BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

MARK S. FAY, Appellant, v. EDMONDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-03-0008 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; GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair; and BUSSE NUTLEY, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated January 22, 2003. The hearing was held on September 24, 2003, at the University of Washington, South Campus Center, Seattle, Washington.

Appearances. Appellant Mark Fay was present and was represented by Luis Moscoso of the Washington Public Employees Association. Respondent Edmonds Community College was represented by Kay Beem, Human Resource Representative and Victor Portolese, Management and Information Services Manager.

Background. As the result of a class study encompassing the Information Technology classes, the Washington State Personnel Resources Board adopted a new class series of Information

Technology Systems Specialist 1 – 5. Kay Beem, Human Resources Consultant, conducted a review of the work Appellant performed as of January 1, 2002. Ms. Beem concluded that Appellant should be allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist I level effective January 1, 2002.

Appellant filed a request for review to the Director of the Department of Personnel. Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist II classification.

On January 3, 2003, Joe Gross, Human Resource Consultant for the Department of Personnel, conducted a telephone verification interview. On January 30, 2003, the Department of Personnel issued a determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist I classification.

On February 21, 2003, Appellant filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board to the determination of the Department of Personnel.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant disagrees with the determination that his position is properly allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist I classification. Appellant argues that he independently provides support and maintenance for many of the crucial servers on campus during the morning hours when he was the only information technology staff on duty. Appellant argues that his work impacted the entire campus if any of the key servers were down. Appellant asserts that he was responsible for analyzing customer service needs and solving standard customer service, equipment and technical problems on computers. Appellant asserts that the work service requests he received were far from routine and included troubleshooting of network cards, routers, printers, as well as hardware troubleshooting and replacement. Appellant contends that he

also performed troubleshooting and resolved issues with databases, and performed testing of critical server software. Appellant argues that the complexity of his job met or exceeded the Information Technology Systems Specialist II level.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellant's duties are at the Information Technology Systems Specialist I level because he performs routine troubleshooting, installation and reinstallation of software and images and configuring hardware and software. Respondent asserts that the majority of Appellant's duties are related to routine tasks and maintenance and fall within the scope of the Information Technology Systems Specialist I job classification. Respondent argues that Appellant worked on lower-level tasks, but on a few occasions took it upon himself to build computers and reinstall operating systems. Respondent contends that Appellant did not perform any higher-level duties for a long enough period of time to warrant reallocation.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist I classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Information Technology Systems Specialist I, class code 2405; Information Technology Systems Specialist II, class code 2406.

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 works for Management Information Systems. His supervisor, Victor Portolese, is the Management Information Services Manager. Appellant's position supports workstation and server hardware and software applications and operations for faculty and staff throughout the campus of Edmonds Community College. Thirty-five percent of Appellant's work time is spent supporting and installing software on staff or faculty computers for operating systems and software; backing up and restoring data on workstations and ensuring network backups run correctly; making Ghost Images and updating workstations and browsers with patches and services packs and running anti-virus software on workstations.

Appellant works independently, and when he receives service requests, he identifies the problem and finds the correct resolution. Appellant spends 20 percent of his time on "special long-term projects" which include portal testing and troubleshooting, kiosk support, developing a Visual Basic Interface for an Accuplacer database, moving applications to new servers and converting users to the new server.

The basic function of the ITSS I classification is to perform "routine information technology systems specialist work, such as troubleshooting, testing, installing, maintaining and/or supporting client applications, hardware and software products, infrastructure equipment or telecommunications software or hardware." The technical work is considered "routine" and performed under general supervision. The duties of Appellant's position fit within this classification; however, Appellant has met the burden of showing that the scope of his responsibilities and his level of independence go beyond the ITSS I classification.

Positions allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist (ITSS) II classification perform recurring duties and responsibilities in analyzing customer needs, installing equipment and software, resolving day-to-day problems, and providing user training. ITSS IIs operate within guidelines to perform standard computer support services. ITSS IIs have a limited scope of responsibility, have limited authority for making decisions, and refer complex problems to higher levels.

After reviewing the duties and responsibilities described in Appellant's position questionnaire, we conclude that Appellant should be allocated to Information Technology Systems Specialist II classification. The duties of Appellant's position fit within this classification because the majority of his duties reflect standard systems specialist work such as responding to, troubleshooting and resolving user problems with computers throughout the college campus; backing up and restoring data on workstations; moving applications and converting users to new servers; and maintaining backups and running anti-virus software on workstations and ensuring they run correctly on the network. Appellant works independently under the general direction of his supervisor.

Appellant has met his burden of proving that his position meets the level of responsibility that is required at the Information Technology Systems Specialist II level.

Conclusion. Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be granted and Appellant's position should be allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist II classification.

///

///

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Mark Fay is granted, the Director's determination is reversed, and Appellant's position is allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist II classification.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2003.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

_____
Busse Nutley, Member