

March 26, 2008

TO: Teresa Parsons  
Director's Review Program Supervisor

FROM: Kristie Wilson  
Director's Review Investigator

RE: **Matthew "Nate" Andrews v. South Puget Sound Community College  
Allocation Review Request No. ALLO-07-040**

On March 18, 2008, a Director's Review meeting took place at the Department of Personnel (DOP), 2828 Capitol Boulevard, Olympia, Washington, concerning the allocation of Nate Andrews's position. Present during the meeting were you, Debbie Brookman Washington State Federation for State Employees (WFSE), Nate Andrews, over the telephone Patricia Hutcherson Ph.D. SPSCC, and myself.

### **Investigator's Finding**

My review finds that Mr. Andrews's position should be reallocated to the Custodian 4 classification.

### **Background**

On February 11, 2007 Mr. Andrews filed a Position Review Request form to SPSCC Human Resource Office requesting that his position be allocated to the class of Custodian 4. Patricia Hutcherson, Ph.D. SPSCC Human Resource Office reviewed this request and issued her decision by letter dated April 27, 2007. She felt that Mr. Andrews was performing his duties at the appropriate level.

On May 24, 2007 WFSE, on behalf of Mr. Andrews, filed a request to the Department of Personnel for a Director's Review.

### **Mr. Andrews' Perspective**

During the review both Mr. Andrews and Ms. Brookman asserted that the allocation decision was incorrect. Mr. Andrews states that he supervises 17 employees. He has authority to approve leave requests, sign performance development plans (PDP), direct work, and quality control. Mr. Andrews states that although there is a Custodian 5 that shares these responsibilities, he has authority to perform these duties.

### **SPSCC's Rationale**

SPSCC asserts that Mr. Andrews only signed one PDP; otherwise he only gave input to the Custodian 5. SPSCC also states that when an issue arises with an employee both Mr. Andrews and the Custodian 5 discuss with SPSCC HR Office and that the Custodian 5 does most of the talking. SPSCC felt that based on observations that Mr. Andrews does not take the lead on issues and therefore felt he was correctly allocated.

### **Reason and Basis for Finding**

The definition for Custodian 4 states:

Positions in this level supervise at least two lower level Custodians or a total custodial/housekeeping program for an agency/facility/institution with ten or more assigned personnel performing custodial/housekeeping duties. Positions may manage a custodial, housekeeping, or general maintenance program for a State agency, facility or institution. Positions may also train subordinates and perform administrative tasks such as recommending budget levels for supplies and equipment, staffing levels, staff training requirements, and department policies and procedures.

Mr. Andrews's position supervises 17 employees and has authority to sign employees' PDPs and leave requests. SPSCC is not disputing his supervisory experience. Although Mr. Andrews signed only one PDP, it does not deny the fact that he has authority to sign PDPs for the other Custodian 1 positions he supervises. Mr. Andrews indicated that some of his duties include:

- Training employees
- Evaluating their work
- Counseling on work habits
- Assisting with budget control
- Providing written inspections

- Authorizing purchase of equipment

Mr. Andrews is a supervisor of 17 staff with supervisory authority. Therefore, Mr. Andrews clearly falls within this definition.

The definition for Custodian 3 states:

Positions in this level lead and/or supervise assigned personnel performing various custodial and housekeeping duties. Regularly assigns, instructs and checks the work of others. Interviews and recommends selection of applicants, conducts training, assigns and schedules work, acts upon leave requests, conducts annual performance evaluations and recommends disciplinary action.

Because of Mr. Andrews's authority and staff size he shares responsibility for, he does not fit within the Custodian 3 definition.

After reviewing the documentation and comments from all parties with regard to Mr. Andrews's assigned duties and responsibilities, I conclude the Custodian 4 classification best describes his position.

### **Appeal Rights**

RCW 41.06.170 governs the right to appeal. RCW 41.06.170(4) provides, in relevant part, the following:

An employee incumbent in a position at the time of its allocation or reallocation, or the agency utilizing the position, may appeal the allocation or reallocation to the Washington personnel resources board. Notice of such appeal must be filed in writing within thirty days of the action from which appeal is taken.

The address for the Personnel Resources Board is 2828 Capitol Blvd., P.O. Box 40911, Olympia, Washington, 98504-0911.

If no further action is taken, the Director's determination becomes final.

c: Nate Andrews  
Patricia Hutcherson, Ph.D. SPSCC  
Lisa Skriletz, DOP

Enclosure: List of Exhibits