STATE OF WISCONSIN	PERSONNEL BOARD
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	*
KENNETH ALSMO,	A.
DUANE BROWN and ADAM KOHLMAN,	
ADAM KORDMAN,	* OFFICIAL
Appellants,	* •
v.	* OPINION AND ORDER
	*
C. K. WETTENGEL, Director,	*
State Bureau of Personnel,	*
	*
Respondent.	*
	*
Case Nos. 73-107, 73-108 and 73-109	*
	*
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	*
Before: Percy L. Julian, Jr., Susan Ste	ininger, Nellie Wilson and William Ahrens

í

OPINION

I. Findings of Fact

Appellants are all permanent employees working under the Division of Mental Hygiene, Central Wisconsin Colony and Training School. As a result of a survey conducted by the Bureau of Personnel in March, 1973, the positions of Appellants Alsmo and Brown were reallocated from Laborer 2 to Laborer and Appellant Kohlman's position was reallocated from Laborer Foreman to Grounds Supervisor 1. Notices of these reallocations were received by Appellants on or about May 15, 1973. Appellants each wrote a letter of appeal dated May 21, 1973 and addressed to Verne Knoll, Deputy Director, Bureau of Personnel. These letters were received by this Board's office on May 24, 1973.

As a result of the Bureau of Personnel survey, the Laborer 1, 2, and 3 series was abolished and substituted by the class series Laborer, Laborer Special, Laborer Lead, and Laborer Supervisor. Furthermore, the positions of Grounds Foreman and Laborer Foreman were abolished and replaced by Grounds Supervisor 1 and 2. Appellants Alsmo and Brown testified that their job duties as of April 29, 1973 were essentially summarized in the identical position descriptions marked and received into evidence as Respondent's Exhibits Numbers 1 and 2. Although not all their duties are included, the ones which occupy the majority of their working time are.

During the warm weather months Appellants Alsmo and Brown work almost exclusively outside, maintaining the lawns and grounds as well as doing minor repair work on the equipment used. They run regular power mowers instead of gang mowers when they mow the lawns.

.

In the winter months Appellants' time is split between snow removal and related tasks and indoor jobs under various craftsmen (painters, maintenance mechanics, and plumbers). In total they spend at most thirty per cent of their time running the type of motorized equipment listed in the Laborer (Special) class specification.

Appellant Kohlman testified that the position description marked and admitted as Respondent's Exhibit Number 5 reflected his job duties as of April 29, 1973. He spent at that time approximately thirty per cent of his time supervising a crew of three men and the rest of his time he performed similar tasks as his subordinates.

The two position descriptions included in Respondent's Exhibit 5, one for 1967 and the other for 1972, are essentially the same. Appellant Kohlman was reallocated to the Labor Foreman position in 1967 as a result of the former position description. He testified, however, that since April, 1973, his duties and responsibilities have changed.

II. Conclusions

The Personnel Board has jurisdiction under Section 16.05 (1) (f), Wisc. Stats., over appeals arising out of reallocations. Further, this appeal was timely filed. Section 16.05 (2), Wisc. Stats. appellants

-2-

5

received notice on or about May 15, 1973, and their letters of appeal were received by this Board's office on May 24, 1973.

The Reallocation of Appellants Alsmo's and Brown's Positions To Laborer Was Proper.

Appellants Alsmo and Brown contend that their positions should have been reallocated from Laborer 2 (SR 3-04) to Laborer (Special) (SR 3-05) instead of to Laborer (SR 3-04). They contend they are performing work which is better classified in the higher position.

The Laborer classification involves routine manual work. The definition in the class specifications of Laborer states in pertinent part:

Employees in this class normally function as either a member of a grounds crew responsible for the maintenance of a grounds facility, or as a member of a transportation crew in an institution.

The Laborer (Special) classification, however, involves specialized laboring work. In pertinent part the class specification definition states:

Employees in this class . . . operate a variety of equipment and motor vehicles used primarily in a grounds maintenance operation . . . Positions at this level also assist in landscaping, in transporting employes and equipment to and from assigned work areas, and may also be assigned a portion of the time to custodial work, snow removal or special events crews. Work at this level is differentiated from that at the Laborer level by the fact that a majority of time is spent in the actual operation of a variety of motorized equipment in a grounds maintenance operation . . . (Emphasis added.)

While it is true that Appellants Alsmo and Brown perform some tasks which fall within the Laborer (Special) classification (for example, snow removal), the majority of them fall within the Laborer classification. By their own testimony the identical

ł

position descriptions introduced as Respondent's Exhibits 1 and 2 summarize their various job duties as of April, 1973. These indicate that Appellants Alsmo and Brown spend considerably less than fifty per cent of their working time operating motorized equipment.

This Board, therefore, finds that the positions of Appellants Alsmo and Brown were properly reallocated form Laborer 2 to Laborer.

The Reallocation of Appellant Kohlman's Position to Grounds Supervisor I Was Proper.

Appellant Kohlman contends that his position should have been reallocated from Laborer Foreman to Grounds Supervisor 2 instead of Grounds Supervisor 1. However, he testified that the 1967 and 1972 position descriptions included in Respondent's Exhibit 5 summarized his duties as of April, 1973.

The definition in the Grounds Supervisor 2 class specification states:

This is a responsible supervisory work at a state operated institution organizing and directing the activities of a crew engaged in semi-skilled and unskilled grounds maintenance tasks. Employes in this class are responsible for supervising the construction, maintenance and repair of secondary roads, parking areas, athletic and other facilities as well as planting and maintaining lawns, trees, shrubs, and flower beds.

On the other hand, the Grounds Supervisor 1 class specification

states in pertinent part:

This is responsible supervisory grounds work. Employes in this class supervise the activities of a crew engaged in semiskilled and unskilled grounds maintenance tasks associated with lawns, parking lots and snow removal. Positions allocated to this class may also serve as line assistant or be responsible for a segment of a complex grounds operation. Positions at this level are distinguished from those at the 2 level by the size of operation and variety of grounds activities supervised. (Emphasis added.) The position of Grounds Supervisor 2 contemplates a broader area of supervision than Appellant now performs. It would usually include a fairly large crew, a broad listing of tasks, and a deeper involvement in each job. For example, a Grounds Supervisor 2 would not only supervise the planting and maintenance of grounds but would also be expected to contribute his ideas on the actual landscaping.

The 1967 and 1972 position descriptions do not reflect that Appellant Kohlman has this type of input. He does claim that since that time he has been required to plan and lay-out various facilities, for example, a small golf course for retarded children.

The issue here, however, is whether the April, 1973 reallocation was proper. If Appellant Kohlman's duties and responsibilities have substantially changed since that time, he should file a reclassification request so that he might be properly classified. If such request is made, this Board asks that the Director handle it as expediously as possible. This Board, however, finds Appellant was properly reallocated in April, 1973, from Laborer Foreman to Grounds Supervisor 1.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the decision of the Director with respect to the April, 1973 reallocations of Appellants Alsmo, Brown and Kohlman be affirmed.

Dated this 3 day of

-5-