BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

WILLIAM MCKINNEY, Appellant, v. UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-01-0018 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated May 24, 2001. The hearing was held on October 26, 2001, at the South Campus Center at the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant William McKinney appeared *pro se*. Amy Hawkins, Human Resource Consultant, represented Respondent University of Washington.

Background. Appellant submitted a Position Questionnaire (PQ) requesting that his position as a Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A be reallocated to the class of Maintenance and Construction Coordinator B or Maintenance Supervisor II. Amy Hawkins conducted a classification review and by memo dated February 7, 2001, Ms. Hawkins concluded that Appellant's position was correctly allocated to the class of Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A. By letter dated March 6, 2001, Appellant appealed this determination to the director

of the Department of Personnel. On April 17, 2001, Tammy Tee, Human Resource Consultant, conducted a telephone interview and by memo dated May 24, 2001, informed Appellant that his position was properly allocated. On June 22, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the determination of the Department of Personnel.

Appellant works for the University of Washington's Physical Plant Department in the Northeast Zone. Appellant coordinates various maintenance and construction projects in the NE Zone. He is not directly responsible for staff involved in the projects, and he does not have authority over the work they perform. The NE Zone Manager is responsible for supervising Appellant.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant takes exception to the director's determination that he does not perform supervisory activities. Appellant also objects to the Department of Personnel's position review process, specifically the telephone verification interview and the designee's refusal to conduct an in-person review. Appellant asserts that the designee also erred when she failed to take into consideration the "inferred" responsibility and accountability placed in him with his assigned projects. Appellant asserts that on a few occasions, he leave slips in the absence of the supervisor and he asserts that while he has no staff assigned under him, they are indirectly reporting to him on a day-to-day basis and throughout the day. Appellant asserts that he is accountable and responsible for estimating maintenance work for both labor and material costs, ensuring that clients are notified of progress of work and when work schedules cannot be met by the Physical Plant. Appellant contends that he is responsible for ensuring that maintenance tasks are completed within the time estimated for their completion and that the quality of the workmanship meets approval. Appellant contends that these duties include supervisory activities and coordination of work for four lead persons and their crews. Appellant asserts that he assigns work orders/requisitions and schedules large projects and utility shut downs. Appellant contends that when the Zone Manager is not present, he takes on higher-level duties and that other staff look to

him for direction. Appellant asserts that this level of responsibility meets the definition of a supervisor and that while he does not hire, fire, discipline or approve leave requests, these duties are a small percentage of the overall time of a supervisor. Appellant contends that while he does not have explicit authority to supervise, this authority is implied. Appellant asserts that he could perform better if he had authority to make sure the work was being done properly and with accountability.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent asserts Appellant does not interview, hire, evaluate or discipline employees as defined by WAC 251-01-395. Respondent asserts that while Appellant coordinates projects with the Maintenance Supervisor II's, he is not the direct supervisor of any employees. Respondent argues that Appellant assists and coordinates functions with leads and serves as an assistant to the Zone Manager. Respondent argues that Appellant's duties of providing direction, advising and coordinating with other divisions to ensure timely and accurate project completions are consistent with the Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A position. Respondent argues that Appellant's position is appropriately allocated to the Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A and B, class codes 5211 and 5212, and Maintenance Supervisor II, class code 5209.

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 that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Appellant takes exception to the position review process employed by the Department of Personnel (DOP). Our purpose is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position, not to determine what process the Director's designee should use when conducting an allocation. Isom v. Dept's of Employment Security, PAB No. ALLO-97-0017 (1997).

The definition of a Maintenance Supervisor II indicates that the incumbent supervises maintenance and operation work on campus buildings, grounds, equipment and other facilities. WAC 251-01-395 defines a supervisor as follows:

> Any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, layoff, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them or adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action if the connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not merely routine or clerical in nature, but requires the use of independent judgment.

Appellant does not dispute that he is not assigned any of the above responsibilities. Allocation to a supervisory classification requires that work performed by incumbent not only meet the definition and distinguishing characteristics of the supervisory classification, but also that the incumbent perform the duties of a "supervisor" as found in WAC 251-01-395. Appellant lacks the accountability or delegated authority for all aspects of supervisory decisions; therefore, his position cannot be reallocated to the Maintenance Supervisor II classification.

The specification for the classes of Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A and B defines these positions as follows:

> Assist in coordination and direction of total physical plant construction and maintenance activities of a large institution.

The duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position are consistent with the definition of this class series, because he assists in the coordination and direction of total physical plant construction and maintenance activities at the University of Washington, a large institution. Appellant works closely with most University departments and divisions on large maintenance projects.

The Distinguishing Characteristics of the Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A and B specification are described as follows:

> This class encompasses positions that coordinate physical plant maintenances and construction activities and involves close liaison with various physical plant organizational divisions and university departments.
>
> Positions at the "B" level supervise and coordinate Maintenance Supervisor II's, or equivalent; AND serve as an immediate assistant to a Maintenance Superintendent or equivalent level.

Appellant clearly coordinates physical plant maintenance and construction activities and he works closely with various physical plant organizational divisions and departments. However, Appellant does not supervise and coordinate Maintenance Supervisor II's. Furthermore, Appellant does not serve as an immediate assistant to a Maintenance Superintendent.

Appellant has failed to prove that his work meets the definition and distinguishing characteristics of Maintenance Supervisor II. Furthermore, Appellant has failed to prove that his work meets the

distinguishing characteristics necessary for reallocation to the class of the Maintenance and Construction Coordinator B.

The record supports that the totality of Appellant's duties meet the definition and distinguishing characteristics of the Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A classification. Furthermore, the duties performed by Appellant are encompassed in the typical work of a Maintenance and Construction Coordinator A. Appellant writes and schedules work orders. Appellant oversees maintenance and alteration shop supervisors on site inspections, in producing estimates, and in performing scheduled construction work. Appellant oversees maintenance projects for safety considerations, identifies safety hazards, and enforces safety rules and regulations.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's determination dated May 24, 2001, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of William McKinney is denied, and the attached Director's determination, dated May 24, 2001, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member