BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LORI WALLACHY, Appellant, vs. WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	CASE NO. R-ALLO-12-001 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 hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated January 13, 2012. The hearing was held on March 14, 2012.

Appearances. Appellant Lori Wallachy was present and was represented by Jason MacKay, Staff Attorney for the Public School Employees of Washington. Merlinda Sain, Human Resource Generalist, represented Respondent Washington State University-Vancouver (WSU).

Background. Appellant's position was allocated to the Information Technology Specialist 2 (ITS2) classification. On April 27, 2011, Appellant submitted a Position Questionnaire to WSU's Vancouver HR office asking that her position be reallocated to the Information Technology Specialist 3 (ITS3) classification. On July 25, 2011, WSU issued its allocation decision concluding that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the ITS2 classification. On August 23, 2011, Appellant requested a director's review of WSU's allocation determination. By letter dated January 13, 2012, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated.

On January 24, 2012, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

As stated by the director's designee, Appellant:

> [P]rovides telecommunications network operations support for WSU Vancouver. Her position is located within the WSU Vancouver Information Technology (VIT) department. [Appellant's] duties include performing IT network operations installation, monitoring, maintenance and troubleshooting functions. Her position provides telecommunications support to the University's Cisco Ethernet and wireless systems. She monitors and maintains the wireless access points across campus. [Appellant] provides support to the Cisco Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) system. She pre-configures and establishes phone settings prior to installation. [Appellant] performs maintenance and warranty replacement functions. She also maintains the campus print server manager.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. Appellant argues that during the time period covered by this review, she spent a majority of her time performing ITS3 level duties. She asserts that she worked independently and regularly performed lead duties, planned and organized work, used discretion in decision making, handled many complex problems, and performed the duties and responsibilities of a systems administrator. Appellant further asserts that she is unaware of any established procedures for accomplishing her work. Appellant contends that she worked on large to moderate sized projects and that she had the authority to make changes to projects. Appellant further contends that the projects impacted large groups of people. Additionally, Appellant asks the Board to give significant weight to the declaration of Ryan Parker an ITS4 who worked with Appellant during the timeframe covered by the review rather than to the position of her supervisor. Appellant asserts that her supervisor was not aware of the work she performed on a day-to-day basis while Mr. Parker was.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent acknowledges that at the time of the review, parts of Appellant's position fell into the ITS3 level but asserts that the majority of her tasks were within the ITS2 class. Respondent argues that Appellant's project duties and the duties she performed in support of systems administration did not reach the level found in the ITS3 class. Respondent argues, for example, that Appellant provided customer support to assure users were connected to the appropriate network but she did not perform core configuration functions for the network. Respondent describes Appellant's duties and responsibilities as providing project and daily support and explains that she was responsible for a portion of projects but not for the projects as a whole. Respondent further explains that while Appellant could set her own schedule, prioritize

daily task, and make decisions about completing her work tasks, she needed approval for deviation from project or work plans. Respondent also explains that Appellant followed established work procedures and that any variance needed approval. In regard to the weight the Board should place on the declaration of Ryan Parker, Respondent states that most likely Mr. Parker was not familiar with the terms, definitions, and criteria used to allocate positions within the state's classification system. Therefore, Respondent asks the Board to consider Appellant's supervisor's input regarding the scope of Appellant's duties and responsibilities rather than Mr. Parker's statement.

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

Relevant Classifications. Information Technology Specialist 2, class code 479J, and Information Technology Specialist 3, class code 479K.

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).

Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the position's duties and responsibilities. See Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

During the hearing, the opinion of ITS4 Ryan Parker was discussed. During the timeframe covered by the position review, Mr. Parker worked with Appellant but he was not her supervisor. While the opinion of other staff is not an allocating criterion, the opinion of Appellant's supervisor should be given appropriate weight. Emerson v. Dept. of Transportation, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-09-010 (2009).

During the timeframe covered by the position review, Michelle Eccles, Information Systems Coordinator, was Appellant's supervisor. During the review process, Ms. Eccles clarified that Appellant was not a system administrator but rather, played a monitoring/managing type of role. She also indicated that complex problems were referred to a higher level and that changes or corrections impacting more than one system or with a large or campus-wide impact required supervisory approval.

The definition for Information Technology Specialist 3 states:

> In support of information systems and users in an assigned area of responsibility, independently performs consulting, designing, programming, installation, maintenance, quality assurance, troubleshooting and/or technical support for applications, hardware and software products, databases, database management systems, support products, network infrastructure equipment, or telecommunications infrastructure, software or hardware.
>
> Uses established work procedures and innovative approaches to complete assignments and coordinate projects such as conducting needs assessments; leading projects; creating installation plans; analyzing and correcting network malfunctions; serving as system administrator; monitoring or enhancing operating environments; or supporting, maintaining and enhancing existing applications.
>
> The majority of assignments and projects are moderate in size and impact an agency division or large workgroup or single business function; or internal or satellite operations, multiple users, or more than one group. Consults with higher-level technical staff to resolve complex problems.

During the hearing before the Board, WSU agreed that Appellant's duties and responsibilities for the print server project fit within the ITS3 classification. This project had campus-wide impact to every user on campus but it represented only 15% of Appellant's overall duties and responsibilities. In addition, we find that a portion of Appellant's responsibilities for the wireless project fit some aspects of the ITS3 level. However, in totality, the wireless project represented only 18% of her

duties and responsibilities. These projects did not embody a majority of Appellant's overall duties and responsibilities. The WSU-Vancouver campus as a whole is a large workgroup. Some of Appellant's work had campus-wide impact but the majority of her duties impacted single users or individual work units and did not have the scope of impact anticipated at the ITS3 level. Further, the majority of Appellant's duties did not require innovative approaches to complete the assignments.

The majority of Appellant's work, scope of responsibility, complexity of duties, and decision-making authority did not rise to the level of duties and responsibilities encompassed by the ITS3 class. We agree with the director's designee that the majority and overall scope of Appellant's assigned duties and responsibilities best fit within the ITS2 class.

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 January 13, 2012, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2012.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____
DJ MARK, Chair

_____
JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair