

ADNAN ABU-SALEH,)	CASE NO. R-ALLO-09-002
)	
Appellant,)	
)	ORDER OF THE BOARD
vs.)	FOLLOWING HEARING ON
)	EXCEPTIONS TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,)	DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
)	
Respondent.)	

On January 20, 2009, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

1 Appellant works in the Project Engineering Office in the NW Region of DOT. The majority of his
2 work involves doing surveys. When performing survey work in the field, Appellant normally works
3 without supervision. Appellant is assigned responsibility for the operation of a variety of
4 instruments used in surveying, maintaining manual survey records and entering survey information
5 into the DOT computer system. In addition he trains other survey crew members in how to operate
6 the equipment and do survey work.
7

8 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that his position allocation should be based on
9 the work he actually performs and not on the work assigned to his position. He asserts that the CQ
10 completed by management for his position is outdated and does not reflect the work he actually
11 performs. Appellant contends that due to the absence of a TE2 Party Chief, he performs the work of
12 the survey crew chief as described in the TE2 classification. Appellant contends that while conducting
13 field surveys he leads a crew of equipment operators performing survey work. Appellant asserts that the
14 majority of his work is performed in the field, he works independently, he receives work assignments
15 from various Transportation Engineer 3s, and he directs staff in the field performing survey work. Based
16 on the work he actually performs, Appellant asks that his position be reallocated to the TE2
17 classification.
18

19 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent agrees with the director's designee that
20 Appellant's position fits the TT3 class. Respondent contends that Appellant was never assigned to be
21 the lead for survey crews and was never assigned crew chief duties. Respondent argues that Appellant
22 was assigned the duties reflected in the CQ completed by management. Respondent contends that
23 Appellant's supervisor was aware of the work generated by TE3's who contacted Appellant and that
24 the work is reflected in the management initiated CQ for Appellant's position. Respondent asserts that
25 Appellant's position is properly allocated to the TT3 classification.
26

27 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to
28 the Transportation Technician 3 classification should be affirmed.
29

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Transportation Technician 3, class code 66100; Transportation Engineer 2,
2 class code 66140.

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

10
11 Both the Personnel Appeals Board and the Personnel Resources Board have held that because a
12 current and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an
13 approved classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for
14 allocation of a position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and
15 responsibilities as documented in the classification questionnaire. Lawrence v. Dept of Social and
16 Health Services, PAB No. ALLO-99-0027 (2000).

17
18 Appellant asserts that the CQ he completed reflects the work he performs. However, that CQ is not
19 approved. DOT asserts that the CQ completed and approved by management reflects the duties
20 assigned to Appellant's position. Appellant has the burden of proving, in part, that the work described in
21 the management CQ is inaccurate. Based on the totality of the evidence, Appellant has failed to
22 demonstrate that the approved CQ for his position does not describe the work assigned to his position.

23
24 Our decision is based on the duties assigned to Appellant's position during the 12 months prior to
25 March 15, 2006. During this time, the majority of Appellant's work entailed performing surveys in the
26 field. Appellant worked on survey crews and he provided work direction to other crew members in
27 survey practices and instrument operation. Survey party chiefs are not assigned to all survey crews.
28 Appellant has failed to provide clear or persuasive evidence to prove that he was assigned the duties of a
29 survey party chief.

1 The definition for the TE2 classification states, “[p]erforms transportation engineering work under
2 general supervision.”
3

4 The definition for the TE2 classification states:
5

6 Work at this level is characterized by the independent application of standard
7 engineering procedures and techniques to accomplish a wide variety of work in the
8 office, laboratory, and/or field. Incumbents generally serve as full production staff
9 or crew leaders. Work is assigned through general instructions and the setting of
10 deadlines by a supervisor who engages in ongoing spot-check review, provides
assistance when problems are encountered and reviews completed work. This role
may include the leadership of technical support staff and entry level engineers such
that incumbents are called upon to direct and train staff.

11 Though not allocating criteria, the TE2 typical work indicates that survey work at this level includes
12 acting as a survey party chief and directing a survey crew.
13

14 Appellant’s position does not meet the scope or level of work found in the TE2 classification. The
15 majority of the work performed by Appellant is field survey work. He does not perform a wide variety
16 of work as envisioned at the TE2 level. As stated above, Appellant works on survey crews and provides
17 work direction to other crew members in survey practices and instrument operation. However, he has
18 not been assigned or designated to act as the survey party chief.
19

20 The definition for the TT3 classification states, “[t]his is the skilled journey level within the
21 Transportation Technician series.”
22

23 The definition for the TT3 classification states:
24

25 In the office, laboratory and/or field, incumbents perform skilled technical tasks in
26 support of engineering projects and programs. Incumbents typically receive
27 instructions about the work to be done including scheduling and priorities, but work
28 with relative independence in selecting methods and resolving routine problems.
29 Employees at this level are expected to exercise initiative and judgment in
independently carrying out assignments according to established policies,
procedures and standards. When solutions are not readily attainable, the employee
refers the problem to the supervisor. Leadership responsibility is normally limited to
on-the-job training of other technical staff. May act as crew leader on specific
assignments that do not require ongoing direction from a supervisor.

1 Though not allocating criteria, the TT3 typical work indicates that survey work at this level includes
2 performing all duties on a survey crew, training other crew members in survey practices and
3 instrument operation, serving as a leader of two-person leveling crews, and being responsible for
4 survey party operations in the absence of the chief.
5

6 Appellant's position fits within the definition, distinguishing characteristics and scope of the TT3
7 classification. Appellant performs journey-level work, his work is performed in support of engineering
8 projects, he works independently, exercises initiative and judgment, provides on-the-job training to
9 member of survey crews, and takes responsibility for survey crew operations in the absence of a survey
10 party chief.
11

12 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has
13 failed to meet his burden of proof.
14

15 ORDER

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Adnan Abu-Saleh
17 is denied and the director's determination dated December 31, 2008, is affirmed.

18 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2009.

19 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD
20

21 _____
22 JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair
23

24 _____
25 DJ MARK, Member
26
27
28
29