1	OFFICIAL
2	OFFICIAL
3	STATE OF WISCONSIN STATE PERSONNEL BOARD
4	**************
5	MOLLY KEALY,
6	Appellant, OPINION & ORDER
7	v. Case No. 74-38
8	C. K. WETTENGEL, Director State Bureau of Personnel,
9	Respondent.
10	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
11	
12	BEFORE: WILLIAM AHRENS, Chairman PERCY L. JULIAN, JR., Member
13	SUSAN STEININGER, Member JOHN A. SERPE, Member
14	The Appellant has appealed a decision of the
15	Director finding that she was not qualified to take the
16	examination for Parole Board Member because she lacked the
17	necessary training and experience requirements as defined by
18	the class specifications; specifically the issue in this
19	case is whether the Appellant has the necessary training and
20	experience required and more specifically whether her law
21	degree and legal training, including work as a Clerk for a
22	judge meet the training and experience requirements with
23	respect to administrative, supervisory or upper level
24	consultative experience in social service programs or programs
25	primarily oriented to the needs or problems of adult or
	juvenile offenders.

۰,

ł

ţ

1

1 2 We find that the Appellant is a Social Worker 2 3 employed by the Division of Corrections at the Wisconsin 4 School for Boys at Wales. 5 We find that from 1948 to 1951 she was a Law 6 Clerk to Judge Julius J. Hoffman. United States District 7 Judge for the Northern District of Illinois. 8 We find that she is a graduate of the University of Chicago School of Law. 9 We find that by stipulation the parties have 10 agreed that she meets the minimum educational requirements as 11 provided by the specifications and the six years of progres-12 sively responsible relevant work experience. 13 We find that the work experience that she had 14 with Judge Julius Hoffman is not sufficient to meet the 15 training and experience requirements provided by the job 16 specifications. Further, we find that her other experience, 17 either professional or voluntary, is not sufficient to meet 18 the training and experience requirements provided by the 19 specifications. 20 We find that her professional and work experience 21 is not the "equivalent training and experience" required by 22 the specifications. 23 We find that with respect to Appellant's legal 24 education and particularly with respect to her work experience 25

2 .

with Judge Hoffman that this occurred from 1948 to 1951 and in our judgment the time gap involved in that training and experience is sufficient to tip the scales against Appellant's contention that it meets the training and experience requirements for the present Parole Board Member position or positions.

Further, we find that Appellant has failed to 8 sustain her burden of proof with respect to the relatedness 9 to the field of social service of her work with Judge Julius 10 There was no evidence that Appellant participated Hoffman. 11 in her work with Judge Hoffman in any way that would suggest 12 comparability between that work and the training and experience 13 required for admission to the examination of Parole Board 14 Member.

15 Appellant contends that previously she was admitted to take the examination for Parole Board Member prior 16 to the adoption of the specifications presently in effect. 17 She further contends that she completed the examination and 18 was one of the top three candidates completing that examination. 19 although because of the application of veterans preference 20 points she was not considered for the position. She contends that because of her previous admission and qualification she 22 should be admitted to the present examination.

We believe that because of the change in specifications Appellant's argument is without merit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

21

23

24

25

3

We further believe that Appellant's application must be treated on its face along with all other applications and must be weighed on its present merits rather than upon some asserted past success. Accordingly on the basis of the entire record $\mathbf{7}$ herein, we unanimously find and conclude that Appellant is not eligible to take the examination for Parole Board Member and the decision of the Director is affirmed or sustained. Date: May 17, 1974. STATE PERSONNEL BOARD liam Ahrens, Cha $\mathbf{24}$

4.