

1 designee conducted a review of Appellant's request and by letter dated December 11, 2007,
2 determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Mail Processing-Driver Lead
3 classification.

4
5 On January 4, 2008, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's
6 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

7
8 Appellant's work is split between SPSCC's mail room and central copy center. He oversees and
9 manages the daily work in both areas and directs the work of two contract staff, two part-time
10 employees and two work study employees. Appellant is responsible for the delivery, collection and
11 sorting of mail and for providing copy center services.

12
13 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that he provides a variety of services
14 within the Central Services department. He asserts that he performs the duties of a supervisor
15 including setting and adjusting work schedules, interviewing new employees, training employees,
16 participating in the evaluation of student employees and contract staff, taking corrective action when
17 necessary, and adjusting grievances. Appellant contends that his position is best described by the
18 Central Services Supervisor 1 classification.

19
20 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that the workload fluctuates between
21 the mail room and the copy center and asserts that at peak times, Appellant may spend more time in
22 one area than the other. Yet, Respondent contends that the preponderance of Appellant's duties is in
23 the mail room. Respondent argues that Appellant does not supervise contract staff, part-time
24 employees or work study employees, rather, he provides daily work direction and assures that the
25 work is performed correctly. SPSCC explains that to compensate for Appellant for his oversight of
26 staff, the lead classification was most appropriate and that because the Mail Processing-Driver Lead
27 class was compensated at a higher level than the copy center classifications, the Mail Processing-

1 Driver Lead class was determined to be the best fit for Appellant's overall duties and
2 responsibilities.

3
4 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
5 to the Mail Processing-Driver Lead classification should be affirmed.

6
7 **Relevant Classifications.** Mail Processing-Driver Lead, class code 113K and Central Services
8 Supervisor 1, class code 2050 (subsequently renumbered to code 106H).

9
10 **Decision of the Board.** Appellant is a valuable employee. He takes pride in doing his work well and
11 in his contributions to the college. However, in determining the proper allocation of a position, we
12 must consider the duties and responsibilities assigned to the position, not the capabilities, expertise
13 or dedication of the incumbent in the position.

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

21
22 The definition for Central Services Supervisor 1 states:

23 Supervise an organization which provides a variety of central services; may
24 include but not be limited to services provided by central duplication, mail
25 distribution and collection, central receiving and storage, campus office supply,
26 office machine and electronic equipment maintenance, automated typing services,
27 equipment and facility inventory, and dispatch and maintenance of vehicles,
28 telephone and radio systems.

29 The distinguishing characteristics for Central Services Supervisor 1 state:

Central Services Supervisor I (sic) position is distinguished by the responsibility of directing, at the operations level, the activities of several smaller units of operating sections or areas in order to carry out policies established by Central Services Supervisor II or other administrative superiors.

Supervision of an organization typically includes setting organizational goals, developing plans to meet goals and objectives, developing policies and procedures, preparing budgets, adjusting and authorizing expenditures, controlling the allocation of program resources, and the supervision of staff. Appellant does not exercise this level of authority for the mail room or for the copy center. In addition, positions allocated to the Central Services Supervisor 1 level typically exercise supervisory authority over lead and supervisor positions. Appellant does not exercise the breadth of supervisory responsibility envisioned by this classification.

Appellant argues that he performs supervisory responsibilities for contract, part-time and work study staff. He does not perform supervisory activities as required for allocation to a supervisory classification. Other than talking to students who are referred to the mail room or copy center for work study employment, he does not participate in the selection of staff. He provides on-the-job work instruction but he does not perform training and development at a level expected of a supervisor. He oversees the daily work of the mail room and the copy center but he provided no examples of short-range or long-range planning. He does not conduct formal performance evaluations but he does provide feedback that is used by others for that purpose. He does not adjust formal grievances, rather he responds to service complaints related to the service provided by mail room and copy center employees. He provided one example in which he corrected a work study employee, however, he provided no examples of providing progressive corrective action as a regular part of his job.

Lead responsibilities include regularly assigning, instructing and checking the work of others on an ongoing basis. Directing the work of others includes providing work guidance and direction without the responsibility of assigning, instructing and checking the work on others on a regular and ongoing basis. Appellant provides work guidance and direction but his duties and

responsibilities go beyond directing the work of others. His duties also include ongoing responsibility to assign, instruct and check the work of mail room and copy center staff. Appellant's oversight of the mail room, the copy center and assigned staff is best described as lead work.

Appellant argues that the Mail Processing-Driver Lead classification does not encompass his work in the copy center. We recognize Appellant's concern. Nonetheless based on his position review request form, a preponderance of his duties (51%) constitutes mail room duties.

In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof. The Mail Processing-Driver Lead classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position. His position is properly reallocated.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Nicholas Dawson is denied and the director's determination dated December 11, 2007, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2008.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

LAURA ANDERSON, Chair

MARSHA TADANO LONG, Vice Chair

JOSEPH PINZONE, Member