

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON

WILLIAM HUNNEWELL)	
Appellant,)	CASE NO. R-ALLO-15-015
vs.)	
EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE)	ORDER OF THE BOARD
Respondent.)	FOLLOWING HEARING ON
)	EXCEPTIONS TO THE
)	DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came before the Personnel Resources Board, NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair; SUSAN MILLER, Vice Chair; and VICKY BOWDISH, Member, for a hearing on Appellant’s exceptions to the director’s determination dated June 9, 2015. The hearing was held on October 7, 2015.

Appearances. Appellant William Hunnewell was present and was represented by Jennifer Dixon of the Washington Federation of State Employees (WFSE). Respondent Everett Community College (ECC) was represented by Linda Nichols, Director of Human Resources, ECC.

Background. Appellant requested reallocation of his Media Technician Supervisor position on March 7, 2014 by submitting a Position Review Request (PRR) to ECC Human Resources (HR). In his PRR, Appellant requested reallocation to an Information Technology Specialist 3 (ITS 3) position.

By letter dated June 26, 2014, ECC notified Appellant that his position was not reallocated to ITS 3 and remained as a Media Technician Supervisor. On July 23, 2014, Appellant submitted a request to OFM State HR for a director’s review of ECC’s determination.

By letter dated June 9, 2015, the director’s designee determined that Appellant’s position should be reallocated to the Media Maintenance Technician 2 job class.

1 On July 9, 2015, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the director's determination. In his exceptions,
2 Appellant indicated the scope of his work best fits the duties of the ITS 3. Appellant's exceptions
3 are the subject of this proceeding.
4

5 Appellant works in Media Services at ECC. As summarized in the director's determination,
6 Appellant provides technical support for campus-wide media technologies in the classroom, for
7 events and for ITV. Appellant assesses technology needs, recommends appropriate systems and
8 components and consults with users to determine and analyze technology needs and problems.
9 Appellant also develops code programs for integrated media systems and installs, maintains,
10 operates and supports production software and hardware.
11

12 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.**

13 In summary, Appellant contends that the advancement of technology has changed the duties of his
14 position to primarily computer based, making his position closer to that of an IT Specialist.
15 Appellant further contends that prior to IT networks, software, applications and other technological
16 advances, media equipment was simply plugged in, a light bulb changed if needed, and other basic,
17 non-computer based tasks performed. Appellant asserts that in order to make the media equipment
18 work, he must understand how to interconnect equipment into one electronic touch screen system for
19 instructors and be able to communicate with IT staff about items such as port usage and VLANs.
20 Appellant compares his work to that of help desk support staff in that he installs and configures
21 peripheral drivers, software and plugins; and troubleshoots and resolves problems behind detailed
22 error messages on media equipment throughout the campus.
23

24 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.**

25 Respondent asserts that Appellant's work is not as complicated as they present. Respondent
26 contends that some of the Appellant's duties may overlap with IT duties, but that does not change
27 the position's best fit into the Media Maintenance Technician series. Respondent agrees with
28 Appellant's testimony that IT staff, not media staff, have network access and network access is one
29

1 example of how the two job series differ. Respondent maintains that the organizational structure of
2 the college is such that Media Services supports instruction, whereas IT support facilities and that
3 each area is part of two separate divisions.

4
5 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination should be affirmed and Appellant's position
6 should remain in the Media Maintenance Technician 2 job class.

7
8 **Relevant Classifications.** ITS 3; Media Maintenance Technician 2.

9
10 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
11 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
12 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
13 work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
14 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
15 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position.
16 See *Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University*, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

17
18 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than
19 one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position,
20 the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position
21 must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the
22 position's duties and responsibilities. See *Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries*, PRB Case No.
23 R-ALLP-07-007 (2007).

24
25 When comparing the assignments of work and the level of responsibility to the available class
26 specifications, the class series concept (if one exists) followed by definition and distinguishing
27 characteristics are primary considerations. While examples of the typical work identified in class
28 specifications do not form the basis for an allocation, they lend support to the work envisioned
29 within the classification.

1
2 As technology advances and many tasks that were once performed by technicians become
3 computerized, many functions and disciplines utilize computers to perform tasks that were once
4 performed using less computerized processes. However, this does not change the purpose or
5 nature of the work being performed. Rather, **only the tools being used and the processes**
6 **necessary to employ those tools have changed.** *Granum v. Department of Corrections, PRB*
7 *Case No. R-ALLO-15-004* (emphasis added). While some aspects of the work Appellant
8 performs appear to be described by the IT classes, the primary focus of the Appellant’s position
9 falls within the scope of the Media Maintenance Technician series.

10
11 Appellant’s duties and responsibilities meet the intent of the class series concept for the Media
12 Maintenance Technician series. Appellant “diagnoses malfunctions, maintains, repairs, installs,
13 constructs, and tests electronic media and/or multi-media equipment and systems.” He also
14 “provides media maintenance technical support.”

15
16 The Appellant’s duties and responsibilities are illustrated by the definition of the Media
17 Maintenance Technician 2 classification. Appellant “performs journey-level media maintenance
18 work troubleshooting, maintaining, repairing, installing, constructing and testing media and/or
19 multi-media equipment.”

20
21 Appellant’s duties and responsibilities meet the intent of the distinguishing characteristics of the
22 Media Maintenance Technician 2. Appellant works “under general supervision to independently
23 perform a variety of troubleshooting, repair, maintenance, construction, testing, and installation
24 activities on media equipment and systems varying from the routine test, maintenance and repair
25 of media equipment...”

26
27 The class series concept, definition and distinguishing characteristics in the Media Maintenance
28 Technician 2 class specification encompass the majority of Appellants duties and responsibilities.

29 The processes by which Appellant performs these tasks, as in *Granum v Department of*

1 *Corrections*, will continually require employment of different tools as technology advances.
2 However, that does not change the overall nature and purpose of the job, which is media services,
3 not IT infrastructure.

4
5 Therefore, we agree with the director's designee that the overall scope of Appellant's position best
6 fits the Media Maintenance Technician 2 classification.

7
8 Since classification revisions are outside the Board's jurisdiction, we strongly encourage ECC to
9 work with the Classification and Compensation staff at OFM State HR, to update the Media
10 Maintenance Technician class series to better reflect technological advances in the work
11 performed.

12
13 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof (WAC 357-52-110). Appellant
14 has failed to meet his burden of proof.

15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by William Hunnewell is
17 denied and the director's determination dated June 9, 2015, is affirmed.

18 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2015.

19 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

20
21 _____
22 NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair

23
24 _____
25 SUSAN MILLER, Vice Chair

26
27 _____
28 VICKY BOWDISH, Member