

SWAIBU MATOVU,	)	CASE NO. R-ALLO-08-025
Appellant,	)	
vs.	)	ORDER OF THE BOARD
	)	FOLLOWING HEARING ON
SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE,	)	EXCEPTIONS TO THE
Respondent.	)	DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

On November 20, 2007, Appellant filed a request for a director's review of SCC's allocation determination. By letter dated November 12, 2008, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the MM1 classification.

1 On November 26, 2008, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's  
2 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

3  
4 This position review covers the time period of December 2006 to June 2007. During this time,  
5 Appellant worked in Facilities Operations at SCC where he reported to a Maintenance Supervisor 1.  
6 Appellant was assigned a variety of maintenance tasks although at times, his work was predominately  
7 plumbing. During the time period covered by the review, Appellant had a working relationship with  
8 journey level plumbers who were available to check his work on more difficult plumbing  
9 assignments. In addition to plumbing, his assignments cover a broad range of sub-journey level  
10 trades' work, including electrical, building repairs, and painting. In his PQ, Appellant indicated that  
11 plumbing comprised 60% of his work. His plumbing work included changing faucets, repairing  
12 toilets, drinking fountains, etc.

13  
14 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that because there was no current position  
15 description (PD) on file for his position, SCC's allocation determination was based on insufficient  
16 information. Appellant further argues that because there was no PD for his position, there is no evidence  
17 to establish that an MM2 had oversight responsibility for the work he performed. Appellant asserts that  
18 he worked independently with no oversight. Further, Appellant asserts that the documentation  
19 submitted fails to establish that his plumbing work was reviewed by plumbers. Appellant contends that  
20 during the time period covered by this review, he was performing primarily journey level plumbing  
21 work, that he independently performed assignments from start to finish, and that his position should be  
22 reallocated to the MM2 classification.

23  
24 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that at the time of Appellant's position  
25 review, he was assigned a variety of semi-skilled, sub-journey level, jack-of-all-trades work. Respondent  
26 agrees that Appellant was assigned plumbing tasks, but asserts that those tasks entailed sub-journey  
27 level work as described at the MM1 level. Respondent contends that in addition to semi-skilled  
28 plumbing work, Appellant also performed semi-skilled painting, electrical maintenance such as changing  
29 light bulbs, outlets and ballasts, and building repairs on walls and floors, etc. While Respondent agrees

1 that Appellant worked independently, Respondent contends that the work he was assigned was not  
2 journey-level work as required for allocation to the MM2 classification.

3  
4 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to  
5 the Maintenance Mechanic 1 classification should be affirmed.

6  
7 **Relevant Classifications.** Maintenance Mechanic 1, class code 626J; Maintenance Mechanic 2, class  
8 code 626K.

9  
10 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
11 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement  
12 of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed.  
13 A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the  
14 available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class that best  
15 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State  
16 University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

17  
18 Typically, a current and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is  
19 documented in an approved position description. The position description becomes the basis for  
20 allocation of a position. While the civil service rules require employers to maintain accurate  
21 position descriptions, failure to do so would be a rule violation appeal or a grievance under a  
22 collective bargaining agreement. This is an appeal of the allocation of Appellant's position. The  
23 lack of a position description is outside of the scope of this proceeding. And, because Appellant's  
24 position is covered by a collective bargaining agreement, most alleged rule violations would be  
25 subject to the grievance process rather than an appeal before this Board.

26  
27 The definition for the MM2 classification states:

28 This is the journey, working or occupational level of the series. Positions at this  
29 level perform a variety of skilled work in the operation, maintenance, repair,

1 remodeling and construction of buildings, grounds, machinery, mechanical facilities  
2 and equipment, and hospital facilities, systems and equipment. Incumbents work  
3 independently and utilize a general knowledge of several related skill fields such as  
4 plumbing, electrical, welding, carpentry, and machinist work.

5 The definition for the MM1 classification states:

6 Positions perform semi-skilled and sub journey work in the maintenance, repair,  
7 remodeling, alterations and construction of buildings, grounds, facilities, and  
8 equipment. Positions are used as general repairers when no immediate journey level  
9 tradesperson is available. General repairer positions are used when it would be  
10 impractical to have several journey level tradespersons on site. Other positions  
11 perform a variety of semi-skilled maintenance duties requiring a limited knowledge  
12 of various trade skills. These positions work independently in routine maintenance  
13 assignments or under the technical direction of a journey level position.

14 The difference between these two classes is the scope and level of work performed. Most positions  
15 within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than one  
16 classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position, the  
17 duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position  
18 must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the  
19 position's duties and responsibilities. Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-  
20 ALLO-07-007 (2007).

21 In this case, because no PD existed for Appellant's position, the decision is based on the documentation  
22 submitted by the parties. We have carefully reviewed the documentation provided, including Appellant's  
23 position questionnaire and work orders. We find that during the time period covered by the review,  
24 some of Appellant's work could be considered working level assignments. However, the majority of the  
25 work he performed during this time period was sub-journey level. He performed this work  
26 independently. In addition to plumbing work, he performed sub-journey level painting, electrical and  
27 building repair work. During the time period covered by this review, the work Appellant performed fit  
28 within the MM1 classification.  
29

1 This decision is based on the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position during the six months  
2 prior to June 11, 2007. If he feels that his duties have changed since that time, he may request a review  
3 of his current duties and responsibilities in accordance with SCC's procedures and the Collective  
4 Bargaining Agreement between SCC and the Washington Federation of State Employees.

5  
6 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has  
7 failed to meet his burden of proof.

8  
9 **ORDER**

10 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Swaibu Matovu is  
11 denied and the director's determination dated September 30, 2008, is affirmed and adopted.

12 DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2009.

13 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

14  
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair

17  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair