

PETER HORVATH and MICHAEL KEOWN,	)	
Appellants,	)	CASE NO. R-ALLO-09-033
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER OF THE BOARD
	)	FOLLOWING HEARING ON
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION	)	EXCEPTIONS TO THE
SERVICES,	)	DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
	)	
Respondent.	)	

On August 1, 2008, Appellants requested a director's review of DIS's determinations. By letters dated July 22, 2009, the director's designee denied Appellants' reallocation requests.

On August 12, 2009, Appellants filed exceptions to the director's determinations. Appellants' exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellants work in DIS's regional remote Node Site in Seattle. Appellants are supervised by an Information Technology Specialist 6 working in the Network Control Center (NCC) in Olympia. The NCC is part of Telecommunication Operations in the Telecommunications Services Division (TSD). The purpose of the Seattle Node Site is to link and route network connectivity for statewide networks. The Network Control Center (NCC) and Network Operations Center (NOC) are co-located in Olympia, and the employees assigned to those centers form a centralized group responsible for the overall operation of the statewide networks and network services. Appellants provide local site support for the Seattle Node Site and perform the physical equipment installation, network cabling installation or removal, and monitoring of the equipment for the site. Appellants' physical access to the network through the Node Site is limited to their assigned region, but the scope and impact of the Seattle Node Site affects a large number of customers located at counties, cities, multiple state agencies, libraries, and the K-20 school consortium.

**Summary of Appellants' Arguments.** Appellants argue that the Seattle Node Site connects to the end user networks as well as the backbone network, contains a variety of equipment and access services, and impacts large number of users from K-20 education facilities, libraries, and city, county and state governments. Appellants assert that the Seattle Node Site is the largest, most complex wide area network operated by state government. Appellants contend that their responsibilities and assignments impact multiple users throughout the state. Appellants describe their duties as:

- responsibility for statewide network transport services including voice, video and data transport,
- monitoring and providing operational support and as well as correcting network malfunctions and working with vendors and other staff in support of network malfunctions, and
- creating installation plans and independently installing and configuring hardware/software to enhance system performance.

Appellants acknowledge that the NCC has the overall responsibility for oversight of the state-wide complex of networks but argue that their positions are responsible at the regional level remote site to perform the hands-on troubleshooting, configuring, installing and maintenance required at the site. Appellants assert that they perform duties and responsibilities equivalent to those of their peers at NCC. Appellants further assert that their positions support the state-wide complex of networks and have a significant impact on customers that rely on DIS to conduct their business. Appellants contend that their duties, responsibilities and scope of work support reallocation of their positions to the ITS3 classification.

**Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent acknowledges that Appellants do invaluable work but asserts that their positions fit completely within the ITS2 classification. Respondent argues that the NCC directs and has oversight of the work performed at the node sites, the NCC has access to the whole state network and can go anywhere and troubleshoot and configure throughout the state, and the NCC staff are responsible for the higher-level, most complex troubleshooting across the state. Respondent further argues that Appellants do not have access to make statewide changes and that their physical access is limited to the regional Node Site. Respondent explains that within the Node Site, Appellants test and monitor circuits, test cables, install network cabling, and support and assist the NCC and NOC in troubleshooting problems as the onsite eyes and hands for the Node Site. Respondent contends that Appellants' work is routine in nature and that more complex issues go to the NCC staff who oversee and direct the work performed at the node sites. Respondent further contends that Appellants' scope of work is limited to individual orders for a single site location like a community college or an office and that these groups are small in scope and impact. Respondent contends that the nature of work performed and the scope of impact of Appellants' positions fit within the ITS2 class.

**Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellants' positions are properly allocated to the Information Technology Specialist 2 classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Specialist 2, class code 479N, and Information  
2 Technology Specialist 3, class code 479N.

3  
4 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
5 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 The definition for Information Technology Specialist 2 states:

13 In support of information systems and users, performs standard consulting,  
14 analyzing, programming, maintenance, installation and/or technical support.

15 Under general supervision, follows established work methods and procedures to  
16 complete tasks on computers and/or telecommunication software/hardware,  
17 applications, support products, projects, or databases for small scale systems or  
18 programs or pieces of larger systems or programs. Performs standard tasks such as  
19 consulting with customers to identify and analyze technology needs and problems;  
20 responding to and resolving trouble reports from users; processing equipment and  
21 service orders; coordinating installations, moves, and changes; analyzing problems  
22 for parts of applications and solving problems with some assistance; supporting and  
23 enhancing existing applications in compliance with specifications and standards;  
24 conducting unit, system or usability testing; writing specifications and developing  
25 reports; developing and conducting application, software and/or system operation  
26 training for users; or serving as part of a problem solving team addressing more  
27 complex issues. The majority of tasks are limited in scope and impact individuals  
28 or small groups. Complex problems are referred to a higher level.

29  
Appellants work under general supervision and perform the duties and responsibilities  
encompassed by the ITS2. Respondent argues that Appellants' scope of impact is limited to single  
employer locations. However, Appellants provided persuasive argument that the majority of their  
assignments and the impact of their work go beyond the scope described at the ITS2 level.

1 The definition for Information Technology Specialist 3 states:

2 In support of information systems and users in an assigned area of responsibility,  
3 independently performs consulting, designing, programming, installation,  
4 maintenance, quality assurance, troubleshooting and/or technical support for  
5 applications, hardware and software products, databases, database management  
6 systems, support products, network infrastructure equipment, or  
7 telecommunications infrastructure, software or hardware.

8 Uses established work procedures and innovative approaches to complete  
9 assignments and coordinate projects such as conducting needs assessments;  
10 leading projects; creating installation plans; analyzing and correcting network  
11 malfunctions; serving as system administrator; monitoring or enhancing operating  
12 environments; or supporting, maintaining and enhancing existing applications.

13 The majority of assignments and projects are moderate in size and impact an  
14 agency division or large workgroup or single business function; or internal or  
15 satellite operations, multiple users, or more than one group. Consults with higher-  
16 level technical staff to resolve complex problems.

17 Appellants support the systems and users associated with the Seattle Node Site, which encompasses  
18 a large and varied region. They install, maintain, troubleshoot and provide technical support for the  
19 systems and connections routed through the site. Appellants use established work procedures,  
20 innovative approaches and monitor and enhance the Node Site operating environments. The  
21 majority of their assignments impact large work groups or single business functions, satellite  
22 operations, multiple users, or more than one group. For complex problems or projects, they consult  
23 with higher-level staff at the NCC or the NOC. Appellants' scope of assigned duties and  
24 responsibilities, the scope of the impact of their work, and their level of authority are  
25 encompassed in the ITS3 classification.

26 In a hearing on exceptions, the appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellants  
27 have met their burden of proof.

28 /////

29 /////

**ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Peter Horvath and Michael Keown is granted and their positions are reallocated to the Information Technology Specialist 3 classification.

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

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
DJ MARK, Member