BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT ELIAS, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SERVICES, Respondent.	)	Case No. ALLO-00-0017 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 GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated May 1, 2000. The hearing was held on September 8, 2000, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. LEANA D. LAMB, Member, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Robert Elias represented himself *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services (DIS) was represented by Brad Conley, Human Resource Consultant.

Background. As a result of a class study, the Washington State Personnel Resources Board adopted revisions to the information technology classes and Appellant's Computer Information System Specialist (CISS) 2 position was reallocated to Information Technology Applications Specialist (ITAS) 5 classification. Shalice Ando, Human Resource Manager, informed Appellant of his reallocation by letter dated July 8, 1999

By letter dated July 20, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel (DOP). In his letter of appeal, Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the Information Technology Systems/Application Specialist (ITS/AS) 6 classification.

On December 2, 1999, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position and by letter dated May 1, 2000, determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification. On May 25, 2000, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Subsequent to filing his appeal, Appellant retired from his position.

Appellant worked for DIS for 14 years. He was responsible for the Accounts Payable (AP) imaging system. His duties included coordination, enhancement and maintenance of the AP imaging system. He ensured that the system ran correctly, made enhancements to the system and worked with vendors and internal customers.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues his duties at DIS continually increased in technical complexity and importance to the agency, his performance evaluations reflected that his performance was above average, and in his classification questionnaire (CQ), he was designated the department's highest level specialist. Appellant asserts that his duties and responsibilities had not changed. Therefore, when he completed his CQ for the class study, he included the designation language as in the past, but his supervisor directed him to remove that language from his CQ. Appellant asserts that the agency failed to apply consistent criteria when allocating positions from the CISS 2 classification to the ITS/AS 6 classification. Appellant further asserts that his supervisor

based his decision to allocate Appellant's position to the ITAS 5 classification on his personal bias toward Appellant rather than on the duties he performed.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent acknowledges that Appellant's past CQs have stated that he served as the department's highest level specialist. Respondent also acknowledges that Appellant's assigned duties and responsibilities have not changed. However, Respondent asserts that an allocation is based on the duties and responsibilities described in the CQ and that in this case, Appellant was not designated in writing as a specialist in his area of knowledge, he did not interact with executive management, did not serve as the agency spokesperson for his area of technical expertise and did not make commitments on behalf of the agency. Therefore, Respondent contends that on a best fit basis, Appellant's position should have been allocated to the ITAS 5 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Information Technology Applications Specialist 5, class code 03295, and Information Technology Systems/Applications Specialist 5, class code 03286.

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).

At the ITS/AS 6 level, incumbents are designated in writing as the highest level authority in an information technology specialty area, they serve as the agency spokesperson in their area of technical expertise and serve as a technical mentor, coach and trainer to others.

Appellant's CQ does not state that he was the highest-level authority for his area nor had he been given any other document designating him as the highest level authority for the Accounts Payable imaging system. Furthermore, his CQ does not indicate that he performed duties at the 6 level. For example, his CQ does not include duties that could be interpreted as acting as the agency spokesperson for the AP imaging system or serving as a mentor, coach or trainer to others. Therefore, Appellant's position was not described by the ITS/AS 6 classification

At the ITAS 5 level, incumbents are professional, technical specialists whose positions focus on and are responsible for agency-level, large-scale applications, projects or databases that have high risk and impact. Incumbents at this level utilize broad technical knowledge in analyzing, consulting, designing, programming, maintaining, or supporting major applications, support products, projects, databases or database management systems.

In the area of the AP imaging system, Appellant performed the duties and responsibilities of a professional, technical specialist. His CQ lists his duties as coordinating projects, including the development, construction, testing and implementation of systems, troubleshooting program modifications, managing and monitoring contracts, and preparing reports. These duties are encompassed in the level of work described in the distinguishing characteristics of the ITAS 5 classification. Therefore, Appellant's position was properly classified.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's determination dated May 1, 2000, 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 May 1, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair