BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LAUREN MCNIECE, Appellant, v. WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-00-0003 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair; GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair; and LEANA D. LAMB, Member. The hearing was held on February 28, 2001, in the Compton Union Building on the campus of Washington State University in Pullman, Washington.

Appearances. Appellant Lauren McNiece was present and was represented by Leslie Liddle, Washington Public Employees Association Employee Relations Specialist. Respondent Washington State University (WSU) was represented by Karen Erp, Human Resource Representative.

Background. Appellant requested a review of the allocation of her Library Technician II position. By memorandum dated April 22, 1999, Respondent determined that Appellant's position should be reallocated to the Library Technician III classification. On May 21, 1999, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Joanel Zeller Huart, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated January 10, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Library Technician III. On

February 10, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant works in the Owens Science and Engineering Library. She is responsible for preparing and sending out material for binding, monitoring the budget for binding, producing fiscal information related to binding, maintaining and revising databases, mending library materials and checking in new serials.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that contrary to the Director's findings, library preservation is a specialized function that requires intensive application of knowledge and skills comparable to the functional areas of cataloging and working with special collections. In addition, Appellant argues that she works under general direction applying her supervisor's policies and objectives, uses independent judgment in planning and organizing her work and determines the priorities and deadlines for materials to be bound. Appellant asserts that she is responsible for binding, which is a specialized function, for the Owens Science and Engineering Library, which is a specialized collection, and that her duties and responsibilities are best described by the Library Specialist I classification.

Summary of Respondent WSU's Argument. Respondent argues that binding is not a specialty, but rather is a subset of library preservations activities and asserts that binding is one of the least complex subtasks of serials work. Respondent asserts that Appellant does not apply intensive knowledge and skills in a specific library functional area, but rather she performs technical tasks to check in serials, perform functions related to binding, catalog materials, shelve materials, and schedule items to be pulled and sent to the bindery. Respondent contends that Appellant's budget responsibilities are limited to monitoring a lump sum portion of the overall library's budget and that she does not develop the budget. Respondent contends that Appellant's position is best described as

performing complex library technical tasks under general supervision as described by the Library Technician III classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position should be allocated to the Library Technician III classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Library Technician III, class code 4327, and Library Specialist I, class code 4310.

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).

The Library Specialist I classification encompasses positions that work under general direction performing complex library technical tasks that require the utilization of specialized knowledge and skills in a specialized functional area or a specific subject area. Appellant performs recurring assignments under the policies and objectives set forth by her supervisor and seeks direction from her supervisor for problems. Therefore, Appellant works under general supervision, not under general direction. Appellant is not assigned to a specialized functional area or specific subject area as described in the basic function for this class. Rather, she performs technical tasks in support of the library. The library as a whole is not a specialized functional area or a specific subject area.

Appellant's position does not meet the intent or level of responsibility envisioned by the Library Specialist I classification.

The Library Technician III classification encompasses positions that work under general supervision and perform complex technical tasks in support of the overall library function. Appellant works under general supervision performing complex library materials maintenance tasks in support of the overall library. Appellant's position is described by the definition and basic function of this class. Furthermore, her duties are described in the typical work statements for the class. Appellant's position is best described by the Library Technician III classification.

Conclusion. Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the Director, dated January 10, 2000, 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 January 10, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504