BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ANDREW CAVENESS, Appellant, vs. CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	CASE NO. R-ALLO-13-010 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came before the Personnel Resources Board, JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair; DJ MARK, Vice Chair; and NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Member, for a hearing on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated June 11, 2013. The hearing was held on August 21, 2013.

Appearances. Appellant Andrew Caveness was present and represented himself. Steven Sarchet, Human Resource Representative, represented Respondent Central Washington University (CWU).

Background. Appellant is employed as a Food Service Supervisor 2 in CWU's Dining Services. The Dining Services is part of CWU's Finance and Auxiliary Services. Due to an anticipated increase in Appellant's responsibilities (the addition of the Connection Card program), the Dining Services Director completed a position description for Appellant's position and asked that the position be reallocated. On August 16, 2012, CWU's human resources staff notified Appellant that his position had been reallocated to the Program Support Supervisor 1 classification. The reallocation was based on the assignment of new duties and the position review initiated by management.

On September 6, 2012, the Office of the State Human Resources Director received Appellant's request for a director's review of CWU's allocation determination. Appellant asked that his position be reallocated to either the Food Service Manager 3 or the Program Manager B

classification. By letter dated June 11, 2013, the director's designee determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Program Support Supervisor 1 classification.

On June 25, 2013, Appellant filed exceptions to the Board. In his exceptions, Appellant asked that his position be reallocated to the Program Manager B classification. However, during the hearing on his exceptions, Appellant indicated that he was requesting reallocation to the Program Manager B or the Food Service Manager 3 classification. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

In summary, Appellant's position manages the day-to-day operations of the Connection Card program, the Cat-C Store which is the campus convenience store, and four espresso bars. Appellant has supervisory responsibility for two classified staff and approximately 50 student employees. Appellant reports to and performs his work under the direction of a Food Service Manager 4 within Dining Services. Appellant's supervisor reports to the Director of Dining Services.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. Appellant argues that the director's designee failed to understand the breadth and scope of his job duties and that reallocation of his position to the Program Support Supervisor 1 classification failed to provide sufficient compensation for his added duties and responsibilities. Appellant asserts that prior to the Connection Card program being assigned to him it had been assigned to an employee whose sole job was management of the program and whose position was also allocated to the Program Support Supervisor l. Appellant contends that with the addition of responsibility for the Connection Card program, his duties and responsibilities are much greater than the previous employee and asserts that he should be compensated accordingly. Appellant asserts that his scope of work is greater than merely overseeing day-to-day activities. Appellant argues that he does not assist or seek approval of the director but rather he has total control and responsibility of the programs. Appellant contends that the Connections Card program, which comprises a lot of his time, is a division of a major administrative department. Appellant argues that he has a higher work load, more responsibility and

generates more money than any other food service manager at CWU and that his compensation does not reflect his added workload. Appellant contends that he performs all of the typical work described in the Program Manager classes and that he exceeds the desirable qualifications for the classes. Appellant argues that his position fits within the Program Manager A class and rises to the level of the Program Manager B and should be reallocated accordingly.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent asserts that at the time of the initial request to reallocated Appellant's position, the Connection Card program comprised approximately 35 percent of Appellant's duties and responsibilities and that overall, his duties and responsibilities best fit within the Program Support Supervisor 1 classification. Respondent contends that Appellant's position did not fit within a Food Service Manager class because his programs are not primarily responsible for preparation and service of food. Respondent further contends that at the time of the reallocation request, Appellant's duties and responsibilities did not meet the scope of work encompassed by the Program Manager classes. Respondent argues that Appellant oversees programs that function under Dining Services and that Dining Services is within a larger administrative department. Respondent acknowledges that allotment of Appellant's time to the various programs and his duties and responsibilities may have changed since the initial reallocation but continues to assert that at the time of the initial request, Appellant's position best fit the Program Support Supervisor 1 class.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Program Support Supervisor 1 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Program Support Supervisor 1, class code 107P, and Program Manager B, class code 107S.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. <u>A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which</u>

that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994). (Emphasis added.)

It is undisputed that the volume of Appellant's work increased with the addition of the Connection Card program. However, as stated above, a position review is not a measurement of volume of work. In addition, Appellant argues that the increase in his work warrants an increase in salary. However, salary inequity is not an allocation criterion and should not be considered when determining the appropriate allocation of a position. See Sorensen v Depts. Of Social and Health Services and Personnel, PAB Case No. A94-020 (1995).

While Appellant's position includes aspects of food service oversight, the preparation and service of food is not a primary responsibility of Appellant's position. Therefore allocation to a Food Service Manager class is not appropriate.

Appellant argues that he performs all of the typical work described in the Program Manager classes and that he exceeds the desirable qualifications for the classes. However, typical work statements are not allocating criteria. Rather they provide guidance on the level of work typically found in the various classes within the series. In addition, desirable qualifications are not allocating criteria. The following standards, in descending order, are primary considerations in allocating positions:

a) Category concept (if one exists).
b) Definition or basic function of the class.
c) Distinguishing characteristics of a class.
d) Class series concept, definition/basic function, and distinguishing characteristics of other classes in the series in question.

The definition for the Program Manager B class states:

> Supervise a division of a major administrative department, operating unit or program undertaking relieving the senior official of operating and administrative detail. Plan, coordinate and implement all functions required by the activity.

The distinguishing characteristics for the Program Manager A and B class state, in part:

> Program Managers administer, supervise, direct and advise on activities involved in providing an essential management service within the institution. They are responsible for advising and assisting, with minimal direction, the senior official and other administrators in the organization on matters pertaining to the program. The primary purpose of these positions is to achieve the goals and objectives of the program by providing, obtaining, and/or coordinating activities as they affect the institution.
>
> Positions in this class involve a wide scope of complex duties and responsibilities in the management of a program which may involve a combination of two or more of the following services: Project management, funds management, contract administration, management analysis, property management, space management, program management, budget planning, public information, faculty, administrative, classified staff and student services administration, personnel administration, and staff supervision. Program Managers exercise independent judgement, and have been delegated decision-making authority. . . .
>
> Program manager at the "A" level are typically first-line supervisors, and are characterized by their total responsibility for a program or management services to an administrative supervisor.
>
> Program Managers at the "B" level are typically second- or third-line supervisors and are distinguished by their responsibility for total control of a program for a particular academic or administrative unit.

Appellant does not supervise a division of a major administrative department. Rather, he supervises programs within dining services. Further, Appellant reports to a Food Service Manager 4 who reports to the Director of Dining Services. Dining Services is an entity within Finance and Auxiliary Services. Appellant's position does not meet the scope and breadth of responsibility envisioned by the Program Manager classes.

The definition for the Program Support Supervisor 1 class states:

> Supervise support staff involved in the performance of duties associated with a highly specialized or technical program(s). Coordinate the operation of a

> specialized or technical program(s). Act as liaison between the program and outside organizations.

The distinguishing characteristics for the Program Support Supervisor 1 class states:

> With delegated authority, interview and recommend selection of applicants, train new employees, assign and schedule work, act upon leave requests, conduct annual performance evaluations and recommend disciplinary action.
>
> Under general direction, perform work using knowledge and experience specific to the program. Devise and implement new procedures and exercise independent judgment in interpreting and applying rules and regulations. Independently advise students, staff, program participants and/or the public regarding program content, policies, procedures and activities; select/recommend alternative courses of action; and either:
>
> - Project, monitor, maintain, initiate and/or approve expenditures on program budgets
>
> <u>OR</u>
>
> - Have extensive involvement with students, staff, the public and/or agencies in carrying out program activities, and coordinate, schedule and monitor program activities to determine consistency with program goals.

We agree with the director's designee that there is overlap between the Program Support Supervisor 1 and 2 classes and that the duties and responsibilities of the Connection Card program may have evolved since they were initially added to Appellant's position. However, this position review is based on the information available in August 2012. At that time, the Connection Card program was not envisioned to comprise a majority of Appellant's overall responsibilities. The duties and responsibilities described by Appellant' supervisor in the initial reallocation request best fit within the Program Support Supervisor 1 classification.

However, based on the arguments presented during the hearing on Appellant's exceptions, we strongly encourage CWU to conduct a review of Appellant's current duties and responsibilities. In addition, if Appellant feels that his duties have changed since the initial reallocation request, he may request a review of his current duties and responsibilities in accordance with CWU's procedures and the civil service rules.

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.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions is denied and the director's determination dated June 11, 2013, is affirmed.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2013.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____
JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair

_____
DJ MARK, Vice Chair

_____
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Member