BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

TINA KLAMPHER, Appellant, vs. CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	CASE NO. R-ALLO-11-010 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came before the Personnel Resources Board, DJ MARK, Chair, and JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair, for a telephonic hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated June 22, 2011. The hearing was held on October 5, 2011.

Appearances. Appellant Tina Klampher represented herself in this matter. Steve Sarchet, Human Resources Consultant, represented Respondent Central Washington University (CWU).

Background. Appellant's position was allocated to the Information Technology Specialist 3 classification. On September 9, 2010, Appellant's supervisor submitted a Position Description Worksheet for Appellant's position to CWU's Human Resources Office. Appellant did not sign the worksheet but later submitted a revised description of her work. Appellant indicated that her supervisor agreed that her revised description of her duties and percentages of time she performed them was accurate.

After meeting with Appellant and with her supervisor, CWU issued its allocation decision concluding that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the ITS 3. On November 22, 2010, Appellant requested a director's review of CWU's allocation determination. By letter dated June 22, 2011, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated.

On July 5, 2011, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works as an Information Technology Desktop support specialist within CWU's Information Technology's Computer Support Services Department. Her primary duties involve supervising student IT technicians and directing university-wide deployment of applications and updates to computers using the ZENworks agent. Appellant works collaboratively with another technician on various aspects of the ZEN 10 software system. She does not have sole responsibility for all aspects of the ZEN 10 software system; rather she is responsible for the ZEN desktop agent which runs on client machines for all CWU computers. This includes developing and deploying software bundles, images, and applications for remote deployment. Appellant also has responsibility for plain application deployment which involves creating the network applications to be associated with the users and creating the installer packages for the plain application installation process.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. Appellant argues that CWU and the director's designee based their decision on the position description submitted by her supervisor and that they failed to consider the revised description that she provided. Appellant asks that her position review be based on the duties and percentages as she described them.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent asserts that consideration was given to the duties and percentages described by Appellant and that consideration was also given the discussions that were held with Appellant and with her supervisor. Respondent contends that Appellant's duties and responsibilities do not rise to the level described in the Information Technology Specialist 4 (ITS4) classification. Respondent concedes that Appellant's position could fit within the first paragraph of the definition of the class, but argues that those duties are not a consequential part of her job. Respondent further argues that Appellant's duties and responsibilities do not meet the remainder of the ITS4 definition. Respondent explains that Appellant is not required to understand the customer's business, to integrate new technology, or to perform work that affects how the

University accomplishes its mission. Respondent asserts that the majority of the duties and responsibilities assigned to Appellant's position fit within the ITS3 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Information Technology Specialist 3 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Information Technology Specialist 3, class code 479K, and Information Technology Specialist 4, class code 479L.

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. 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. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

The definition for Information Technology Specialist 4 states:

> Performs analysis, system design, acquisition, installation, maintenance, programming, project management, quality assurance, troubleshooting, problem resolution, and/or consulting tasks for complex computing system, application, data access/retrieval, multi-functional databases or database management systems, telecommunication, project or operational problems.
>
> As a senior-level specialist in an assigned area of responsibility and/or as a team or project leader, applies advanced technical knowledge and considerable discretion to evaluate and resolve complex tasks such as planning and directing large-scale projects; conducting capacity planning; designing multiple-server systems; directing or facilitating the installation of complex systems, hardware, software, application interfaces, or applications; developing and implementing quality assurance testing and performance monitoring; planning, administering, and coordinating organization-wide information technology training; acting as a liaison on the development of applications; representing institution-wide computing and/or telecommunication standards and philosophy at meetings; or developing security policies and standards.

> Incumbents understand the customer's business from the perspective of a senior business person and are conversant in the customer's business language. Projects assigned to this level impact geographical groupings of offices/facilities, and/or regional, divisional, or multiple business units with multiple functions. The majority of tasks performed have wide-area impact, integrate new technology, and/or affect how the mission is accomplished.

The ITS4 classification encompasses a broad scope of duties that are assigned to positions that perform senior level duties that typically include devising methods and procedures to meet new and unique work requirements and to resolve new and unique problems for complex systems and applications with a wide area of impact.

We recognize that a portion of Appellant's duties reach some aspects of the ITS4 level. However, overall her scope of responsibility, complexity of duties, level of analysis, and level of decision-making authority does not. We agree with the director's designee that the overall level, scope and diversity of Appellant's assigned duties and responsibilities are more closely in line with the ITS 3 class.

Appellant is the University's desktop support specialist for the server based desktop management system and her assigned area of responsibility encompasses university-wide operations. However, her responsibilities for the ZENworks application are limited in scope. This limits her responsibility for performing functions at the level encompassed by the ITS4 class. Appellant's duties and the breadth and scope of her responsibilities fit within the Information Technology Specialist 3 classification.

In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has failed to meet her burden of proof.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions is denied and the director's determination dated June 22, 2011, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2011.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____

DJ MARK, Chair

_____

JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair