

1 **BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD**  
2 **STATE OF WASHINGTON**

3 JEFF GANDER )  
4 Appellant, ) CASE NO. R-ALLO-16-010  
5 vs. )  
6 COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF SPOKANE ) ORDER OF THE BOARD  
7 Respondent ) FOLLOWING HEARING ON  
8 ) EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
9 ) DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

10 **Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came before the Personnel Resources Board, NANCY  
11 HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair, and SUSAN MILLER, Vice-Chair. The hearing was held on October  
12 5, 2016, in room 301 of the Raad Building, 128 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW.

13 **Appearances.** Appellant Jeff Gander was present by telephone and represented by Shannea  
14 Patterson of the Washington Federation of State Employees (WFSE), who was present at the  
15 hearing. Respondent Community Colleges of Spokane (CCS) was present by telephone and  
16 represented by Michael Lenker, Human Resource (HR) Consultant, CCS.

17 **Background.** On April 10, 2015, Appellant submitted a Position Review Request (PRR) to CCS's  
18 HR Office requesting reallocation from an IT Specialist 3 (ITS 3) to an ITS 4. By letter dated  
19 December 1, 2015, CCS HR notified Appellant his position was being reallocated from an ITS 2 to  
20 an ITS 3.  
21

22  
23 On December 21, 2015, OFM State HR received a request for a director's review. By letter dated  
24 May 31, 2016, the director's designee notified Appellant his position was properly allocated to ITS  
25 3.  
26  
27  
28  
29

1 On June 30, 2016, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the director's determination. In his  
2 exceptions, Appellant indicated the duties and responsibilities of his position best fit the ITS 4  
3 job class.

4  
5 As summarized in the director's review, Appellant is assigned to the CCS Office of Information  
6 Technology's centralized Customer Support Services Department. Appellant is the sole onsite IT  
7 support person for the education labs at Airway Height Correction Center (AHCC). His duties  
8 during the period of review include updating and reconfiguring servers from older versions to  
9 Windows 2012; and serving as the only onsite staff member to perform technical troubleshooting  
10 and repairs of all CCS computer equipment at the facility.

11  
12 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant disagrees with the director's designee and  
13 believes his position should be reallocated to ITS 4. Appellant asserts that as the sole IT support  
14 person at AHCC, the complexity of his duties and required technical ability rise to the level of an  
15 ITS 4. Appellant contends since the work must be done absent the internet, he must devise his own  
16 procedures, further adding to the complexity of the work. Appellant maintains his supervisor, Ben  
17 Sharp, ITS 4, gives him the freedom to devise methods and resolve problems.

18  
19 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent agrees with the director's designee that the  
20 duties of Appellant's position fit the ITS 3 job class specification. Respondent contends that  
21 consistent with the ITS 3 definition, Appellant's responsibilities are moderate in size (200-500  
22 students) and impact a satellite operation, not multiple business units as the ITS 4 definition states.  
23 Respondent further contends the size and scope of the education lab is small compared to some  
24 academic areas, such as Arts and Sciences, which requires service for approximately 2700 students.

25  
26 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination should be affirmed, and Appellant's position  
27 should remain as ITS 3.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** ITS 3; ITS 4.

2  
3 **Definition of ITS 3**

4 In support of information systems and users in an assigned area of responsibility,  
5 independently performs consulting, designing, programming, installation,  
6 maintenance, quality assurance, troubleshooting and/or technical support for  
7 applications, hardware and software products, databases, database management  
8 systems, support products, network infrastructure equipment, or  
9 telecommunications infrastructure, software or hardware.

10 Uses established work procedures and innovative approaches to complete  
11 assignments and coordinate projects such as conducting needs assessments;  
12 leading projects; creating installation plans; analyzing and correcting network  
13 malfunctions; serving as system administrator; monitoring or enhancing operating  
14 environments; or supporting, maintaining and enhancing existing applications.

15  
16 The majority of assignments and projects are moderate in size and impact an  
17 agency division or large workgroup or single business function; or internal or  
18 satellite operations, multiple users, or more than one group. Consults with higher-  
19 level technical staff to resolve complex problems.

20  
21 **There are no distinguishing characteristics for the ITS 3.**

22  
23 **Definition of ITS 4:**

24 Performs analysis, system design, acquisition, installation, maintenance,  
25 programming, project management, quality assurance, troubleshooting, problem  
26 resolution, and/or consulting tasks for complex computing system, application,  
27 data access/retrieval, multi-functional databases or database management systems,  
28 telecommunication, project or operational problems.

1 As a senior-level specialist in an assigned area of responsibility and/or as a team  
2 or project leader, applies advanced technical knowledge and considerable  
3 discretion to evaluate and resolve complex tasks such as planning and directing  
4 large-scale projects; conducting capacity planning; designing multiple-server  
5 systems; directing or facilitating the installation of complex systems, hardware,  
6 software, application interfaces, or applications; developing and implementing  
7 quality assurance testing and performance monitoring; planning, administering,  
8 and coordinating organization-wide information technology training; acting as a  
9 liaison on the development of applications; representing institution-wide  
10 computing and/or telecommunication standards and philosophy at meetings; or  
11 developing security policies and standards.

12  
13 Incumbents understand the customer's business from the perspective of a senior  
14 business person and are conversant in the customer's business language. Projects  
15 assigned to this level impact geographical groupings of offices/facilities, and/or  
16 regional, divisional, or multiple business units with multiple functions. The  
17 majority of tasks performed have wide-area impact, integrate new technology,  
18 and/or affect how the mission is accomplished.

19  
20 **There are no distinguishing characteristics for the ITS 4.**

21  
22 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which  
23 classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A  
24 position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an  
25 evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. A position review is a  
26 comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available  
27 classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class that best  
28  
29

1 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See *Liddle-Stamper v.*  
2 *Washington State University*, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

3 Allocating criteria consists of the class specification's class series concept (if one exists),  
4 the definition and the distinguishing characteristics. Typical work is not an allocating  
5 criterion, but may be used to better understand the definition or distinguishing  
6 characteristics.

7  
8 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in  
9 more than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification  
10 for a specific position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered  
11 in their entirety and the position must be allocated to the classification that provides **the**  
12 **best fit overall for the majority of the position's duties and responsibilities.** *Dudley*  
13 *v. Dept. of Labor and Industries*, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-007 (2007) (emphasis  
14 added).

15  
16 The Board carefully reviewed the documentation submitted during the director's review  
17 and considered the arguments presented by the parties at the hearing before the Board.

18  
19 The ITS 4 definition stipulates incumbents are senior level specialists. **According to the**  
20 ***Glossary of Classification Terms*, "senior" is defined as follows:**

21  
22 The performance of work requiring the consistent application of advanced  
23 knowledge and requiring a skilled and experienced practitioner to function  
24 independently. **Senior-level work includes devising methods and processes to**  
25 **resolve complex or difficult issues that have broad potential impact. These**  
26 **issues typically involve competing interests, multiple clients,** conflicting rules  
27 or practices, a range of possible solutions, or other elements that contribute to  
28 complexity. The senior-level has full authority to plan, prioritize, and handle all  
29

1 duties within an assigned area of responsibility. Senior-level employees require  
2 little supervision and their work is not typically checked by others (emphasis  
3 added).

4 Appellant functions independently, however his level of work does not have broad  
5 potential impact, involve competing interests or multiple clients, as the definition of  
6 “senior” indicates. The scope of Appellant’s work is limited to the AHCC education labs  
7 which is a moderately sized unit. While Appellant is fully qualified to handle the unique  
8 technical challenges, including updating systems to Windows 12 servers and performing  
9 other tasks without the benefit of the internet, the scope of impact is on one area, rather  
10 than multiple units, as the ITS 4 class specification states.

11  
12 Consistent with Appellant’s duties and responsibilities in the AHCC education labs, the  
13 ITS 3 definition specifies the positions support information systems and users. Also  
14 consistent with the definition of the ITS 3 is Appellant’s innovative approach to  
15 performing his work, such as without the use of the internet. Additionally, the ITS 3  
16 specifies the majority of projects are moderate in size and impact, as is Appellant’s work  
17 for AHCC education labs.

18  
19 The board agrees with the director’s review decision that the duties of Appellant’s  
20 position for the six month review period best fit the ITS 3 job class.

21  
22 In a hearing on exceptions, the appellant has the burden of proof (WAC 357-52-110). Appellant  
23 has not met his burden of proof.

**ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by JEFF GANDER is denied and Appellant's position remains allocated to Information Technology Specialist 3.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

**WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN MILLER, Vice-Chair