BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

GARY VANCE, Appellant, v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-04-0008 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, BUSSE NUTLEY, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated June 2, 2004. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington, on September 17, 2004. GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, reviewed the record and participated in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Gary Vance was present and appeared *pro se*. Robert Swenson represented respondent Department of Social and Health Services.

Background. Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) signed February 24, 2003, requesting that his position as Information Technology Systems Specialist 2 be reallocated to the class of Information Technology Systems Specialist (ITSS) 4. By letter dated July 31, 2003, Lynne Glad, Human Resources Manager, notified Appellant that his position best fit the job classification of ITSS 3 because his duties more closely matched the distinguishing characteristics for that class. On August 27, 2003, Appellant appealed this determination to the director of the Department of

Personnel (DOP). On October 14, 2003, and December 16, 2003, the DOP conducted allocation reviews and by letter dated June 2, 2004, informed Appellant his position was properly allocated to the ITSS 3 classification because Appellant's job assignments did not include responsibility for "a region or geographic grouping of locations" or "multiple business units with multiple business functions."

On July 1, 2004, Appellant filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant asserts that other ITSS employees within the department were reallocated to the 4 level on the basis that their work impacted multiple business units and multiple business functions. Appellant asserts that the scope and responsibilities of his job includes ITSS 4 duties, including responsibility as the Assistant Network Administrator providing computer network, printer and file server support for Western State Hospital and all its entities. Appellant asserts that while the Child Study and Treatment Center may have their own computer technicians, they rely on him for network services.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellant is correctly allocated to the ITSS 3 level. Respondent asserts that Appellant does not support more than one division because the Child Study Treatment Center and the Special Offender Center are all a part of the Division of Mental Health, and have their own information technology staff to support their computers. Respondent argues that Appellant's duties consist of assisting and supporting his manager, who is the network administrator.

Relevant Classifications. Information Technology Systems Specialist 2, class code 03272; Information Technology Systems Specialist 3, class code 03273; Information Technology Systems Specialist 4, class code 03274.

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. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. 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 which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Allocation to the ITSS 4 classification requires the incumbent to perform "system design, acquisition, installation, maintenance, troubleshooting, problem resolution and/or consultation tasks for complex systems, projects, or operational problems that impact a region, geographical grouping of offices/facilities, or multiple business units with multiple business functions."

The primary issue here is whether position number NX71 has assigned responsibility for computer support services for "multiple business units with multiple business functions."

The Department of Social and Health Services is organized into eight separate administrations: Executive, Aging and Disability Services, Children's, Economic Services, Health and Rehabilitative Services, Juvenile Rehabilitation, Management Services, and Medical Assistance. Western State Hospital is a part of the Mental Health Division of the Health and Rehabilitative Administration. The Child Study and Treatment Center, the Special Commitment Center, PALS, Department of Personnel, Green Hill School, Lakeland Village, Fircrest School, the Washington State Patrol NCIC background check system are not "different divisions or separate entities" within Western State Hospital.

Appellant's CQ supports that his responsibility is to monitor and troubleshoot computer connections between Western State Hospital, and for example, the Washington State Patrol background check system. Appellant, however, does not to provide system design, acquisition, installation, maintenance, troubleshooting, problem resolution and/or consulting tasks for a "region, geographical grouping of offices, or multiple business units with multiple business functions." Rather, the duties Appellant performs are in direct support for the computer network at Western State Hospital, a single business unit.

Appellant has not met his burden of proving that the duties of his position the definition and distinguishing characteristics of the of ITSS 4 class specification. Therefore, the appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's determination dated June 2, 2004, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination dated June 2, 2004, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2004.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

_____
Busse Nutley, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504