BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DAVID HEATH, Appellant, v. CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-02-0014 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATIONS 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, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair. The hearing was held on October 1, 2002, at the Central Washington University in Ellensburg, Washington. RENÉ EWING, Member, reviewed the record and participated in the decision in this matter. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant David Heath was present and represented himself *pro se*. Dennis Defa, Assistant Director of Human Resources, represented Respondent Central Washington University (CWU).

Background. As a result of a class study, the Washington State Personnel Resources Board adopted revisions to the higher education information technology classes. Appellant's position was reviewed by CWU's internal position audit team, which recommended that Appellant's position be allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification. Subsequently, a CWU peer review team reviewed Appellant's position and concurred with the recommendation. CWU Human Resources staff also agreed with the recommendation and Appellant's position was allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification, effective January 1,

2002. Appellant was notified of the allocation of his position by letter dated December 19, 2001 from Dennis Defa.

On January 3, 2002, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel (DOP). In his letter of appeal, Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist IV classification.

The Director's designee, Kari Lade, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position and forwarded the results of her review to Teri Thompson, Director of Classification and Compensation. By letter dated May 20, 2002, Ms. Thompson notified Appellant that his position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification. On June 7, 2002, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works in the Plant Operations unit of CWU's Facilities Management Department (FMD). Appellant is a member of the FMD team that provides senior-level support for a complex network of LAN's, including gateways, servers and varying protocols, for network systems controlling campus building environments and the campus-wide life safety system. Appellant's duties include troubleshooting, testing, installing, and maintaining hardware, software, and network infrastructure equipment. Appellant works independently to carry out his assignments. Appellant's assignments impact individual buildings on campus, however, if an environmental system fails, adjacent buildings may be impacted. Appellant works under the direction of the Manager of Plant Operations who set policies and objectives, and he has overall responsibility for the plant operations systems.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that he works under administrative direction, designs and carries out senior-level assignments in accordance with broad policy statements, and consults with the state fire marshal when upgrading systems or designing systems for new buildings. Appellant contends that his supervisor and administrator believe his position should be allocated to the ITSS IV classification and asserts that the Director's designee failed to give the comments of his supervisor and administrator appropriate weight. Appellant contends that he performs senior-level duties for a complex campus-wide system and that his position should be allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist IV classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent contends that the Director's determination is supported by a preponderance of the evidence and is consistent with the findings of CWU's internal review committees and the decision of human resources staff. Respondent asserts that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Information Technology Systems Specialist III, class code 2407; Information Technology Systems Specialist IV, class code 2408.

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).

Positions allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist (ITSS) IV classification function as senior-level specialists and independently utilize advanced technical knowledge on projects that impact major work groups or multiple functional areas. Generally, ITSS IVs serve as team or project leaders or supervise staff. ITSS IVs independently plan, design and carry out projects and their work is evaluated in terms of its adherence to program goals or compliance with laws, regulations or general institution policies. Appellant's position does not meet the level of independence or breadth of impact intended by this level. Appellant works as a member of the FMD team and occasionally functions as a project leader as do other members of the team. Appellant's supervisor maintains overall responsibility for the plant operations systems and ensures adherence to program goals or compliance with laws, regulations or general institution policies. The scope of Appellant's work does not impact the functions of other major work groups or multiple functional areas. Rather Appellant's work is limited to environmental control systems and the life-safety system, which does not meet the breadth of impact anticipated at the ITSS IV level.

Positions allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist III classification work independently, consult with users, complete assignments and coordinate projects, and resolve problems. ITSS IIIs have a moderate scope of responsibility and their work impacts internal or satellite operations, multiple users, or more than one group. At this level, complex problems are resolved by consulting with a higher level such as a higher-level specialist, supervisor or technical consultant. In addition, ITSS IIIs may lead and mentor other staff. Appellant works independently under the general direction of his supervisor. Appellant's supervisor sets the overall goals and objectives for the work unit. Appellant's work involves internal operations and affects more than one building and more than one group. Appellant occasionally serves as the lead staff person on

projects and he consults with other team members or vendors to resolve unusual or complex problems. The scope and complexity of Appellant's duties and responsibilities and his level of independence fit the ITSS III classification.

Conclusion. Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and Director's determination, dated May 20, 2002, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of David Heath is denied and the Director's determination dated May 20, 2002, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2002.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

_____
René Ewing, Member