WEST VIRGINIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

GRIEVANCE BOARD

CHARLES MYERS and

CAROLYN RHODES,

Grievants,

v. **Docket No. 04-HHR-149(E)**

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND

HUMAN RESOURCES/BUREAU

FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

and DIVISION OF PERSONNEL,

Respondents.

DECISION

This grievance was filed by numerous employees of the Department of Health and Human Resources' ("DHHR"), Bureau for Children and Families ("BCF"), as a result of new classifications and pay grade assignments which were implemented for positions within the Bureau for Child Support Enforcement ("BCSE") in 2003. Many employees of BCF have requested that a "series" be created for their classifications and that their classifications be placed in higher pay grades, similar to the benefits conferred upon the newly-created BCSE classifications.

Procedural History

In October of 2003, approximately 250 individuals, in various classifications, filed these grievances around the state. After denials at levels one and two, the various grievances were consolidated at level three, and the Division of Personnel ("DOP") was joined as an indispensable party. A level three hearing was conducted, in person and byvideoconferencing, before David M. Adkins, DHHR Grievance Evaluator, on November 21, 2003, January 30, 2004, and March 9, 2004. The grievances were denied by level three decision dated April 15, 2004.

Upon appeal to level four, these cases were ultimately divided into separate grievances, according to job classifications. Grievants are classified as Child Protective Service Workers. A hearing was held, during which Grievant Myers appeared by telephone, on March 28, 2007. Apparently, Grievant Rhodes did not appear and could not be reached. Both Grievants represented themselves at level four. Respondents appeared by counsel, B. Allen Campbell, Senior Assistant Attorney General, for DHHR, and Karen O. Thornton, Assistant Attorney General, for DOP. During the hearing, Grievant Myers gave testimony to the effect that "raises given to day care workers should have been across the board." Shortly after this testimony, due to technical difficulties, Grievant Myers was disconnected from the call and could not be reached thereafter.

After Grievant Myers' disconnection from the hearing, a discussion was had on the record between counsel and Administrative Law Judge Paul Marteney, during which those present surmised that, due to the statements made by Grievant Myers in his testimony, perhaps his case had mistakenly been included with the other grievances which resulted from the child support division changes. It appears this assumption was based upon Grievant Myers' reference to "day care workers," who were clearly not at issue in this grievance, leading to the assumption that his case was part of a completely different grievance against DHHR. However, upon review of the original grievance filing, the undersigned concludes that no error was made. Grievants filed their claim along with two other individuals from the Webster County office and stated their grievance as:

> This is in response to the recently revised job class specifications posted 08- 29-03 and effective 9-01-03 on the West Virginia Division of Personnel official website.
>
> We WV DHHR employees, Child and Adult service unit (Protective Service Workers, and Social Service Supervisor) have been discriminated against by the State of West Virginia. A career ladder and equitable pay have not been established by the State of West Virginia for our positions, but have been established and granted to other DHHR employees with equal or less complex duties. (See footnote 1)

Despite Grievant's unfortunate and unexplained reference to day care workers, it appears that this claim is similar to others which resulted from the classifications and pay grade assignments which occurred during the child support division's reorganization in 2003.

Although given the option to file fact/law proposals at the conclusion of all of these related grievances, Respondents elected to rely upon the proposals filed on October 10, 2006, after the conclusion of the initial level four hearing in *Posey v. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 04-HHR-149(A) (Sept. 17, 2007). Grievants did not file proposals.

Due to the resignation of Chief Administrative Law Judge Marteney, this matter was reassigned to the undersigned on August 18, 2007. The undersigned has been providedwith, and has reviewed, the entirety of the level three record, along with the recordings of the proceedings conducted at level four.

Synopsis

Grievants are employed as Child Protective Service Workers. They contend that, because funding was made available to the BCSE to create new classifications and provide salary increases to employees of that division, all DHHR employees should have received pay increases. The changes within BCSE were caused by severe recruitment and retention issues in that division, and the funding used to provide pay increases was largely from federal sources and earmarked only for use in child support services. Grievants established no legal right to a pay increase as a result of these events.

Findings of Fact

1. Grievants are employed by DHHR as Child Protective Service Workers (“CPS Workers”).

2. After completion of a one-year training period, all employees in Grievants' classification are classified as CPS Workers and are paid within Pay Grade 15, with a salary range of $27,252 to $50,400 annually. During the training period, they are classified as CPS Worker Trainees and are assigned to Pay Grade 13.

3. Pursuant to a request from its former commissioner, and as the result of severe recruitment and retention problems, DOP conducted a classification study of various positions within the Bureau of Child Support Enforcement (“BCSE”). As a result of the study, in January of 2001, DOP

recommended the creation of several new classifications, including Child Support Technician 1 and 2, Child Support Paralegal, ChildSupport Specialist 1, 2, and 3 ("CSS"), Child Support Supervisor 1 and 2, and Child Support Regional Manager.

4. In 2002, BCSE Commissioner Susan Shelton Perry submitted a request for approval of the implementation of the new classifications, but it was rejected by the DHHR Secretary, because DHHR could not provide the necessary funding. Although most of the funds were to be provided by federal sources, DHHR was asked to provide nearly $1,000,000 of the necessary money.

5. On September 1, 2003, the State Personnel Board approved the creation of the new BCSE classifications, prompting the filing of the instant grievances. Virtually all of the funding for this program was provided by the federal government, through matching and incentive funds designated for child support issues, based upon the West Virginia program's performance. These federal funds are only to be used by BCSE and cannot be "shared" with any other division of DHHR.

6. All CPS Workers are assigned the same duties and responsibilities and perform the same work.

Discussion

As this grievance does not involve a disciplinary matter, Grievants have the burden of proving their grievance by a preponderance of the evidence. Procedural Rules of the W. Va. Educ. & State Employees Grievance Bd. 156 C.S.R. 1 § 4.21 (2004); *Howell v. W. Va. Dep't of Health & Human Res*., Docket No. 89-DHS-72 (Nov. 29, 1990). *See* W. Va. Code § 29-6A-6. (See footnote 2) *See also Holly v. Logan County Bd. of Educ*., Docket No. 96-23-174(Apr. 30, 1997); *Hanshaw v. McDowell County Bd. of Educ*., Docket No. 33-88-130 (Aug. 19, 1988). "The preponderance standard generally requires proof that a reasonable person would accept as sufficient that a contested fact is more likely true than not." *Leichliter v. W. Va. Dep't of Health & Human Res.*, Docket No. 92-HHR-486 (May 17, 1993).

At level four, Grievant Myers testified that he believed the funding DHHR granted to BCSE should have been distributed among all of the employees of the entire Department. It appears that Grievants do not claim they are misclassified, nor have they compared themselves, or their job duties, to any particular classification of BCSE employees.

The State Personnel Board has the authority and responsibility to establish a pay plan for all positions within the classified service, guided by the principle of equal pay for equal work. W. Va.

Code § 29-6-10(2). (See footnote 3) The State Personnel Board has wide discretion in performing its duties, although it cannot exercise its discretion in an arbitrary or capricious manner. Also, the rules promulgated by State Personnel Board are given theforce and effect of law and are presumed valid unless shown to be unreasonable or not to conform with the authorizing legislation. *Moore v. W. Va. Dep't of Health and Human Res./Div. of Personnel*, Docket No. 94-HHR-126 (Aug. 26, 1994). *See Callaghan v. W. Va. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 273 S.E.2d 72 (W. Va. 1980).

Additionally, "DOP is primarily concerned with administering a classification and compensation plan that equitably compensates similarly situated employees while maintaining appropriate recruitment and retention, thereby assuring that each state agency has sufficient qualified personnel to perform its assigned governmental function." *Travis v. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 96-HHR-518 (Jan. 12, 1998). As stated by the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, an employee who alleges impropriety regarding a reclassification action or challenges the pay grade to which his or her position is assigned, bears the burden of proving the claim by a preponderance of the evidence. This is a difficult undertaking. *W. Va. Dep't of Health v. Blankenship*, 189 W. Va. 342, 431 S.E.2d 681 (1993); *Bennett v. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 93-HHR-518 (June 23, 1995); *Johnston v. W. Va. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 94- HHR-206 (June 15, 1995); *Thibault v. W. Va. Div. of Rehab. Serv.*, Docket No. 94-RS-061 (May 31, 1995); *Frame v. W. Va. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 94-HHR- 140 (Nov. 29, 1994).

"There is no question DOP has the authority to establish pay grades within a pay plan." *Stephenson v. W. Va. Bureau of Employment Programs/Div. of Personnel*, Docket No. 92-DOP-447 (Aug. 12, 1993). The Grievance Board's role is not to act as an expert in matters of classification of positions, job market analysis, and compensation schemes,or to substitute its judgment in place of DOP. *Moore*, *supra*. Rather, the role of the Grievance Board is to review the information provided and assess whether the actions taken were arbitrary and capricious or an abuse of discretion. If a grievant can demonstrate his or her classification or pay grade was made in an arbitrary and capricious manner or was an abuse of discretion, then he or she has met the required burden of proof. *See Kyle v. W. Va. State Bd. of Rehab.*, Docket No. VR-88-006 (Mar. 28, 1989).

"Generally, an action is considered arbitrary and capricious if the agency did not rely on criteria intended to be considered, explained or reached the decision in a manner contrary to the evidence before it, or reached a decision that was so implausible that it cannot be ascribed to a difference of

opinion. *See Bedford County Memorial Hosp. v. Health and Human Serv.*, 769 F.2d 1017 (4th Cir. 1985); *Yokum v. W. Va. Schools for the Deaf and the Blind*, Docket No. 96-DOE-081 (Oct. 16, 1996)." *Trimboli v. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 93-HHR-322 (June 27, 1997). Arbitrary and capricious actions have been found to be closely related to ones that are unreasonable. *State ex rel. Eads v. Duncil*, 196 W. Va. 604, 474 S.E.2d 534 (1996). An action is recognized as arbitrary and capricious when "it is unreasonable, without consideration, and in disregard of facts and circumstances of the case." *Id*. (*citing Arlington Hosp. v. Schweiker*, 547 F. Supp. 670 (E.D. Va. 1982)). The arbitrary and capricious standard is a high one, requiring willful and unreasonable action and disregard of known facts.

Obviously, very little evidence was introduced at level four. Unlike the grievants in other related cases, such as *Posey*, *supra*, and *Mathes v. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 04-HHR-149(B) (October 3, 2007), Grievants do not compare themselvesto any particular child support employees who allegedly perform similar duties. In the absence of sufficient evidence demonstrating that DOP's determination of pay grade for their positions was clearly wrong, inappropriate, or the result of an abuse of discretion, deference must be given to DOP's determination. *Largent*, *supra*; *O'Connell*, *supra*. The evidence in this case does not support the conclusion that Grievants' assigned pay grade is arbitrary and capricious or constitutes an abuse of DOP's ample discretion in these matters.

Like the grievant in *Myers v. Department of Health and Human Resources,* Docket No. 04-HHR-149(C) (Oct. 5, 2007), it appears that Grievants believe that, since the BCSE employees received a pay increase in conjunction with the reclassification project, they also should have received one. In *Aultz v. West Virginia Department of Transportation*, Docket No. 90-DOH-522 (February 28, 1991), this Grievance Board refused to find that state salaries can be compared, and equal compensation required, across classification lines. In *Aultz*, the grievants contended they should receive the same salary increase awarded to employees in the Highway Engineer II, Chemist IV, and Geologist IV classifications. This assertion was rejected, and the Administrative Law Judge found the Division of Highways and DOP had not "abused their discretion in upgrading the salary- levels [of these classifications] in light of the recruitment and retention problems."

The evidence at level three established severe recruitment and retention issues, along with BCSE's difficulties in complying with various federal requirements, which led to the changes in that

division. The reclassifications and pay grade assignments were related only to those issues, and they do not entitle Grievants to a pay increase. Moreover,undisputed testimony both at levels three and four established that the funding was earmarked only for child support services and could not be "shared" with other divisions, as Grievants have alleged. Grievants have failed to meet their burden of proof.

The following conclusions of law support this Decision.

Conclusions of Law

1. Grievants have the burden of proving their grievance by a preponderance of the evidence. Procedural Rules of the W. Va. Educ. & State Employees Grievance Bd. 156 C.S.R. 1 § 4.21 (2004); *Howell v. W. Va. Dep't of Health & Human Res*., Docket No. 89-DHS-72 (Nov. 29, 1990). *See Holly v. Logan County Bd. of Educ*., Docket No. 96-23- 174 (Apr. 30, 1997); *Hanshaw v. McDowell County Bd. of Educ*., Docket No. 33-88-130 (Aug. 19, 1988).

2. An employee who alleges impropriety regarding a reclassification action or challenges the pay grade to which his or her position is assigned bears the burden of proving the claim by a preponderance of the evidence. This is a difficult undertaking. *W. Va. Dep't of Health v. Blankenship*, 189 W. Va. 342, 431 S.E.2d 681 (1993); *Bennett v. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 93-HHR-518 (June 23, 1995); *Johnston v. W. Va. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 94-HHR-206 (June 15, 1995); *Thibault v. W. Va. Div. of Rehab. Serv.*, Docket No. 94-RS-061 (May 31, 1995); *Frame v. W. Va. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 94-HHR-140 (Nov. 29, 1994).

3. If a grievant can demonstrate his or her classification or pay grade was made in an arbitrary and capricious manner or was an abuse of discretion, then he or she hasmet the required burden of proof. *See Kyle v. W. Va. State Bd. of Rehab.*, Docket No. VR-88-006 (Mar. 28, 1989).

4. "Generally, an action is considered arbitrary and capricious if the agency did not rely on criteria intended to be considered, explained or reached the decision in a manner contrary to the evidence before it, or reached a decision that was so implausible that it cannot be ascribed to a difference of opinion. *See Bedford County Memorial Hosp. v. Health and Human Serv.*, 769 F.2d 1017 (4th Cir. 1985); *Yokum v. W. Va. Schools for the Deaf and the Blind*, Docket No. 96-DOE-081 (Oct. 16, 1996)." *Trimboli v. Dep't of Health and Human Res.*, Docket No. 93-HHR-322 (June 27, 1997).

5. Unless a grievant presents sufficient evidence to demonstrate DOP's interpretation of pay grade is clearly wrong, or the result of an abuse of discretion, an administrative law judge must give deference to DOP and find that the pay grade assignment was correct. *O'Connell v. W. Va. Dept. of Health and Human Resources*, Docket No. 95-HHR-251 (Oct. 13, 1995).

6. State salaries cannot be compared, nor equal compensation required, across classification lines. *See Aultz v. West Virginia Dep't of Transp*, Docket No. 90-DOH-522 (February 28, 1991).

7. Grievants have failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it was arbitrary and capricious or an abuse of discretion for Respondents not to grant them a pay increase as a result of the changes made within BCSE in 2003.

Accordingly, this grievance is **DENIED**. Any party, or the West Virginia Division of Personnel, may appeal this decision to the Circuit Court of Kanawha County, or to the "circuit court of the county in which the grievance occurred." Any such appeal must be filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of this decision. *See* W. Va. Code § 29-6A-7 (repealed, *See Footnote 2, supra)*. Neither the West Virginia Education and State Employees Grievance Board nor any of its Administrative Law Judges is a party to such appeal and should not be so named. However, the appealing party is required by W. Va. Code § 29A-5-4(b) to serve a copy of the appeal petition upon the Grievance Board. The appealing party must also provide the Board with the civil action number so that the record can be prepared and properly transmitted to the appropriate circuit court.

Date: October 17, 2007

_____

DENISE M. SPATAFORE

Administrative Law Judge

Footnote: 1

The other original Grievants were Linda Smith, a Social Service Supervisor, and Patricia Myers, an Adult Protective Service Worker. Because they were in different job classifications, their grievances were separated at level four, and they were assigned docket numbers 04-HHR-149(Q) and 04-HHR-149(C), respectively.

Footnote: 2

In 2007, the Legislature, 2007 Acts ch. 207, abolished the West Virginia Education and State Employees Grievance Board, replacing it with the Public Employees GrievanceBoard. W. Va. Code §§ 18-29-1 to 18-29-11 and W. Va. Code §§ 29-6A-1 to 29-6A-12 were repealed and replaced by W. Va. Code §§ 6C-2-1 to 6C-2-7 and W. Va. Code §§ 6C- 3-1 to

6C-3-6 (2007). Grievances which were pending prior to July 1, 2007, are decided under the former statutes, W. Va. Code §§ 18-29-1 to 18-29-11, for education employees, and W. Va. Code §§ 29-6A-1 to 29-6A-12, for other state and higher education employees. See Executive Order No. 2-07, May 8, 2007. References in this decision are to the former statutes, which continue to control the proceedings in this case.

Footnote: 3

Section 5.1 of DOP's Rules notes the purpose and intent of the classification plan is to "[t]o attract qualified employees and retain them in the classified service" and the State Personnel Board "shall endeavor to provide through the pay plan adequate compensation based on the principles of equal pay for equal work among the various agencies and on comparability to pay rates established in other public and private agencies and businesses."