**Comments on Technical Clerical Study for AFSCME Local 3336-October 21, 2010**

**Administrative Specialist 1 and 2s**

In the DAS review process there were no proposed changes to either of these classifications.

As a result of the management review process several changes were proposed for both classifications. and are found in the distinguishing features section of the specs.

There appears to be some fine tuning of the language to make it more readable but there is also what could amount to a significant change. During the management review process the word ‘interpret’ was changed to ‘analyze’.

AS 2 now reads as follows: *This class is distinguished from the lower level by*

*the responsibility to analyze and apply laws, rules, policies and procedures to a given set of*

*circumstances, typically where the application is non-routine or not clear, and requires an*

*element of judgment.*

Previous language read*: This class is distinguished from the lower level by the responsibility*

*for interpreting laws, rules, policies and procedures, and for applying those interpretations to specific situations some of which may be non-routine.*

There is also a sentence where the word interpret is simply deleted from the list of responsibilities.

Comments

* This change in language, from interpret to analyze, is significant due to the inherent decrease in the level of responsibility and independent thought and action. It is important to note however that many AS 1s and most AS2s have responsibility for interpreting laws, policies, data and associated trends in your PDs.
* It is clear from a review of submitted PDs that the majority of our AS 1 and 2s are permit coordinators. Several are program coordinators and only one has a clear set of administrative support only duties. The general description of the class states that they “assist” program coordinators or managers yet some of you have program coordinator in your own working title.
* I think we should consider proposing striking the word assist and substitute “acts as” in the AS 2 series.
* There is also no mention of web duties in the class specs for either class. Web duties are assigned to at least 3 AS folks according to the PDs. I imagine there are more where the duties have not been included in the PD.

**Executive Support Specialist (ESS) 1 and 2**

There are serious concerns with these proposed class specs.

Previously, the term confidential was used in several areas of duties. The omission of “confidential” is not a problem for the ES1s, and might perhaps make it harder for management to argue that they should be excluded from the bargaining unit. But the fact that this omission was not made on the ESS2 class specs may signal that is exactly what management is trying to do with the ESS2s.

Moreover, the ESS 2 class specs as proposed by the management team change “*typically* agency heads, deputy directors” to “*for example*, agency heads, deputy directors, or *similar level management positions*.” The phrase “or similar level management positions” is confusing because there are no other positions at the same level of agency heads and deputy directors. So is the union to understand that only 2 ES2s will be employed by each agency, and if so what will happen to the other ES2s working in each agency?

Comments

* PDs for our ESS reflect that all of the ESSs with the exception of 1 are performing ESS2 work.
* Should there even be 2 levels in this series?
* What is currently missing from the proposed class specs are duties related to facilities management and LAN responsibilities.

**Office Specialists 1 and 2**

There were no significant changes made to this series aside from the fact that DAS proposes eliminating the Office Assistant classification altogether. This will make this a 2 step classification series instead of one.

Comments

* Although the class specs read fairly accurately as to the general level of duties that should be expected at that range of compensation, the PDs and my knowledge of the work done by some OS1s leads me to believe they should be OS2s due to the varied systems they work with and level of decision making necessary for the job.

**Public Service Representatives**

There were no changes of significance to the PSR 1 and 2 class specs. We do not have 3s and 4s at DEQ at the present time. I have included some comments regarding changes made to those levels for your information however.

The original specs for PSR3s read as follows: It is further distinguished from the higher level by increased technical knowledge in order to analyze, interpret, and apply laws and rules and the absence of resolving problems of a non-routine nature and greater requirement for the use of judgment in determining an appropriate course of action

The management team changed it to: This level is distinguished from the higher level by the absence of responsibility for *resolving problems of a non-routine nature requiring negotiation and extensive research and analysis. It is further distinguished from the higher level by the latter requiring increased technical knowledge to analyze and apply laws and rules and a greater requirement for the use of judgment in determining an appropriate course of action.*

The State is also saying that the PSR3 need to possess “increased technical knowledge to analyze and apply laws and rules and a greater requirement for the use of judgment in determining an appropriate course of action.” Similar changes are suggested for the AS series. In all cases the word “interpret” was omitted.