

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

CANDACE ALVAREZ,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
OLYMPIC COLLEGE,  
Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-08-013

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, JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair, and LAURA ANDERSON, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated May 1, 2008. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on September 11, 2008.

**Appearances.** Appellant Candace Alvarez was present and was represented by Cari Trussell, Employee Relations Specialist with the Washington Public Employees Association. Respondent Olympic College (OC) was represented by Jacquie Curry, Human Resource Consultant.

**Background.** Appellant's position was allocated to the Program Assistant class. On February 2, 2007, she submitted a Position Question to OC's Human Resource Office requesting reallocation to the Program Coordinator classification. Respondent determined the Appellant's that position was properly allocated. On June 14, 2007, Appellant requested a director's review of her position.

During the hearing before the Board, Appellant explained that she originally requested reallocation the Program Coordinator class because it was the next level in her current series. Appellant further explained that after she requested a director's review, she learned that she could request reallocation to a class outside of her current classification and she identified the Space Analyst I classification as a better fit for her position.

1  
2 On April 8, 2008, Teresa Parsons, the director's designee, conducted a review of Appellant's  
3 position. By letter dated May 1, 2008, Ms. Parsons determined that Appellant's position should  
4 be reallocated to the Program Coordinator classification.

5  
6 On May 30, 2008, Appellant filed exceptions to director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are  
7 the subject of this proceeding.

8  
9 Appellant works in Instructional Support Services for Olympic College. She is the primary  
10 contact for room scheduling for three campuses. She provides information to faculty, students,  
11 staff and off-campus customers, oversees billing for room rentals, and coordinates services, such  
12 as equipment usage, with other departments as needed. Appellant maintains the building and  
13 space inventory database system, determines square footage of new and remodeled assignable  
14 spaces and updates the information in the database, runs reports and provides information,  
15 determines classroom capacities, and determines which classrooms and room configurations  
16 meet special needs. In addition, on a yearly basis, she conducts physical inventories of all  
17 classrooms and their equipment.

18  
19 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that she performs the full scope of duties  
20 and responsibilities assigned to the Space Analyst 1 classification. She asserts that she functions  
21 independently from her supervisor and exercises full decision-making authority for her assigned  
22 duties and responsibilities. While Appellant admits that she does not prepare student rosters, she  
23 contends that she prepares quarterly rosters of classrooms as anticipated by the Space Analyst 1  
24 classification. Appellant argues that her duties and responsibilities go beyond receiving and  
25 confirming room reservations and asserts that the majority of her time is spent maintaining the  
26 building and space inventory. Appellant asks that on a best fit basis, her position be reallocated to  
27 the Space Analyst 1 classification.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that the college believed the best fit for  
2 Appellant's position was the Building Coordinator classification but that because this was a lower  
3 level than the Program Assistant class, they chose not to reallocate her position downward.  
4 Respondent contends that Appellant's position is primarily responsible for coordinating room  
5 reservations, tracking inventory and maintenance, and dealing with walk-in and telephone requests  
6 for information. Respondent acknowledges that Appellant maintains the building and space  
7 inventory database but asserts that she utilizes pre-existing information to update the data.  
8 Respondent also acknowledges that Appellant's duties and responsibilities touch on the work  
9 typically performed by the Space Analyst 1 but asserts that she is not responsible for the full scope  
10 of responsibilities performed by space analysts. Respondent recognizes that Appellant's position is  
11 unique and that she is the only person who coordinates room reservations for all three campuses.  
12 However, Respondent contends that Appellant's duties and responsibilities best fit within the  
13 program classification series and as such, does not dispute reallocation of her position to the  
14 Program Coordinator level.

15  
16 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position should be reallocated  
17 to the Program Coordinator classification should be affirmed.

18  
19 **Relevant Classification.** Program Coordinator, class code 107N (formerly 2256), and Space  
20 Analyst I, class code 544E (formerly 4633).

21  
22 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification  
23 best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
24 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which  
25 that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a  
26 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a  
27 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the  
28 position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1  
2 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more  
3 than one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific  
4 position, the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and  
5 the position must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the  
6 majority of the position's duties and responsibilities. Dudley v Dept. of Labor and Industries, R-  
7 ALLO-07-007 (2007).

8  
9 The Program Coordinator definition provides that positions allocate to this class "[c]oordinate  
10 the operation of a specialized or technical program."

11  
12 In summary, a program is defined as a specific, specialized area involving discrete, specialized  
13 tasks and components that require work not readily transferable from one program to another.  
14 The duties of Appellant's position fit the definition of a program. Her position performs specific,  
15 specialized and technical work as the primary contact for room scheduling for all facilities on  
16 OC's three campuses.

17  
18 The distinguishing characteristics of the Program Coordinator class state:

19 Under general direction, perform work using knowledge and experience specific  
20 to the program. Exercise independent judgment in interpreting and applying rules  
21 and regulations. Independently advise students, staff, program participants and/or  
22 the public regarding program content, policies, procedures and activities;  
23 select/recommend alternative courses of action and either:

- 24 • Project, monitor, maintain, initiate and/or approve expenditures on program  
25 budgets

26 OR

- 27 • Have extensive involvement with students, staff, the public and/or agencies in  
28 carrying out program activities, and coordinate, schedule and monitor program  
29 activities to determine consistency with program goals.

1 Appellant uses knowledge and experience about the scheduling process, policies, procedures and  
2 room capacities in performing the duties of her position. She exercises independent judgment  
3 and independently advises students, staff, faculty and members of the public regarding room  
4 rentals. She initiates billings and tracks payments for room rentals, but she does not have budget  
5 responsibilities. She does have extensive involvement with staff, faculty and others who use OC  
6 facilities.

7  
8 While the Program Coordinator class appears to cover the scope of Appellant's position, there is  
9 a classification that not only encompasses the scope of her position, but specifically encompasses  
10 the unique functions that she performs.

11  
12 When there is a class that specifically includes a particular assignment and there is a general  
13 classification that has a definition which could also apply to the position, the position should be  
14 allocated to the class that specifically includes the position. [See Mikitik v. Dept's of Wildlife  
15 and Personnel, PAB No. A88-021 (1989)].

16  
17 In this case, the Space Analyst 1 classification specifically includes the majority of the duties and  
18 level of responsibility assigned to Appellant's position.

19  
20 The definition for the Space Analyst 1 classification provides that positions allocated to this  
21 classification "[m]aintain current room and building space inventory for all campus facilities;  
22 prepare classroom and laboratory utilization data and coordinate the updating of reference  
23 plans."

24  
25 Appellant's duties and responsibilities include:

- 26 • maintaining room and space inventory,
- 27 • determining what space is assignable for classes or other events,
- 28 • determining the size of the available space and its capacity,
- 29

- maintaining, updating and utilizing the building and room inventory and the scheduling database,
- maintaining data on classroom usage,
- running reports and providing information to management and other facility staff, and
- conducting inventory of furniture and equipment, including technology capabilities.

The distinguishing characteristics of the Space Analyst 1 classification state: “[p]ositions in this class perform prescribed procedures in space utilization data collection and application in space programs.” Appellant independently interprets and applies policies and procedures for room rentals and usage, collects data on space utilization, and applies the data to determine which space is best equipped to meet needs and capacity of classes or events. In performing her duties, she exercises a high level of independent decision-making authority and raises issues to a higher level only when further clarification is needed.

Appellant’s position fits within the definition and distinguishing characteristics of the Space Analyst 1 classification.

In a hearing on exceptions, the appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has met her burden of proof.

### **ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Candace Alvarez is granted and her position is reallocated to the Space Analyst I classification.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2008.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair

LAURA ANDERSON, Member