BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

THOMAS KOEHLER, Appellant, vs. WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	CASE NO. R-ALLO-12-005 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; JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair; and NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Member, for a hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated April 11, 2012. The hearing was held on July 18, 2012.

Appearances. Appellant Thomas Koehler was present and was represented by Desiree Desselle, with the Washington Federation of State Employees. Kendra Wilkins-Fontenot, Assistant Director for Employment Services, represented Respondent Washington State University (WSU).

Background. Appellant's position was allocated to the Locksmith classification. On December 15, 2010, he submitted a Position Review Request form (PRR) asking that his position be reallocated to the Maintenance Mechanic 2 job class. On June 14, 2011, WSU issued its allocation decision concluding that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On June 22, 2011, the Department of Personnel received Appellant's request for a director's review of WSU's allocation determination. By letter dated April 11, 2012, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Locksmith classification.

On May 8, 2012, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

In his PRR, Appellant lists his duties as follows:

35%	Install, maintain, and repair doors, locks, exit devices, door closers, and other related finish hardware.
20%	Install, maintain, and repair handicap and automatic entrances, power operated overhead doors, operable partitions, and motorized gates.
15%	Install, maintain, and repair building interiors such as drywall, patch, and paint, toilet partitions, ceiling tiles, flooring, signage, and office furniture.
15%	Maintain, repair, or replace building exteriors such as soffit/facia, hand rails ,and protective barriers, roof hatches, windows, glass, bug screens, and fencing.
15%	Cover emergencies and shop responsibilities for the WSU Locksmith Supervisor every Friday from 6 am to 4:30 pm.

Appellant indicates that, in part, his duties include responsibility "for security of the buildings, occupants, and equipment housed on the WSU campus and satalite (sic) facilities either by routine or emergency maintenance, repairs, and installation of electronic and mechanical access controls, and security devices." As described in his PRR, the majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities involve doors, including overhead doors, partitions and gates, locking and entrances devices, and emergency responses on behalf of the Locksmith Supervisor. As clarified during the hearing before the Board, Appellant's work on behalf of the Locksmith Supervisor did not include supervising staff, but rather, entailed making and issuing keys and performing tasks typically performed by the supervisor.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. Appellant argues that he performs work in a variety of skilled trades including work that involves carpentry, electrical, and sheet metal, as well as locksmith tasks. Appellant contends that because he performs multi-skilled tasks, his position best fits within the Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification. Appellant explains that the Maintenance Mechanic series includes locksmith work and at the 2 level, includes supervision which is a responsibility he performs when the Locksmith Supervisor is unavailable. Appellant further explains that he does not work in the lock shop. He works in the carpenter shop and is assigned tasks in conjunction with other maintenance mechanics. Appellant asserts that when considering the

duties and responsibilities of his position in their entirety, his position best fits within the Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent argues that the majority of Appellant's work falls within the Locksmith classification. Respondent acknowledges that Appellant performs some work outside of the Locksmith class but contends that this represents a small percentage of his overall work and does not warrant reallocation to the Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification. Respondent asserts that the majority of Appellant's work and the primary function of his position consists of maintaining, repairing, and installing manual, electrical, and computerized locks and locking systems, and installing and repairing doors, including fire doors, window hardware, and gates. Respondent explains that Appellant performs some repairs on non-locking devices but asserts that these repairs revolve around his locksmith duties. Respondent argues that Appellant does not perform a variety of skilled work in multiple trades a majority of the time as required for allocation to the Maintenance Mechanic series. Respondent contends that the Locksmith classification encompasses the majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities.

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

Relevant Classifications. Locksmith, class code 615E, and Maintenance Mechanic 2, class code 626K.

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).

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. Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007).

Additionally, when there is a class that specifically includes a particular assignment and there is a general classification that has a definition which could also apply to the position, the position should be allocated to the class that specifically includes the position. [See Mikitik v. Dept's of Wildlife and Personnel, PAB No. A88-021 (1989)].

In Wallen v. Washington State University, PRB Case R-ALLO-09-028 (2009), we further clarified the use of the general Maintenance Mechanic series. In Wallen, we stated that "[t]he Maintenance Mechanic series is a general series that encompasses positions that use multiple skills to perform work in a variety of disciplines. This series is not intended to include positions that perform work predominately in one skilled trade."

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 class series concept for the Maintenance Mechanic class series describes positions that do a variety of "general maintenance, repair, remodeling and construction duties utilizing working knowledge of several related skill fields such as electrical, plumbing, carpentry, welding,

painting and machinist work." In addition, positions in this series "inspect, repair, install and maintain physical facilities, locks and maintain and repair machinery and equipment."

In this case, Appellant's work does not require him to perform work in a variety of skilled trades a majority of the time as required for the general maintenance, repair, remodeling, and construction duties found in the Maintenance Mechanic series. Rather, the majority of his work includes duties described in the Locksmith classification.

The definition of the Locksmith class provides that incumbents function as fully qualified journey-level locksmiths and perform a variety of duties in skilled locking systems repair and installation work. While not allocating criteria, the typical work for a class describes the types of tasks typically performed by incumbents. The typical work for a Locksmith includes, in part, making and issuing keys; repairing manual, computerized, and electronic door opening and locking systems; and maintaining and repairing fire doors, door closures, and door jams. The Locksmith class encompasses locks, locking systems and repairs for all types of doors including standard entrance/exit doors, handicapped access doors, fire doors and overhead doors. As described in his PRR, a majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities align with the duties and responsibilities described in the Locksmith classification.

Consistent with Dudley, Mikitik, and Wallen, when viewing the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position in their entirety, the majority of his work is predominately in one skilled trade, specifically the locksmith trade. Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Locksmith classification.

Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof.

/ / / / /

/ / / / /

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions is denied and the director's determination dated April 11, 2012, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2012.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____
DJ MARK, Chair

_____
JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair

_____
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Member