

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

CINDY BOEKHOFF,

Appellant,

vs.

BELLEVUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-07-002

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, LARRY GOODMAN, Chair, and LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated February 27, 2007. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on August 1, 2007.

Appearances. Appellant Cindy Boekhoff was present and was represented by Leslie Liddle, Executive Director of the Washington Public Employees Association. Bellevue Community College (BCC) was represented by Lucy Macneil, Vice President of Human Resource Services.

Background. Appellant's position was allocated to the class of Administrative Assistant A. On May 20, 2005, she submitted a Position Review Request Form B to BCC's Human Resources Office. Appellant requested that her position be reallocated to the Administrative Services Manager A classification. By email dated July 5, 2006, BCC informed Appellant that her position was properly allocated. By letter dated July 27, 2005, Appellant requested a director's review of her position.

After filing her request for review, on October 28, 2005, Appellant signed a Position Review Request form, in which she described the purpose of her position and the specific duties that she performed. In this request form, Appellant indicated that the Administrative Services Manager A or B classification provided the best fit for her position. Appellant's supervisor signed the form

1 on November 28, 2005, and indicated that he disagreed with Appellant's description of her
2 duties. The Department of Personnel received the additional information on December 7, 2005.

3
4 On October 17, 2006, Teresa Parsons, the director's designee, conducted a review of Appellant's
5 position. By letter dated February 27, 2007, Ms. Parsons determined that Appellant's position
6 was properly allocated to the Administrative Assistant A classification.

7
8 On March 26, 2007, Appellant filed exceptions to Ms. Parson's determination. In her letter of
9 exceptions, Appellant requests that her position be reallocated to at least the Administrative
10 Assistant B classification. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

11
12 At the time of her request for reallocation, Appellant provided administrative support to the
13 Director of Campus Operations. Campus Operations includes custodial services, capital
14 programs, grounds, public safety, maintenance, material resources and the mail room, campus
15 operations and campus events. In performing her duties, Appellant used a detailed spreadsheet to
16 track and monitor various budgets. She reviewed purchase orders and invoices, assigned budget
17 codes and transferred data to the appropriate budget spreadsheet. The information Appellant
18 tracked and entered into the spreadsheet was used by her supervisor to make budgetary
19 decisions. Appellant also responded to inquires from students, staff and administrators. She
20 handled daily issues that arose in Campus Operations including emergency situations which she
21 referred to the appropriate work group for resolution.

22
23 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that the employer and the director's
24 designee failed to adequately review and analyze her position because they did not consider the
25 Administrative Assistant B classification. Appellant asserts that she provides administrative support
26 for budget development and management, expenditure control, automated work order system
27 management, general administrative and office management, records management and report
28 preparation. Appellant is the sole person providing administrative support to the Director of Campus
29

1 Operations. Campus Operations employs more than 75 full-time classified employees. Appellant
2 contends that based on the level of her responsibilities and the size and diversity of Campus
3 Operations, the Administrative Assistant B classification provides the best fit for her position.

4
5 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that 60 percent of Appellant's duties
6 involve budgetary responsibilities such as sorting invoices and contracts, entering expenditures on
7 spreadsheets, reconciling expenditures with the monthly status reports, assigning budget codes, and
8 handling purchase requisitions, and that 20 percent of her duties include distributing mail,
9 responding to email and researching answers, monitoring electronic requests for service, and
10 forwarding requests for service to the appropriate work group. Respondent asserts that these duties
11 and responsibilities are described by the administrative support activities found in the Administrative
12 Assistant A classification. While Respondent acknowledges that the basic function statements found
13 in the Administrative Assistant A and B classifications are virtually the same, Respondent contends
14 that the distinguishing characteristics show that the B level exercises a higher level of management
15 responsibility and authority than those assigned to Appellant. For example, Respondent argues that
16 Appellant provided no evidence to show that she exercises judgment to resolve unusual
17 administrative problems in areas affecting budget planning, that she develops fiscal plans,
18 performance goals or special projects, that she has contact with administrative officers and
19 community leaders, that she has the authority to commit Campus Operations to courses of action
20 without supervisory approval, or that she supervises staff. Respondent further argues that
21 Appellant's duties and responsibilities do not rise to the level of the typical work statements listed in
22 the Administrative Assistant B. Respondent asserts that scope of duties and level of responsibilities
23 of Appellant's position are best described by the Administrative Assistant A classification.

24
25 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
26 to the Administrative Assistant A classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classification.** Administrative Assistant A, class code 2045, Administrative Services
2 Manager A, class code 2009.

3
4 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification
5 best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
6 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which
7 that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
8 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
9 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the
10 position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

11
12 Here, as in Liddle-Stamper, we are comparing the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position
13 to the available classification specifications. We are considering the relevant classifications that were
14 in effect at the time she requested her review from BCC and determining which classification best
15 describes the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to and performed by her position at that
16 time.

17
18 Appellant argued that BCC and the director's designee failed to consider the Administrative
19 Assistant B classification as the proper allocation for her position. We have carefully reviewed this
20 classification and compared it to the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position. We find that
21 her duties and responsibility do not rise to the level or scope of management authority intended by
22 this classification. For example, she does not have the delegated budgetary authority envisioned at
23 this level. She does not monitor, control and develop budget estimates, establish short-term or long-
24 term fiscal plans and performance goals, or develop, plan and coordinate special projects. She is not
25 a supervisor and the organizational unit does not encompass a breadth of complexity that requires
26 coordination of efforts to the extent envisioned by the Administrative Assistant B classification.
27 While Appellant argues that this classification was relevant to her reallocation request, we disagree
28 and find that BCC and the director's designee did not error by not including this classification in
29

1 their analysis of Appellant's position. We do not expect the director's designee to address every
2 possible classification in his/her determination, only those classes that are *relevant* to the specific
3 duties and responsibilities under review.

4
5 Appellant focused her argument on exceptions on the Administrative Assistant B classification. She
6 did not present arguments to show that her duties and responsibilities met the Administrative
7 Services Manager A classification.

8
9 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has
10 failed to meet her burden of proof. Appellant's position is properly allocated to Administrative
11 Assistant A.

12
13 **ORDER**

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Cindy
15 Boekhoff is denied and the director's determination dated February 27, 2007, is affirmed and
16 adopted.

17
18 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2007.

19 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

20
21 _____
22 LARRY GOODMAN, Chair

23
24 _____
25 LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair
26
27
28
29