

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

TODD HAAK,

Appellant,

vs.

SEATTLE CENTRAL COMMUNITY  
COLLEGE,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-06-011

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 Resources Board, MARSHA TADANO LONG, Chair, and LARRY GOODMAN, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated April 13, 2006. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on October 5, 2006.

**Appearances.** Appellant Todd Haak was present and was represented by Gary Hill with the Washington Federation of State Employees. Seattle Central Community College (SCCC) was represented by Tina Brady, Manager of Human Resource Services.

**Background.** Appellant's position was allocated to the class of Program Coordinator. As a result of a position review, his position was reallocated to Program Support Supervisor II. Appellant filed an appeal of the SCCC's decision and asked that his position be reallocated to the Program Manager B classification.

On January 13, 2006, Kari Lade, Human Resource Consultant for DOP, conducted a review of Appellant's position. During the review, additional information was provided by Appellant and his supervisor. Ms. Lade received the final information on March 10, 2006. After receiving the additional information, Ms. Lade forwarded the results of her review to Teri Thompson, Classification and Compensation Program Director for DOP. By letter dated April 13, 2006, Ms.

1 Thompson, acting as the director's designee, determined that Appellant's position should be  
2 reallocated to the Program Manager A classification

3  
4 On May 12, 2006, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions  
5 are the subject of this proceeding.

6  
7 Appellant's position is assigned to the Running Start program within Student Development Services  
8 at SCCC. Appellant reports to Bea Kiyohara, Vice President for Student Development Services. In  
9 addition to Running Start, Student Development Services includes a number of other  
10 services/programs such as Disability Support Services, the Center for Deaf Students, the Student  
11 Activity Center, Women's Programs and the Wellness Center.

12  
13 Appellant is responsible for managing the Running Start program. His duties include:  
14 implementing policies unique to the program, supervising two office support staff, providing public  
15 information about the Running Start program at SCCC, providing advice and information to  
16 students, parents, high school personnel and others about the Running Start program at SCCC, and  
17 managing the Running Start budget in regard to the number of students participating in the program,  
18 billings to high school districts for student participation in the program, authorizing purchases and  
19 other areas unique to running start.

20  
21 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that he has total control for the Running  
22 Start program. Appellant asserts that he has purchasing authority, he is the source of all public  
23 information regarding the program, he develops and writes reports about the program for use by his  
24 supervisor and others, and he has the final authority for billings and adjustments to billings for each  
25 school district participating in the program at SCCC. Appellant asserts that based on the level of  
26 independence and authority he exercises and the fact that his position reports to a Vice President of  
27 SCCC, his position is best described by the Program Manager B classification.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent agrees with DOP's findings that Appellant's  
2 position should be allocated to the Program Manager A classification. Respondent asserts that  
3 because Appellant reports to the Vice President for Student Development Services, his position is  
4 properly allocated to the "A" level. In addition, Respondent argues that Appellant is not a second-  
5 line supervisor as required for allocation to the "B" level.

6  
7 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
8 to the Program Manager A classification should be affirmed.

9  
10 **Relevant Classifications.** Program Manager A, class code 2015; and Program Manager B, class  
11 code 2016.

12  
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification  
14 best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
15 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which  
16 that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by  
17 employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and  
18 responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specification. This review  
19 results in a determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of  
20 the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

21  
22 The Program Manager A and B classes share a common definition which states: "[s]upervise a  
23 division of a major administrative department, operating unit or program undertaking relieving the  
24 senior official of operating and administrative detail. Plan, coordinate and implement all functions  
25 required by the activity." Appellant's position fits within this definition.

26  
27 The distinguishing characteristics for Program Manager A and B state, in relevant part:

1 Program manager [sic] at the "A" level are typically first-line supervisors, and are  
2 characterized by their total responsibility for a program or management services to  
an administrative supervisor.

3 Program Managers at the "B" level are typically second- or third-line supervisors and  
4 are distinguished by their responsibility for total control of a program for a particular  
5 academic or administrative unit.

6 Appellant is not a second- or third-line supervisor. In addition, he reports to the Vice President for  
7 Student Development Services. The Vice President has overall responsibility and authority for the  
8 total control of Student Development Services and the various student development programs and  
9 services that report to her. Appellant exercises a high level of responsibility and independence in the  
10 management of the Running Start program, but he does not have total control at the level envisioned  
11 by the Program Manager B classification.

12  
13 Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Program Manager A classification.

14  
15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Todd Haak is  
17 denied and the Director's determination dated April 13, 2006 is affirmed and adopted.

18  
19 DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2006.

20 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 MARSHA TADANO LONG, Chair

24  
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 LARRY GOODMAN, Vice Chair