BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LINDA LEE, Appellant, v. COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF SPOKANE, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-00-0036 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this matter came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated July 26, 2000. The hearing was held on August 7, 2001, in Room 100 of the Airport Ramada Inn in Spokane, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, reviewed the record, including the file, exhibits, and the recorded proceedings, and participated in the decision in this matter. LEANA D. LAMB, Member, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Linda Lee was present and was represented by Desiree Desselle, Area Representative for the Washington Federation of State Employees. John Boesenberg, Director of Human Resources for the Washington State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, represented Respondent Community Colleges of Spokane (CCS).

Background. On July 28, 1999, Appellant requested an allocation review of her Program Coordinator position. Respondent forwarded the request to John Boesenberg for review. By memorandum dated September 20, 1999, Mr. Boesenberg informed Linda McDermott, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources at CCS, that Appellant's position was properly allocated. By

letter dated September 28, 1999, Ms. McDermott notified Appellant of the decision. On September 30, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel.

The Director's designee, Tammy Tee, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated July 26, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On August 23, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works in the Publications and Graphics Department at CCS's District Office. She is responsible for maintaining the look, feel and content of the District Office's internet and intranet web sites. In summary, Appellant's duties include:

- Consulting with and providing support to clients in regard to what software and format they should use for web page information;
- Providing input on the design of the web sites and layout of information;
- Editing for format, errors and information flow;
- Recommending software and hardware upgrades; and
- Updating quarterly information on the web sites.

CCS has several campus locations that each maintains their own internet and intranet sites. The employees responsible for this function at the campus locations are classified in the computer field.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant contends that she does not work for a program, perform clerical work, manage a budget, work under program policies, or have contact with the public. Therefore, she asserts that her position does not fit the Program Coordinator classification. Appellant argues that she is responsible for creating the look and feel of the web page, which requires her to be responsible for the architecture of the web site. She asserts that the specific expertise and training she uses is more consistent with the computer classifications. Appellant contends that she works under administrative direction, utilizes standards for computer, and

manages a stand-alone function with no distinct policies or procedures. Therefore, she asserts that her position is best described by the Computer Services Consultant II classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent contends that Appellant is not an applications specialist within an information services organization and that she does not work within a complex heterogeneous computing environment as required for allocation to the Computer Services Consultant class series. Respondent argues that Appellant's position best fits the Program Coordinator classification because she works under general direction performing discrete tasks that are unique to maintaining the web site. Respondent contends that Appellant reports to the publications/graphics/marketing manager and that the primary focus of her position is posting documents on the web page and advising clients on the best way to format information for placement on the web page. Respondent argues that Appellant is not responsible for the content of the information posted on the web page, but rather, ensures that the information posted on the web page is consistent with the look and feel of the web page.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Program Coordinator classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Program Coordinator, class code 2256; and Computer Services Consultant II, class code 2345.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular

position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

The class series concept for the computer services consultant class series states:

> Serves as an applications specialist within an information services organization operating in a complex heterogeneous computing environment. Provides application support services to multiple institutions/departments/units. Application support services include defining computing needs, writing user documentation, preparing and conducting training programs, providing project control, and planning for and delivery of computing applications and technologies.
>
> This series differs from other computer related series in that the primary function is to work directly with clients in defining application needs, designing system specifications, and applying various types of information systems to meet client/user needs. Positions in this series work independently or as a team member, and/or direct the work of systems analyst/programmers and/or other technical staff.
>
> This series does not provide the technical design or programming functions necessary for complete system development and implementation AND does not perform hardware repair and maintenance as a primary duty.

An information services organization is a department that manages computing and application development and provides support services to clients and users. Appellant does not work for an information services organization; rather, she works for the Publications and Graphics Department. A complex heterogeneous computing environment consists of multiple yet differing operating systems, hardware technologies and software systems connected by a network and serving a large, diverse user base. Appellant's responsibility for maintaining the web site and assisting a variety of units/departments of the district office does not encompass the breadth of systems or technologies inherent in the computer services consultant classes. Furthermore, the primary focus of Appellant's position is not defining application needs, designing system specifications, and applying various types of information systems to meet client/user needs. Appellant's duties and responsibilities are

not described by the class series concept for the computer services consultant class series; therefore, her position should not be allocated to this series.

The class series concept for the program class series states:

> Perform work requiring knowledge and experience that is specific to a program. Organize and perform work related to program operations independent of the daily administrative office needs of the supervisor. Represent the program to clients, participants and/or members of the public.
>
> A program is a specialized area with specific complex components and discrete tasks which distinguish it from the main body of an organization. A program is specific to a particular subject. The specialized tasks involve interpretation of policies, procedures and regulations, budget coordination/administration, independent functioning and typically, public contact. Duties are not of a general support nature transferable from one program to another. Performance of clerical duties is in support of incumbent's performance of specialized tasks.

A program is specific to a particular subject and has components and tasks that distinguish it from other programs or the main body of an organization. Appellant performs work that is specific to the web site. She interprets standards for computing, functions independently, and represents the web site to clients and to members of the public. Appellant's duties are not transferable from the web site to another program and her clerical duties are in support of the web page. Of the currently available classifications, Appellant's position best fits within the program class series.

Appellant works with little supervision, she plans and organizes her own work and determines the best methods to employ to maintain the web site and assist clients. Appellant's position fits the Program Coordinator description in that she coordinates the operation of the web page program. Furthermore, in relevant part, positions at the Program Coordinator level work under general direction, use knowledge and experience specific to the program, exercise independent judgment, advise staff and clients regarding the program and suggest alternative courses of action, and have extensive involvement with staff in carrying out program activities and determining consistency

with program goals. The Program Coordinator classification describes Appellant's level of independence, involvement with other staff and use of knowledge and experience specific to the web site. Appellant's position is best described by the Program Coordinator classification.

Conclusion. Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Program Coordinator classification and her appeal should be denied. The determination of the Director, dated July 26, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Linda Lee is denied and the determination of the Director, dated July 26, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair