

STATE OF OHIO
STATE PERSONNEL BOARD OF REVIEW

SANDRA TOLBERT
and
LAURIE L. MAHER,

Case Nos.: 05-REC-01-0022
05-REC-01-0023

Appellants,

v.

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY,

Appellee

ORDER


This matter came on for consideration on the Report and Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge in the above-captioned appeals.

After a thorough examination of the record and a review of the Report and Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge, along with any objections to this report which have been timely and properly filed, the Board hereby adopts the Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge.

Wherefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the determination of Appellee that Appellants' positions are properly classified as Help Desk Consultant – Physical Plant, classification number BG53801C, be **AFFIRMED**, pursuant to O.R.C. 124.03 and O.R.C. 124.14.



Tracy – Aye
Lumpe – Aye
Booth – Aye



Roger W. Tracy, *Chairman*

CERTIFICATION


The State of Ohio, State Personnel Board of Review, ss:

I, the undersigned clerk of the State Personnel Board of Review, hereby certify that the foregoing is (the original/a true copy of the original) order or resolution of the State Personnel Board of Review as entered upon the Board's Journal, a copy of which has been forwarded to the parties this date, May 9, 2006.



Diane Mills
Clerk

NOTE: Please see the reverse side of this Order or the attachment to this Order for information regarding your appeal rights.



**STATE OF OHIO
STATE PERSONNEL BOARD OF REVIEW**

Sandra Tolbert and Laura L. Maher,

Case Nos.: 05-REC-01-0022
05-REC-01-0023

Appellants

v.

March 10, 2006

Bowling Green State University

Elaine K. Stevenson
Hearing Officer

Appellee

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

To the Honorable State Personnel Board of Review:

This cause came on for consideration upon Appellants' timely filing of their appeals from the results of the job audits performed on their respective positions. A record hearing in this matter was held on September 28, 2005. Present at the hearing were Appellants, Sandra Tolbert and Laura L. Maher, who appeared *pro se*. Appellee was present through its designee, Marsha Serio, Labor Relations Manager.

The jurisdiction of the State Personnel Board of Review over the subject matter of this proceeding was established pursuant to sections 124.03 and 124.14 of the Ohio Revised Code.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In 2004, Appellant Tolbert and Appellant Maher requested job audits of their positions. Both Appellants held the classification of Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant at the time of their audit requests. Appellee determined that Appellants' positions were properly classified as Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant, classification number BG53801C.

At record hearing, Appellants stated that their job duties are the same and agreed that Laurie Maher would testify for both of them regarding their job duties. Appellant Maher testified that she has been employed by Appellee since 1999. Appellant Maher testified that Appellants' immediate supervisor is Robert Hayward, whose position is classified as Director of Administrator Services of Facilities Services. Appellant Maher stated that she and Appellant Tolbert work in the Office of Facilities Services.

Appellant Maher testified that she and Appellant Tolbert are responsible for operating the help desk in the Office of Facilities Services. Appellant Maher testified that she and Appellant Tolbert spend approximately seventy-five percent of their work time operating an eight-line switchboard, processing maintenance requests and work orders, processing building key and alarm requests, and processing security issuances. Appellant Maher indicated that she and Appellant Tolbert utilize the College and University Financial System (CUFS) to perform their job duties. Appellant Maher indicated that she and Appellant Tolbert also enter and update key data. Appellant Maher explained that they ensure that key requests and forms are properly prepared and entered into the computer for the approximately one hundred departments on campus. Appellant Maher stated that key audits include processing charges to each department for lost keys and lost alarm codes. Appellant Maher further stated that she and Appellant Tolbert process purchase orders and requisitions for the Office of Facilities Services. Appellant Maher indicated that she and Appellant Tolbert supervise student employees. She noted that the number of student employees in the Office of Facilities Services fluctuates from one to five.

Appellant Maher stated that she spends approximately five percent of her work time serving as back-up to the Network Administrator for the Office of Facilities Services. Appellant Maher indicated that Appellant Tolbert also spends approximately five percent of her work time serving as back-up to the Facilities Services' Network Administrator. Appellant Maher explained that the Office of Facilities Services has its own server because all campus departments use the services of Facilities Services. Appellant Maher noted that, except for the Office of Facilities Services, university departments are under the campus-wide network maintained by the Office of Information Technology Services.

Upon further questioning, Appellant Maher stated that the Facilities Services' Network Administrator generally works from 8:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. Appellant Maher stated that she and Appellant Tolbert serve as back-up to the Network Administrator from 2:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m., and on days when the administrator is absent. Appellant Maher stated that she and Appellant Tolbert handle problems with the Facilities Services' computer database, such as resetting passwords and re-booting the server if it goes down.

Appellant Maher stated that, in July 2005, she was assigned the job duty of performing budget fund transfers related to billing issues of the Office of Facilities Services. She indicated that she spends approximately ten percent of her work time performing fund transfers in CUFS. Appellant Tolbert stated that, in July 2005, she was assigned the job duty of processing electronic department charges for items such as building keys, signs, and grounds services. Appellant Tolbert indicated that she spends approximately thirty percent of her work time processing electronic charges in CUFS.

Robert Roger Hayward testified that he has been employed by Appellee for approximately twenty-five years. Mr. Hayward stated that he is the Director of Administrative Services of Facilities Services. Mr. Hayward confirmed that Appellant Maher accurately described the job duties performed by Appellants. Mr. Hayward noted that Appellants are responsible for ordering supplies and processing invoice payments and other accounting documents in CUFS. Mr. Hayward stated that Appellants rely on their excellent interpersonal skills in handling the approximately 10,000 work requests that the Office of Facilities Services receives each year. He noted that Appellants are continually multi-tasking. Mr. Hayward confirmed that Appellants perform key audits and maintain the database related to key audits and other security issues. Mr. Hayward also noted that Appellants follow-up on issues related to the maintenance and security of campus buildings.

Upon further questioning, Mr. Hayward acknowledged that Appellants perform all the duties listed in the class concept of the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification. He further acknowledged that the series purpose of the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification describes the primary purpose of Appellants' positions in the Office of Facilities Services.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on the testimony presented and evidence admitted at record hearing, and the entirety of the record, I make the following findings of fact:

1. Appellants Maher and Tolbert are employed by Appellee in its Office of Facilities Services. The Office of Facilities Services is responsible for maintaining all campus facilities. Appellants' positions are classified as Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant, classification number BG53801C.
2. The primary purpose of Appellants' positions is to serve as the central information link between the Office of Facilities Services and the approximately one hundred university departments. Appellants' primary job duties involve facilitating maintenance and repair requests and work orders. Appellants process various types of purchasing documents, process key orders and perform key audits, and perform other related clerical and office tasks as assigned.
3. Appellants spend approximately seventy-five percent of their work time operating the Office of Facilities Services' eight-line switchboard. Appellants answer incoming calls, direct information requests and process incoming maintenance and work orders. Appellants handle approximately 10,000 maintenance and work order

requests each year. Appellants process and update information regarding proper key issuance and alarm keys. Appellants enter and update information related to key issuances and alarm keys. Appellants also process various types of purchasing documents, including purchase orders, requisitions, and invoices. Appellants utilize the College and University Financial System (CUFS) to perform their job responsibilities.

4. Appellee's Office of Information Technology Services is responsible for providing technical support for Appellee's campus computer operating systems.
5. The Office of Facilities Services houses its own server and employs a Network Administrator to handle its server issues. The Facilities Services Network Administrator generally works from 8:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. From 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., and on days the network administrator is absent, Appellants serve as back-up to the network administrator. Typically, Appellants handle computer-related issues such as resetting passwords and occasionally re-booting the server. Appellant Maher spends approximately five percent of her work time acting as back-up to the Network Services Administrator and Appellant Tolbert spends approximately five percent of her work time acting as back-up to the Network Services Administrator.
6. In July 2005, Appellant Maher was assigned the job duty of performing budget fund transfers in CUFS. Such fund transfers are related to billing issues of the Office of Facilities Services. Appellant Maher spends approximately ten percent of her work time performing this job duty.
7. In July 2005, Appellant Tolbert was assigned the job duty of processing electronic department charges for items such as building keys, signs, and grounds services. Appellant Tolbert spends approximately twenty percent of her work time processing electronic department charges in CUFS.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Pursuant to R.C. 124.03(A), this Board is empowered to hear appeals of employees in the classified state service from final decisions of appointing authorities or the director of administrative services relative to, *inter alia*, refusal of the director of administrative services, or anybody authorized to perform the director's functions, to reclassify an employee's position, with or without a job audit under R.C. 124.14(D). R.C. 124.14(D)(2) provides that the Board is to consider anew reclassifications and may order reclassification of an employee's position to such appropriate classification as the facts and evidence warrant. The Board's decision must be consistent with the applicable classification specifications. (See R.C. 124.03(A))

The first classification considered was that Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant, classification number BG53801C.

The Class Concept for the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification states:

Under general supervision receives and distributes inquiries and requests for maintenance, issues keys, creates purchasing documents and invoices billings through University computerized financial system, operates department switchboard and two-way radio program, and performs other related clerical tasks.

The Series Purpose for the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification states that the purpose of this job classification is to serve as a central information link between Physical Plant, the university community and outside vendors. An incumbent works under the direction of the Assistant Director for Administration, Physical Plant and assists in the areas of maintenance and repair requests, work order processing, purchasing and invoicing, key orders, operating the department's switchboard, and performing other related clerical and office tasks as assigned.

The evidence established that the Office of Facilities Services is responsible for the maintenance of all campus buildings. The evidence further established that Appellants work in the Office of Facilities Services.

The testimony presented and evidence admitted demonstrated that Appellants perform all of the duties listed in the class concept for the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification. Specifically, Appellants receive and distribute inquiries and requests for maintenance, issue keys, create purchasing documents and invoice billings through CUFS, operate the office's eight-line switchboard, and perform clerical and office tasks related to the Office of Facilities Services. The evidence also established that the primary purpose of Appellants' positions is to serve as the central information link between the Office of Facilities Services and the approximately one-hundred university departments. Appellants' primary job functions involve facilitating maintenance and repair requests and work orders, processing purchasing documents, processing key orders and performing key audits, and performing other related clerical and office tasks as assigned.

The testimony presented and evidence admitted at record hearing further established that Appellants perform substantially all of the illustrative duties listed in the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification specification, including receiving and

processing maintenance requests and work orders, preparing purchasing documents and invoices, entering and updating key data, and operating the switchboard. Appellants spend approximately seventy-five percent of their work time performing the above-mentioned job duties.

Accordingly, based on the above-analysis of Appellants' job responsibilities and the function statement and illustrative job duties described by the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification specification, I find that this classification precisely describes Appellants' job responsibilities.

Although the record established that Appellants' job duties are accurately described by the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification specification, Appellants assert that they have been assigned three additional job duties that are not described by this classification specification.

First, Appellants act as back-up to the Office of Facilities Services' Network Services Administrator, who is responsible for maintaining the Facilities Services' server. The Network Services Administrator generally works from 8:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. From 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., and on days the Network Administrator is absent, Appellants handle computer-related issues, such as resetting passwords and occasionally re-booting the server. Appellant Maher spends approximately five percent of her work time acting as back-up to the Network Services Administrator and Appellant Tolbert spends approximately five percent of her work time acting as back-up to the Network Services Administrator.

Second, Appellant Maher performs budget fund transfers in CUFS. Such fund transfers are related to billing issues of the Office of Facilities Services. Appellant Maher spends approximately ten percent of her work time performing this job duty.

Third, Appellant Tolbert processes electronic department billings in CUFS. This job duty involves billing departments electronically for items such as building keys, signs, and grounds services. These are services provided by the Office of Facilities Services. Appellant Tolbert spends approximately twenty percent of her work time performing this job duty.

Based upon the three additional job duties discussed above, the following classifications were considered: Help Desk Consultant - Computer Services, classification number BG64102C; Administrative Assistant 1, classification number 63121C; and Business Services Officer, classification number 63311C.

The primary function of the Help Desk Consultant - Computer Services classification is to provide first-level problem solving assistance related to computer help desk

environments. A review of the illustrative job duties and major work characteristics listed in the Help Desk Consultant - Computer Services classification specification indicates that the primary function of an incumbent in this classification is to provide technical assistance for computer operating systems throughout the university.

The evidence established that Appellee's Office of Information Technology Services is responsible for providing technical support for Appellee's various campus-wide computer operating systems. The evidence further established that Appellants are not assigned to the Office of Information Technology Services, nor are Appellants responsible for providing technical support for computer operating systems throughout the university. It is noted, however, that Appellants perform some of the illustrative duties listed in Help Desk Consultant - Computer Services classification specification, such as processing password cards and updating computer database. Although Appellants perform some of the illustrative job duties listed in the Help Desk Consultant - Computer Services classification specification, Appellants' responsibilities with respect to computer operating systems are limited to the Office of Facilities Services' server. Moreover, it should be noted that each Appellant spends only five percent of her work time acting as back-up to the Network Administrator for the Office of Facilities Services. It should also be noted that the illustrative duties listed in the Help Desk Consultant - Computer Services classification specification do not describe any of Appellants' primary job responsibilities, such as receiving and processing maintenance requests and work orders, preparing purchasing documents and invoices, and operating the department switchboard.

Therefore, because the Help Desk Consultant - Computer Services classification does not provide an accurate description of Appellants' job responsibilities, this classification is not appropriate for Appellants' positions.

The next classification considered was that of Administrative Assistant 1. The function of this classification is to assist in program direction by relieving superior of routine administrative duties. The rank one illustrative duties of this classification require an incumbent to research and analyze materials, information, and programs, and to provide information and advice to assist administrator in decision making, and to make recommendations in developing new procedures and programs.

The testimony presented and evidence admitted at record hearing failed to establish that the function of Appellants' positions is to assist in program direction by relieving superior of routine administrative duties. Appellants are not responsible for researching and analyzing information and programs, nor are Appellants responsible for assisting their administrator in decision making. As discussed previously, Appellants' primary function is to serve as the central information link between the Office of Facilities Services and the university departments. Appellants' primary job duties involve processing maintenance and

repair requests and work orders, processing purchasing documents, processing key orders, performing key audits, and performing other related clerical and office tasks as assigned. The record established that Appellants' primary job duties are not the duties of a superior that have been delegated to Appellants; rather, these job duties are directly assigned to the help desk positions occupied by Appellants. It is noted that although Appellants perform some office tasks described by the Administrative Assistant 1 classification specification, such as processing bills for payment and purchasing supplies, these job duties are directly related to the functions of the Office of Facilities Services and are job duties described by the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification specification.

Therefore, because the Administrative Assistant 1 classification specification does not accurately reflect the function of Appellants' positions in the Office of Facilities Services, this classification is not appropriate for Appellants' positions.


The final classification considered was that of Business Services Officer. The Business Services Officer classification requires that an incumbent perform and coordinate a variety of support functions of an agency or institution. A review of the illustrative duties listed in this classification specification indicates that this classification contemplates the coordination and performance of a variety of fiscal functions and personnel functions.

Although Appellants are involved in performing some fiscal functions described by the Business Services Officer classification specification, this classification specification does not completely describe any of Appellants' primary job responsibilities, such as operating the department switchboard, processing key orders, and processing maintenance requests and work orders. In considering both the function statement and illustrative duties described by the Business Services Officer classification specification, I find that this classification does not provide the most accurate description of Appellants' job responsibilities. Therefore, the Business Services Officer classification is not the most appropriate classification for Appellants' positions.

In summary, I find that the evidence established that Appellants' job duties are most accurately described by the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification specification. I further find that Appellants' job responsibilities with respect to fund transfers and electronic billing may properly be considered to fall within the billing duties described by the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification specification. The five percent of work time that each Appellant spends providing technical support for the Office of Facilities Services, does not, by itself, support a finding that Appellants' positions are not properly classified.

RECOMMENDATION

Therefore, because the primary job duties performed by Appellants fall squarely within the class concept and illustrative job duties set forth in the Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant classification specification, I respectfully **RECOMMEND** that Appellee's determination that Appellants' positions are most properly classified as Help Desk Consultant - Physical Plant, classification number BG53801C, be **AFFIRMED**.


Elaine K. Stevenson
Hearing Officer

:eks