

# MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska  
Department of Administration  
Division of Personnel & Labor Relations

**To:** Nicki Neal  
Director

**Date:** April 1, 2008

**Thru:** Cynthia Gouveia   
Class Studies Supervisor

**Phone:** 465-4075  
**Fax:** 465-1029  
**Email:** cindy.gouveia@alaska.gov

**From:** Diane Larocque   
Human Resources Specialist

**Phone:** 465-3837  
**Fax:** 465-1029  
**Email:** diane.larocque@alaska.gov

**Subject:** Adult Probation Officer Study

## **Introduction:**

The Department of Corrections (DOC), Division of Probation and Parole submitted a classification study request for the Adult Probation Officers (APO) I – VI on March 9, 2007. The Division Director cited two major objectives for the study. The first objective was to broaden the APO IV job class to provide more flexibility with its use. The second objective was a salary review. The Director stated that because a significant part of the APO's work involves aspects of law enforcement duties, and each incumbent must meet mandatory Alaska Police Standards Council (APSC) requirements and some APOs carry firearms, that a review of the salary ranges for all APO levels was warranted.

## **Study Scope:**

The study included the review of all permanent full time Adult Probation Officer positions. All positions are located in the Department of Corrections, Division of Probation and Parole, Division of Institutions, or the Parole Board. The following list includes the number of permanent positions by job classes at the time of the study:

APO I – 21  
APO II – 112  
APO III – 35  
APO IV – 3  
APO V – 2  
APO VI - 0

## **Study Method:**

A teleconference planning meeting was held on May 21, 2007 with Division Directors to discuss the various milestones, expectations, and phases of the study. During this meeting the due date for position descriptions was set for June 15, 2007 and later extended to June 29. An occupational consultant presentation was given by the requesting agency on June 27, 2007.

Two week long trips were scheduled to tour facilities and interview staff from the Division of Probation and Parole and Division of Institutions. For the Division of Probation and Parole, the interviews included staff from the Dillingham rural office, the larger Kenai and Fairbanks field offices, and the Anchorage Probation Office. For the Division of Institutions, both the Wildwood and Fairbanks Correctional Facilities were toured and incumbents in benchmark positions from both institutions were interviewed. In addition, incumbents at the Anchorage Central Office were interviewed. Because the Parole Board office was limited to two newly appointed incumbents, telephonic discussions about their work occurred with the Executive Director of the Parole Board.

Class specifications were drafted and provided to the agencies for review and feedback. A test allocations session was conducted with the classification staff to test the clarity and accuracy of the draft specifications. After considering comments from the agencies and classifiers, revisions to the drafts specs were made and re-submitted for agency review. The class specifications were finalized after reaching consensus with the agencies, and positions were allocated using the new class specifications. A draft allocations spreadsheet was submitted to the respective agency directors for review, and concurrence with position allocations was attained.

The revised job classes were analyzed for internal alignment and the draft salary analysis was sent to the divisions for review and comment. Additional comments regarding the internal alignment were submitted by DOCs Assistant Commissioner and Administrative Director and were taken into consideration.

#### **History of Job Class:**

Probation Officers II were established in 1966; Probation Officers I, III, and IV were established in 1970.

A class study concluding in 1983 resulted in the expansion of the series to include a Probation Officer V.

In April 1990, Probation Officers' duties were distinguished between the Juvenile Probation Officers and Adult Probation Officers and resulted in a new class series for each. This change was a direct result of AAC 85.900 that required APSC certification for Probation Officers working with adult probationers. Salary ranges for both newly created series remained unchanged.

In 1991 Minimum qualifications were revised.

In May 2001, a classification study of the Adult Probation Officers was concluded. This study resulted in the addition of an APO VI job class, and a salary range increase at the APO I, IV, and V levels. There were no changes to the APO II and III salary ranges.

#### **Class Analysis:**

##### *Reporting structure:*

The Division of Institution's APOs are located in the state's correctional facilities while the Division of Probation and Parole's community APOs are assigned to probation field offices. The

Parole Board also employs a small unit of APOs. The reporting structure for all APOs is the same at the entry and journey levels, with all reporting to a supervisory APO III. There are however, significant differences in the reporting and organizational structures between the divisions beyond the APO III level. The institutional APO III reports directly to the facility's Assistant Superintendent or Superintendent, the community APO III reports to a higher ranking probation officer, and the APO III with the Parole Board reports directly to the Parole Board's Executive Director. Because of the differences in reporting structures, the Director of the Division of Institutions did not consider the APO IV and V job classes useful or needed for this division, and the two job classes were revised with a primary focus on the Division of Probation and Parole and the Parole Board's organizational needs. Throughout the process, all three agency directors were solicited for input, feedback, and recommendations for all changes and revisions to the class specifications.

#### *Nature of the work*

DOC contended that when comparing APO positions within the State of Alaska both Alaska State Troopers and the Social Worker, Children's Services (CS) are most similar in nature because they both involve field operations and office case management. As part of the overall analysis, DOP closely examined the nature of the work of these job classes as well as the APOs, and came to the conclusion that one has to examine the primary purpose of the work and the actual work being performed rather than limiting the analysis to basic similarities:

APOs perform professional work to administer, supervise, or manage probation/parole functions and services for an adult offender population in either an institutional or community setting. The primary responsibility of all APOs is to provide case management and supervision which includes monitoring offenders, performing risk assessments, writing reports, and intervening when needed. Although the nature of the work performed by APOs includes a combination of social work and law enforcement elements, the work itself is not social work nor is it law enforcement. In the case of the Social Workers of all varieties, including those in Children's Services, incumbents are generally members of a multi-disciplinary treatment team who professionally assess mental health, behavioral characteristics and treatment needs, develop treatment plans, coordinate and facilitate social services for clients, assist communities or groups to provide or improve social and health services, and protect, educate, and counsel individuals and groups based on professional theories and principles. Incumbents perform intense investigation and/or assessment to aid and protect clients by performing outreach, crisis intervention, therapy, social rehabilitation, and providing training in skills of everyday living. In contrast the investigation and assessment performed by APOs is done primarily for the purpose of supervising and monitoring offenders. Any counseling provided by an APO is not professional counseling, rather it is general guidance, suggestions, or recommendations. While the APO may make recommendations to an offender for community assistance or services, the APO often makes the referral using a list of available resources. Further, it is ultimately the offender, not the APO, who is responsible for following through to obtain assistance and services. The APO's scope of responsibility and degree to which they assess needs, deliver or facilitate services between clients and service providers, protect clients and families, serve as liaison between family members and clients, and provide counseling to offenders is on a very different level than Social Workers. With regard to the law enforcement elements of the job, APOs do have the authority to conduct a search, re-arrest probationers/parolees who have violated conditions of

release, and order random UAs. However, when APOs conduct home visits or plan to re-arrest a probationer/parolee for court violations, this most often occurs with the support and presence of a law enforcement officer or another APO. APOs and local law enforcement officers often work together in joint partnership during these situations. The major difference in responsibilities between the two is that the law enforcement official has as his/her primary responsibility, the prevention and detection of crime and the enforcement of the penal, criminal, traffic, or highway laws of the state. Although the APO's work sometimes includes limited aspects of law enforcement duties, their primary responsibility is case management and offender supervision. Generally speaking, while Social Workers, law enforcement officials, and the APOs may at times share similar elements of duties, the overall nature of the work for all three groups is very different. And although the social work and law enforcement related aspects of the job make up an important part of the APO's work, they are a limited part of the overall and primary responsibility of the job which is to provide caseload management and offender supervision.

One of the driving forces for the salary analysis was DOC's request that consideration be given for the APSC training and the fact that some APOs carry firearms. It is true that in addition to meeting classification minimum qualifications, all APOs employed by DOC are required to meet APSC standards and must obtain a basic probation officer certificate within fourteen months of hire. The APSC standards are: must be a US citizen, at least 21 years of age, with a high school degree or GED, possess a valid Alaska driver's license, have no convictions of serious misdemeanors or felony crimes within the last 10 years, and must not have used controlled substances. The basic probation officer certification is obtained by completing the probation and parole training academy and field training. The APSC academy training includes a minimum of 80 training hours along with additional training which generally takes five to six weeks to complete. All APOs initially receive the same basic training, and eventually branch off on the specific training track geared to either the institutional or community APO. However, in addition to APOs, there are other job classes in the state system that requires incumbents to complete law enforcement or public safety academy training. Two examples are the Correctional Officers and Park Rangers. Although the continued employment of appointed Correctional Officers is contingent upon their participation and successful completion of training at the Alaska Correctional Officer Academy, the internal alignment for the Correctional Officers' job classes has been and remains solely based on the primary duties performed. Likewise, Park Rangers are commissioned peace officers (as provided in Alaska Statute 41.21.955), are responsible for the enforcement of state statutes and park regulations, are required to carry a firearm, may investigate criminal activity, interview and interrogate witnesses or suspects, issue citations, collect evidence and make arrests. Employees must also satisfactorily complete law enforcement or public safety academy training. While Park Rangers may perform law enforcement related duties within State park areas, law enforcement is not their principal responsibility. Their principal responsibility is to manage and coordinate the activities of a park unit that includes fish and wildlife resources and habitat, cultural and historic sites, developed recreational facilities and information and education centers. Further, regarding the related issue of carrying firearms, while it is true that most APOs are certified to carry a firearm, they are not required to do so. The decision to carry a firearm is made at the discretion of each individual APO, and no APO in the institutions carries a firearm. Again, most Park Rangers in the field carry firearms. Regardless, internal alignment of a job class or series is appropriately based on primary responsibilities, not specific training or the option to carry a firearm.

*Flexible Staffing:*

DOC requires and provides extensive training for new employees, and an employee must successfully pass the training within fourteen months of hire to remain employed. To accommodate this, a flexibly staffed trainee level was established and in place at the onset of this study. DOP's criteria for establishing flexibly staffed positions is that the series must include trainee and journey levels and have a formalized training plan in place. Since flexible staffing is a management tool used to aid recruitment and facilitates entry into an occupational field, continuing to allow a flexibly staffed trainee level remains consistent with the overall goal to provide flexibility and stability to the division, and is appropriate.

*Defining levels:*

While the class specifications were revised, the concepts in the APO I- II job classes remained relatively the same. The APO III and IV job classes were broadened out to provide for a Program Specialist at the APO III level and to emphasize the managerial responsibility at the APO IV level. The APO V level was also revised to more clearly emphasize the administrative and managerial authority that is consistent with job classes at this level:

APO I is the trainee level in the series. In addition to working towards completing mandatory APSC and academy training, incumbents gain professional knowledge of probation and parole principles and practices through on-the-job experience. At this level, incumbents learn a variety of duties such as: how to conduct investigations, evaluate and assess offender needs and risk level, develop and recommend release plans, assist with placement and program services, monitor, manage, and enforce compliance with release conditions, and prepare and complete extensive documentation and reports. Advancement to the Adult Probation Officer II level occurs only when the incumbent successfully completes all training, including the specified terms of the APSC training and certification requirements, and is certified by the supervisor as prepared to perform at the next level.

APO II is the journey level in the series. Incumbents apply professional knowledge of probation and parole principles and practices to independently perform the full range of duties to assess, evaluate, supervise, and guide incarcerated or released felony adult offenders. It is at this level where the majority of the work is performed.

APO III is the supervisory level or program specialist level in the series. Under the supervisory option the incumbent is the first line supervisor responsible for the day-to-day operation of a unit or field office. Incumbents plan, direct, and oversee the probation/parole work for the unit or office, and are responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the work performed by staff. Positions assign and review work, and evaluate performance and methods. Under the program specialist option the incumbent's primary purpose is to assist managers with the coordination and delivery of a specific program service or function. The advanced level work is defined by characteristics such as: serving as the primary contact for a specific program or functional area; providing program information and guidance to staff or outside agencies; the need to comprehend and work with other state and federal regulations; and having decision making authority for matters related to program implementation.

APO IV is the first managerial level in the series. Incumbents are responsible for managing the operations and services of multiple adult probation offices, units, or one or more major programs. Although there are several options in this job class, the class controlling work is the primary responsibility for assisting senior managers with managing overall operations and to evaluate and provide quality control on the probation/parole services, functions, and programs.

APO V is the Chief Probation Officer for a region or the Anchorage District Probation Office. The incumbents report to the Director and manage and administer all elements of community-based probation services and line functions in a region or the Anchorage District Probation Office. These positions serve as senior managers who are responsible for the overall direction, administration, and effectiveness of program services under their scope of responsibility.

APO VI job class was created with the intention of performing specialized duties and serving as an Assistant to the Director. As part of the study, the duties originally assigned to this position were re-assigned to the Adult Probation Officers IV and V. As a result of this change the APO VI was deemed no longer needed and subsequently abolished.

#### *Grouping:*

The state's classification plan provides for the grouping of positions into job classes when they are sufficiently similar with respect to duties and responsibilities, degree of supervision exercised and received, and entrance requirements so that: 1) the same title can be used to clearly identify each position; 2) the same minimum qualifications for initial appointment can be established for all positions; 3) the same rate of basic pay can be fairly applied to all positions; and 4) employees in a particular class are considered an appropriate group for purposes of layoff and recall. Job classes should be constructed as broadly as is feasible as long as the tests of similarity are met. Although the institutional APO's duties differ somewhat from the community field officers and Parole Board officers, the overall responsibility and purpose of the work is relatively the same. Both are responsible for managing offender caseloads and monitoring offenders. This includes duties such identifying problem areas; guiding and assisting probationers/parolees with solving problems; recommending and setting up contact with community and social services and agencies, engaging in consistent contact with offenders to ensure compliance with court conditions; and preparing and writing a variety of reports. All APOs serve as officers of the court, evaluate probationers/parolees interpret sentencing guidelines, investigate backgrounds, and make recommendations for actions to take on a case either to the court or parole board. In addition, the role of the institutional probation officer has expanded to include more field work and law enforcement related duties through the expanding use of electronic monitoring. The result of the grouping test indicated that for the APOs in all the three agencies, the work was sufficiently similar to support its current assignment to the Adult Probation Officer series. The same minimum qualifications for initial appointment exist for the institutional, community, and Parole Board APOs, and all are considered an appropriate group for purposes of layoff and recall.

#### Class Title:

A class title should be the best descriptive title for the work. It is intended to concisely and accurately convey the kind and level of work performed and should be brief, easily recognized, gender neutral, and understood by potential applicants.

The current class title, Adult Probation Officer, sufficiently describes the work performed by this group and is retained.

Minimum Qualifications:

The minimum qualifications established for a job class must relate to the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to perform the work and must not create an artificial barrier to employment of individuals in protected classes. Required training should be limited to the basic formal training that customarily prepares individuals for work in the field. Experience requirements are intended to ensure new employees can successfully perform the work after a period of orientation or familiarization. Required experience should be directly related to the actual duties of positions in the class and should not be equivalent to the work to be performed.

Adult Probation Officer is a professional series that requires the application of social, psychological, and behavioral principles and theories. Incumbents utilize this knowledge to perform, supervise, manage, or administer probation/parole functions and services for an adult offender population in an institutional or community setting. The advanced educational requirement for the Adult Probation Officer profession has been strict in the past by requiring a degree in specific degree fields. However chronic difficulties with recruitment and retention necessitated the need to broaden the minimum qualifications to a general post-secondary education degree and to also provide an experience substitution. Both paths are directly related to the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to perform the work. By meeting the college degree minimum qualification, incumbents are likely to have acquired the basic skills necessary to write and complete a variety of professional assessment and report documents, as well developed the skills needed to accurately and appropriately analyze and assess information and records from both within and outside agency sources. The experience substitution allows the ability for management to consider applicants who have related paraprofessional work experience and could be reasonably expected to advance to the professional level after a period of training and familiarization. The extended training plan and flex staffing at the entry level of the series provides an incumbent with the opportunity to further develop the specific knowledge and skills required of the job. Beginning at the entry level and progressing through the highest levels in the series, the minimum requirements are consistent and the progression of work experience is logical.

Class Code:

A Class Code is assigned based on the placement of the job class in the classification schematic of Occupational Groups and Job Families. Occupational Groups are made up of related Job Families and encompass relatively broad occupations, professions, or activities. Job Families are groups of job classes and class series that are related as to the nature of the work performed and typically have similar initial preparation for employment and career progression.

The Adult Probation Officers are currently listed in the Police, Fire Fighters, and Corrections group (PJ) in the Probation and Parole family (PJ04). This family includes classes that advise on, administer, supervise or perform probation or parole services. Initial preparation for employment is typically through specialized training with subsequent career progression based on progressively responsible experience.

The nature of the work to perform, supervise, manage, or administer probation/parole functions and services for an adult offender populations, the level of decision making, and the typical training and experience required to enter and advance in the work support keeping the revised classes in the Corrections job family. The Adult Probation Officers I-V will remain assigned Class Codes PJ0401-5 respectively. The Adult Probation Officer VI, PJ0406 will be abolished.

AKPAY Code:

AKPAY Codes are assigned to job classes for use in legacy computer systems that cannot use the six-digit Class Codes in the current Classification Outline. The job classes revised in this study will retain their previously assigned AKPAY Codes.

Fair Labor Standards Act

The single position in this study is covered by the minimum wage and maximum hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as Amended (FLSA). While exemption from the provisions of the Act are determined based on the specific circumstances of an individual employee on a work-week basis, there are general aspects of the classes and their influence on the exemptions for employees in bona fide executive, professional, or administrative positions that can be addressed in general.

There are both salary and duty requirements which dictate FLSA exemption status. There are three categories used in this analysis to determine the eligibility for overtime exemptions under the Fair Labor Standards Act: Administrative, Professional, and Executive:

Administrative Exemption Status: in order to qualify an employee must be compensated on a salary or fee basis at a rate of not less than \$455 per week and his or her primary duty must be the performance of office or non-manual work that is directly related to the management or general business operations of the employer that includes the exercise of discretion and independent judgment with respect to matters of significance. Some examples of this type of work include tax, finance, accounting, budgeting, personnel, and procurement related functions. No Adult Probation Officers perform office work related to management or business operations as a primary duty, and therefore do not meet the FLSA administrative criteria for overtime exemption.

Professional Exemption Status: in order to qualify an employee must be compensated on a salary or fee basis at a rate of not less than \$455 per week and an employee's primary duty must be work requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning, which is customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction; or be work requiring invention, imagination originality or talent in a recognized field of artistic or creative endeavor. While Adult Probation Officer work is professional and sets a college degree as the minimum qualification, it is a general degree not a specific field of science or learning. In a substitution in the minimum qualifications allows for experience or a combination of college education and experience to qualify. Since the Adult Probation Officer minimum qualifications do not require an advanced specialized field of science education or learning, no Adult Probation Officers meet the FLSA professional criteria for overtime exemption.

Executive Exemption Status: in order to qualify an employee must be compensated on a salary or fee basis at a rate of not less than \$455 per week and the primary duty must be the management of a customarily recognized subdivision of the organization, including the customarily and regularly directing of work of two or more employees; and include authority to hire or fire other employees or make recommendations as to the change of status of other employees that are given particular weight. While some Adult Probation Officers II may perform lead level duties, none are required to supervise or manage staff or programs and do not meet exemption criteria. Most Adult Probation Officers III, IV, and V, have as a primary duty supervision and/or management. Under FLSA, management is defined as activities such as interviewing, selecting, training and directing employees; maintaining production for use in supervision or control; appraising employee's productivity and efficiency for the purpose of recommending promotions or changes to status; handling complaints, grievances, and discipline; determining techniques, apportioning the work among employees; planning and controlling budgets and monitoring or implementing legal compliance measures. For those Adult Probation Officers III, IV, and V who have as a primary duty the supervision and management a recognized subdivision (i.e. work unit, area office, region), and supervise at least two full time employees or the equivalent, these incumbents meet the FLSA criteria for executive exemption and are not eligible for overtime. However, for those APO IIIs who manage a rural probation office but have as their primary responsibility case management and offender supervision, these incumbents do not meet the FLSA criteria for executive exemption and are eligible for overtime.

**Internal Alignment:**

The salary range of a job class is determined based on internal consistency within the state's pay plans, in accordance with merit principles, with the goal of providing fair and reasonable compensation for services rendered and maintaining the principle of "like pay for like work." In evaluating internal consistency, the difficulty, responsibility, knowledge, skills, and other characteristics of a job are compared with job classes of a similar nature, kind, and level in the same occupational group and job family or related job families.

Adult Probation Officers perform case management duties that include some elements of social work as well as law enforcement. Based on this premise, DOC focused primarily on these two elements when providing their recommendations for comparable job classes. As a result their recommendations were well outside the scope of the Probation and Parole family and Police, Fire Fighters, and Corrections group (PJ), but were considered and analyzed for internal alignment to provide a comprehensive and fair analysis.

The following job classes were submitted by DOC for internal alignment comparison: Juvenile Probation Officers, Adult Probation Officers ASAP, Employment Counselors, Investigators, Social Workers, Social Workers Children's Services, Child Support Specialists, Children's Services Specialists, Retirement and Benefits Specialists, Medical Assistance Administrators, Workforce Development Specialists, Worker's Compensation Officers, Disability Adjudicators, Developmental Disabilities Program Specialists, Intake Officer, Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors, Eligibility Technicians, Alaska Military Youth Academy Supervisor, Assistant Correctional Superintendent, and Alaska State Troopers. DOP included Park Rangers in the comparison in order to consider a job series within the same salary schedule that has peace officer status.

Recommended job classes excluded from the internal alignment were the Eligibility Technicians which are technical rather than professional job classes and the Intake Officer which is an exempt job class. The Alaska State Troopers were also excluded because they follow a different pay plan.

The following is the breakdown of recommended job classes. All were analyzed and assigned to the appropriate levels with the following result:

***Entry/trainee level:***

Juvenile Probation Officer I (SR14/ PJ04), Adult Probation Officer, ASAP (SR13/ PJ04), Social Worker I (SR14/ PF02), Social Worker Children's Services (SR15/PF02), Social Services Specialist I (SR14/ PF02), Children's Services Specialist I (SR15/PF02), Child Support Specialist I (SR14/PF01), Employment Counselor I (SR14/PF05), Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor (SR15/PF04). These are all entry or trainee level job classes that provide professional program assistance, consultation and/or counseling. Incumbents learn to perform case management work, perform assessments and evaluations, determine client needs, determine a rehabilitative course of action, and provide consultation and assistance to clients in obtaining services and achieving goals.

Investigator I (SR13/PI04) is a professional entry level job class that performs some law enforcement work involving detection, collection, custody and interpretation of evidence. Incumbents learn to prepare reports and provide testimony as a witness at legal or administrative proceedings.

At this level and in each of these job classes, all incumbents receive training. This may be through formal training, on-the-job training, or both. Incumbents learn proper interview techniques, investigation and evaluation methods, report writing, and case documentation. Incumbents become familiar with the purpose and application of the statutes, regulations, policies and procedures that govern the work, learn to establish contacts and maintain an effective rapport with other agencies representatives and the general public. At this level assignments may either become increasingly complex with the goal of developing a full range of skills or incumbents perform work of limited scope and complexity, assisting higher level staff who performs at the full proficiency level.

***Journey level:***

Juvenile Probation Officer II (SR16 PJ04), Adult Probation Officer II ASAP (SR16 PJ04), Employment Counselor II (SR16 PF05), Social Worker II (SR16 PF02), Social Worker CSII (SR17 PF02), Social Services Specialist II (SR16 PF02), Children's Services Specialist II (SR16 PF02), Medical Assistant Administrator I (SR16 PF01), Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor II (SR17 PF04), and Retirement and Benefits Specialist I (SR16 PB03). These are journey level job classes that provide professional program assistance, consultation and/or counseling. Incumbents independently perform the full range of case management work, assessments and evaluations, determine client needs, determine a rehabilitative course of action, and provide consultation and assistance to clients in obtaining services and achieving goals.

Disability Adjudicator I (SR18 PF01), Park Ranger I (SR16 PI01), Investigator II (SR16 PI04), and Wage-Hour Investigator I (SR16 PC02). These are positions that perform the full range of duties to investigate alleged violations, research background complaints, recommend corrective action or issue corrective orders. Incumbents apply a working knowledge of the conduct of court proceedings and/or administrative or quasi-judicial hearing procedures to provide testimony as a witness at legal or administrative proceedings.

***Supervisory or program specialist:***

Juvenile Probation Officer III (SR18 PJ04), Social Worker III (SR18 PF02), Social Services Specialist III (SR18 PF02), Social Worker CS III (SR18 PF02), Social Work CS IV supervisor (SR19 PF02), Children's Services Spec III (SR17 PF02), Children's Support Specialist II (SR16 PF01), Alaska Military Youth Academy Supervisor (SR17 PE02), and Retirement and Benefits Specialist II (SR18 PB03). At this level incumbents perform advanced level work as either a first line supervisor who is responsible for the supervisory and administrative duties of a unit, section, or rural office, or serve as a specialist in a narrow but complex program or functional area who apply broad programmatic knowledge to assist managers with the coordination and delivery of a specific program service or function.

Disability Adjudicator II (SR20 PF01), Park Ranger II (SR18 PI01), Investigator III (SR18 PI04), and Wage-Hour Investigator II (SR18 PC02). Positions perform advanced level work to supervise subordinate professional positions that investigate alleged violations, research background complaints, recommend corrective action or issue corrective orders. Incumbents have considerable knowledge of the laws, regulations, rules, policies, procedures, and precedents affecting programs.

***Program Manager or 2<sup>nd</sup> level supervisor:***

Employment Counselor III (SR20 PF05), Social Worker IV (SR19 PF02), Children's Support Specialist III (SR18 PF01), Medical Assistant Administrator III (SR20 PF01), Social Services Program Coordinator (SR20 PF01), Retirement and Benefits Specialist III (SR20 PB03), Park Superintendent (SR20 PI01), Investigator IV (SR20 PI04), Vocational Rehabilitation Manager (SR20 PF04), Assistant Correctional Superintendent (SR19 PJ03), and Wage-Hour Investigator III (SR21 PC02). The primary responsibility at this level is management. These job classes have substantive involvement and authority for managing major programs or agency subdivisions. As such, incumbents exercise significant authority for the review and approval of work, program functions, and program application. As a manager the incumbent provides program direction, organization, leadership, supervision and planning. Incumbents in these job classes are involved with program policy and procedure development, have administrative and resource control, and exercise considerable authority to make decisions that have a substantial impact on the program or functions. The scope of responsibility is over major programs or large, complex, or multiple agency subdivisions.

***Regional Supervisor:***

Juvenile Probation Officer IV (SR20 PJ04), Social Worker V Children's Services (SR 21 PF02), Staff Manager (SR21 PF02), Children's Services Manager (SR21 PF02), Social Services Program Officer (SR21 PF02), and Assistant Chief Vocational Rehabilitation Services (SR21PF04). Positions at this level are primarily senior managers who report to the director and

are responsible for the overall direction and administration of program services or operations through subordinate supervisors and managers for a large geographical area, often a region. Work at this level is characterized by the responsibility for developing long-term program goals and objectives; assisting with budget development; managing, planning, and administering resources; analyzing organizational structure; and formulating operational policies and procedures for implementing the services and program functions.

#### Conclusion:

There are five levels of Adult Probation Officers: Entry (APO I), Journey (APO II), Supervisory/Specialist (APO III), 1<sup>st</sup> level manager (APO IV), and Regional Supervisor or 2<sup>nd</sup> level manager (APO V). The classification factors taken into account are the nature, variety, and complexity of work, the nature of supervision received, the nature of available guidelines for performance, initiative and originality, purposes and nature of person-to-person work relationships, nature and scope of consequence of error, nature and extent of supervision over others, and qualifications. All factors are taken into account and provide the basis for analyzing job classes and making comparisons. The standard practice used in internal alignment is to establish the journey level range as the benchmark for range comparison. Once the journey level range has been established, a two range difference between levels above and below journey is typical. For those job series where only a one range difference exists between levels, it has been demonstrated that there is limited difference in the work between levels. It is clear that in the APO series there are significant differences in duties, scope of responsibility, recommendations, decisions, commitments, and consequence of error at all levels to warrant the two range difference.

The APO II is the full proficiency/journey and baseline level for comparison. It is at this level where the incumbent performs the full range of probation and parole related work. Although the APO's work is a unique blend of duties which include some elements of social work, law enforcement, and providing guidance, they do not perform these functions at the same level as professional social workers, law enforcement personnel, or counselors. Further, the primary focus of the work is not social work, law enforcement, or counseling, rather the principle responsibility of the APO is offender case management and supervision. This work has not significantly changed since the last classification study was performed in 2001 when the APO I, IV, and V salary ranges were increased in recognition of the social work related elements of the job at the APO I trainee level, the statewide programmatic scope of responsibility at the APO IV level, and the regional and managerial responsibilities at the APO V level. The responsibilities and authority level for these job classes, as well as for the APO II and III, remains relatively the same today.

When analyzing the primary purpose of the work, the APO II job class most closely compares with the Juvenile Probation Officer II. Although APOs work with adult offenders and JPOs work with juvenile offenders, both job classes are responsible for performing work with a similar purpose of encouraging rehabilitation and relocation back into the community while protecting the public. Incumbents in both job classes perform similar duties such as: evaluating the risk the offender may present to the community; supervising and monitoring offenders; writing a variety of reports, including reports generated for court; developing release plans and making referrals for services and/or treatment; and enforcing the court's conditions of release. Incumbents in both

job classes also exercise legal authority for taking custody of offenders and serve as Officers of the Court. Minimum qualifications are similar for each job class in that there is a bachelor's degree requirement and specific progressive work experience. While a primary difference is that DOC sets as a condition of continued employment the requirement of all APOs to obtain basic APSC certification, other job classes such as Correctional Officers and Park Rangers also require similar specialized training. The internal alignment for these job classes as well as the APOs is based on primary responsibilities and duties, and the basic knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to perform the work, which is consistent with the concept of like pay for like work.

The APO II most closely compares with the JPO II (SR16) and remains assigned to salary range 16. By applying the standard two step difference between job classes, the Adult Probation Officers I – V are appropriately assigned to salary ranges 14, 16, 18, 20, and 22 respectively.

**Conclusions:**

The primary purpose of this study was to update all class specs, broaden out the APO IV, and review the series for appropriate internal alignment. All class specifications have been revised to more accurately reflect the work performed at each level. Job classes have been broadened out at specific levels to allow for better use, and the minimum qualifications on all levels have been revised to aid recruitment. Internal alignment analysis indicated the APO I – IV job classes were appropriately assigned to salary ranges 14, 16, 18, and 20 respectively. The APO V job class was assigned to salary range 22 to reflect the addition of responsibilities and authority level previously assigned to the APO VI, and remain consistent with the two range increment between classes. Because the APO VI job class has never been utilized and the duties assumed by the regional manager, the APO VI job class was abolished.

The position allocation analyses for study positions are being transmitted through the OPD System. The revised job classes are effective April 1, 2008.

**Attachments:**

Final class specifications

cc: Donna White, Director  
Division of Probation and Parole  
Department of Corrections

Garland Armstrong, Director  
Division of Institutions  
Department of Corrections

Kathy Matsumoto, Executive Director  
Parole Board  
Department of Corrections

Sharleen Griffin, Director  
Division of Administrative Services  
Department of Corrections

Dianne Kiesel, HR Manager II  
Management Services - Public Protection Group