 through PR4) and what the proposed series would look like (Assistant Park Ranger, PR2-4).

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 9 of 12

See Teresa's testimony for more details. After discussion, it was agreed by all meeting participants the proposed change was not to change the *Park Ranger 1* title to *Assistant Park Ranger*, Tracy confirmed this.

In response to Don Hall, if a permanent PR1 employee doing non-law enforcement work elects to pursue in-training appointment, 4.5c would allow that employee reversion rights should the employee fail the in-training requirements as they would be in "trail service" status as a permanent employee.

Peter Gayton, OFM, Classification and Compensation Team Manager: Peter expressed support for the proposal item as he felt it did indeed give Parks more flexibility.

Scott Nicholson, OFM Labor Negotiator: In response to Don Hall's example of what flexibility would really look like with the proposed changes. He stated the "soft landing" the agency would define with the proposed changes, would be if you hired an individual doing non-law enforcement activities as with the PR1—the positions would look favorably as one which could take on an in-training component should a need arise to fill a PR2. If the PR1 in-training plan fails, the employee would "soft land" back into the PR1 non-law enforcement position. The proposed changes were actually creating a "soft landing" needed for flexibility as well as the realities of funding, for example, the Discover pass PR1 duty (non-in-training to the PR2).

Scott added Parks was also in bargaining regarding changes to the PR2, PR3, and PR4 duties which is ongoing at this point and part of a larger staffing model for Parks; he would not make further comment on the active bargaining proceedings and felt it was independent of the current proposed changes—and there were no impacts. The agency was basically trying to create a clear model between what we need in law enforcement versus what was need for Discover pass enforcement for a funding model to add clarity. By adding the language created an additional hybrid not contemplated in the contract, which made it clear in the in-training program. He concluded they stand by the fact the contract allowed them to fulfill the in-training component.

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: After Becky's testimony, Tracy expressed confusion of the differing job titles used interchangeable in the testimony presented and asked for clarification: *Assistant Park Ranger* versus *Park Ranger 1*. Becky responded both titles represented the same position--meaning they were one in the same; she just followed job title language from 2012. She went on addressing Becky regarding the concerns the union had going from 18 months in-training to 36 months in-training. Becky responded by stating the agency did not agree with earlier testimony (see above for further testimony). Tracy reaffirmed by all present, there was no proposal to change the Park Ranger 1 job class title to Assistant Park Ranger and all were in agreement. After hearing testimonies, Tracy

Director's Meeting Minutes

State Human Resources, Office of Financial Management

February 12, 2015

Page 10 of 12

concluded there was a lot of consternation regarding the *job title* of the classification, the *in-training* component, and the *discretion of the agency* on how the PR1 is utilized. She went on stating if the agency were to put the in-training opportunity in the language, "at the discretion of the agency" they would still have the ability to specify which positions would be in-training and which would not when planning to hire. Parks confirmed this (Becky Daniels).

Because there were still too many unanswered questions, Tracy postponed the item and did not take any action. She asked the agency to work with their labor partners towards an agreement and bring back the proposal item for consideration at the May 14th Director's meeting.

After hearing all testimony, the item was postponed until the next Director's meeting. No action was taken.

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: Also for consideration in section C of the program, was an emergency handout item 22a, Financial Services Specialist 4. Staff recommended adoption as proposed with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Item(s) 22a 165J Financial Services Specialist 4 [Emergency Handout](#)

Speaker(s):

Lester Dickson, Classification and Compensation Specialist, HRD, DSHS: Expressed his agency's support of this item.

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: Hearing no comments, exhibit item 22a was adopted as presented with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Compensation – Section D

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: In section D, compensation, was item 23, the Vancouver School District 2014 to 2015 Teacher "V" Rate Salary Schedule adjustment. Staff recommended adoption as presented with an effective date of September 1, 2014.

Item(s) 23 Proposed V-Range Salary Schedule Explanation
The 2014-2015 VSD#37 Certificated Teaching Salary Rates

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: Hearing no comments, item 23 was adopted as presented with an effective date of September 1, 2014.

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: The next item under section D, compensation, had appeared on the November 13, 2014 Director's meeting agenda but was inadvertently missed the day of the meeting. Item 24, "T" Range abolishment, returned for consideration as proposed with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Abolishment

Item(s) 24 "T" Range

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Director, OFM: Hearing no comments, item 24 was adopted as proposed with an effective date of February 13, 2015.

Rule Amendments – Section E

There were no rules amendments during this period.

Adjournment

Nancy Jacobski, HRC, Director's Meeting Coordinator: The business was concluded and the meeting was adjourned. The next regularly scheduled Director's Meeting was announced as being Thursday, May 14, 2015, beginning at 8:30 a.m., unless otherwise specified; Conference Room 110, first floor, Capitol Court Building, 1110 Capitol Way South, Olympia, Washington 98501-2251.

Minutes Approved By

Glen Christopherson, Assistant Director
State Human Resources
Office of Financial Management

Date

Acronyms

- DSHS: Department of Social and Health Services
- HR: Human Resources
- HRC: Human Resource Consultant
- HRD: Human Resources Department
- MOU: Memorandum of Understanding
- OFM: Office of Financial Management
- Parks: Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
- SHR: State Human Resources
- WFSE: Washington Federation of State Employees