BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

VICKIE CAHILL, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-99-0031 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, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated October 21, 1999. The hearing was held on June 6, 2000, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Vickie Cahill was present and was represented by Michelle Castanedo, Area Representative for the Washington Federation of State Employees. Respondent Department of General Administration was represented by Cyndy Putsher, Human Resource Consultant.

Background. On April 6, 1999, Appellant requested reallocation of her Custodian position by submitting a classification questionnaire (CQ) to Respondent's Personnel Office. Appellant requested that her position be reallocated to the Caretaker classification. By memorandum dated April 15, 1999, Respondent denied Appellant's request for reallocation. Appellant appealed to the Department of Personnel. The Department of Personnel received Appellant's appeal on May 13, 1999. The Director's determination was issued on October 21, 1999. The Director's designee,

Mary Ann Parsons, concluded that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 5, 1999, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works in the Division of Capitol Facilities on the Capitol campus. She performs custodian duties and minor maintenance in and around the O'Brien Building, the Cherberg Building, the Insurance Building and the Institutions Building.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that the definition for the Caretaker classification encompasses positions that perform minor maintenance and custodial work in and around buildings while the definition for the Custodian classification encompasses positions that perform custodial work in buildings. Because Appellant performs some of her daily duties outside of buildings, she argues that her position is best described by the Caretaker classification. In addition, Appellant contends that the minor maintenance she performs is best described by the Caretaker classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent contends that 75 percent of Appellant's duties are custodial in nature and are best described by the Custodian classification. Respondent further contends that the maintenance duties described in Appellant's CQ are not semi-skilled duties as envisioned by the Caretaker classification. Respondent argues that the Custodian classification is intended to encompass positions that perform minor maintenance, such as those duties described in Appellant's CQ and that work inside as well as outside buildings. Respondent further argues that the work Appellant performs outside of buildings is custodial in nature.

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

Relevant Classifications. Custodian, class code 83190, and Caretaker, class code 83120.

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).

While a comparison of one position to another similar position may be useful in gaining a better understanding of the duties performed by and the level of responsibility assigned to an incumbent, allocation of a position must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to an individual position compared to the existing classifications. The allocation or misallocation of a similar position is not a determining factor in the appropriate allocation of a position. Flahaut v. Dept's of Personnel and Labor and Industries, PAB No. ALLO 96-0009 (1996).

The Caretaker classification encompasses positions that perform minor repair, maintenance, and janitorial work. The focus of the typical work is on repair and maintenance duties that require the use of plumbing, carpentry and electrical skills and knowledge. Performance of these duties requires the use of hand and power tools and equipment and includes such duties as repairing light switches and fixtures; installing electrical outlets; repairing doors, hardware, windows, gutters, tables, and cabinets; building cabinets and shelves; repairing plumbing; and repairing and maintaining electric or gas powered tools or equipment. The maintenance and repair duties listed in

Appellant's CQ do not meet the scope or level of duties anticipated by the Caretaker classification. Furthermore, the focus of her position is not the maintenance and repair of buildings. Rather, as described in her CQ, the focus of Appellant's position is the performance of custodial duties.

The Custodial classification encompasses positions that perform a variety of custodial work inside and outside of buildings. The focus of the typical work is on cleaning and maintaining facilities which requires the use of hand and power cleaning equipment and includes duties such as cleaning floors, walls, woodwork, furniture and equipment; cleaning and supplying restrooms; performing unskilled minor maintenance and repair work; performing unskilled painting; replacing light bulbs; collecting and disposing of garbage and trash; shoveling snow and cleaning sidewalks on an emergency basis; and occasionally performing yard and garden chores. The maintenance and repair duties listed in Appellant's CQ, such as oiling hinges, unplugging sewer and water lines, and painting closets and cupboards, are consistent with the scope and level of maintenance duties encompassed by the Custodian classification. Furthermore, the overall focus of her position is cleaning public access areas inside and outside of buildings which includes dusting, vacuuming, mopping, cleaning glass doors; polishing and oiling brass and marble; sweeping/blowing outside stairs, handicap ramps, porches, loading docks and parking stalls; and collecting and disposing of garbage and trash. Although Appellant cleans outside areas on a daily basis rather than on an emergency basis, her overall duties are consistent with the scope and level of custodial duties encompassed by the Custodian classification.

Position allocations are made on a best fit basis. An allocation determination must be based on the <u>overall</u> duties and responsibilities, as documented in the CQ. When viewed in totality, the level and scope of the duties and responsibilities of Appellant’s position are best described by the Custodian classification. Appellant's position is properly allocated and the determination of the Director’s designee should be affirmed.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's determination dated October 21, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination dated October 21, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member