BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

WENDY MCFADDEN, Appellant, vs. OLYMPIC COLLEGE, Respondent.	CASE NO. R-ALLO-10-002 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, LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair, and DJ MARK, Member, for a hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated December 29, 2009. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on April 7, 2010.

Appearances. Appellant Wendy McFadden was present and represented herself. Olympic College (OC) was represented by Annie Davis, Human Resources Consultant.

Background. Appellant's position was allocated to the Program Coordinator classification. On February 11, 2009, she completed a Position Review Request asking that her position be reallocated to the Program Manager B classification. The request was received by OC's Human Resource Services on February 13, 2009. By letter dated May 27, 2009, OC reallocated Appellant's position to the Program Specialist 2 classification.

On June 25, 2009, Appellant filed a request for a director's review of OC's allocation determination. By letter dated December 29, 2009, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Program Specialist 2 classification. On January 27, 2010, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works in the Veterans' Services Office within Student Financial Services at OC. Appellant reports to the Associate Dean of Student Financial Services. As stated in the position

description form, Appellant is responsible for coordinating the activities for Veterans Education. Appellant works under the guidance of Washington State and Federal Regulations and OC policies and procedures covering veterans' education benefits. She represents the Veterans' Services Office to students, potential students, members of the public, college personnel, and regulatory agencies. She is responsible for processing applications for veterans' educational benefits; advising and interpreting policies, procedures and regulations; and training and directing the work of work study and part-time staff in the office. Her duties include, in part, general office management, preparing written communications, gathering and reporting information, acting as the program liaison, overseeing a $5000 emergency fund, and overseeing the day-to-day work performed by the work study and part time staff who work in the Veteran's Services Office.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. In summary, Appellant argues that she is totally in charge of the Veterans' Services Office which she asserts is a self-contained program and has historically been recognized as such with a Program Manager as the head of the program. Appellant acknowledges that a budget analyst handles the program's budget but asserts that she prepares budget requests, advises department heads, and provides information related to budget issues such as the financial impact to the program of mandated tuition waivers at OC. Appellant further asserts that she supervises staff including hiring and firing staff as necessary. Appellant contends that she independently plans, coordinates and implements all functions of the program and that she receives no direction or supervisory guidance from her supervisor. Appellant argues that on a regular and on-going basis, her duties and responsibility extend far beyond that of a Program Specialist 2 and are congruent with the distinguishing characteristics of the Program Manager B classification.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent acknowledges that Appellant is a valued and respected employee whose services are appreciated. Nonetheless, Respondent argues that the director's designee was correct in her assessment of Appellant's position and determination that her position is correctly allocated to the Program Specialist 2 classification. Respondent asserts that Appellant's supervisor retains authority and responsibility for development of the program's budget, setting program goals and expectations, and approving program expenditures and budget

requisitions. Respondent contends that Appellant does not develop policies and procedures for the Veterans' Services but rather implements the rules, regulations and policies mandated by the Washington State and Federal Regulations governing veterans' education benefits. Respondent asserts that Appellant does not have total control of the program, that she does not perform the scope or level of duties described in the Program Manager B classification, and that veterans' services is not considered an essential management service as described in the Program Manager B classification. Therefore, Respondent contends that Appellant's position does not fit within the definition of the Program Manager B classification but best fits within the Program Specialist 2 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Program Specialist 2 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Program Specialist 2, class code 107I; Program Manager B, class code 107S.

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 following standards, in descending order, are the primary considerations in allocating positions:

- Class series concept (if one exists).
- Definition or basic function of the class.
- Distinguishing characteristics of a class.

- Class series concept, definition/basic function, and distinguishing characteristics of other classes in the series in question.

The Program Manager classifications do not contain a class series concept. Therefore, the definition becomes the first consideration in allocating positions to these classes. Both the Program Manager A and B classifications contain the identical definition. The definition provides that positions allocated these classes "[s]upervise a division of a major administrative department, operating unit or program undertaking relieving the senior official of operating and administrative detail. Plan, coordinate and implement all functions required by the activity."

Appellant's position does not fit within this definition. Appellant works with minimal supervision. However, she does not have the authority to make the level of decisions anticipated in the Program Manager B classification. For example, she provides input into activities such as budget development, but she does not develop the budget. She oversees a $5000 emergency "fund" for students, but she does not have expenditure authority for the program budget in its entirety. And, she works in coordination with her supervisor to set program goals and expectations for the program that are consistent with the rules and regulations set by outside entities. Appellant does not have authority to independently hire employees. Appellant cannot issue discipline.

The Program Manager distinguishing characteristics provide further clarification. At the Program Manager A level, incumbents are typically first-line supervisors and they have total responsibility for a program. As stated above, Appellant's position does not have total responsibility for the veterans' services program. At the Program Manager B level, incumbents are typically second- or third-line supervisors and have responsibility for total control of a program. Appellant does not supervise other supervisors and she does not have responsibility for total control of the veterans' services program. Appellant's position does not fit with the Program Manager classifications.

In addition, the Department of Personnel Glossary of Classification, Compensation, and Management terms provides that program management duties involve authority over:

- Developing program goals and objectives.

- Developing timetables and work plans to achieve program goals and objectives.
- Developing program policies and procedures.
- Preparing program budgets, adjusting allotments and authorizing expenditures.
- Controlling allocation of program resources.
- Setting and adjusting program priorities.
- Evaluating program effectiveness.

Appellant does not have authority over the breadth of duties typically performed by positions that manage programs.

The Board has thoroughly reviewed the record in this case, including Appellant's exhibits, and considered the arguments of the parties. Based on a totality of evidence, we find that Appellant's overall duties and level of responsibility, including her responsibility for directing and supervising the work of lower level staff, best fit within the scope, intent and level of authority found in the Program Specialist 2 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 by Wendy McFadden is denied and the director's determination dated December 29, 2009, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2010.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____

LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair

_____

DJ MARK, Member