

U.S. mail. They also pick up regular U.S. mail at about half of the stops and deliver it to the U.S. postal station adjoining the campus. They do not sort or process this mail.

In the van, one employe drives and makes deliveries and pickups while the other employe sits on a swivel seat and sorts the mail picked up at each stop, and either bundles or boxes the mail to be delivered at the next stop. At the larger stops and at multiple stops, both employes make deliveries and pickups. The mid-day switch of duties is done primarily because of eye strain encountered in reading addresses and because of the physical exertion of the variety of constant movement encountered in sorting the mail while the van is in motion, which requires the exchange of duties to maintain efficiency.

As between the two positions on the vans, neither exercises lead worker authority, although this is included in the Shipping and Mailing Clerk 3 class specifications and is expected by management of that position. Both employes on the van make suggestions to each other concerning the operation of the mail handling system and generally cooperate in performing their duties. The permanent employes in these positions have found through experience that this system is more efficacious than a system where lead work functions are performed by one employe. The employes have frequent contacts with other employes in the various mail rooms on campus as they make their rounds. They provide specific instructions on mail processing to new student employes. They bring mail processing errors to the attention of the permanent employes, usually Mail Clerk 2's, in the mail room, with the understanding that the employes on the van will not accept the mail unless the errors are corrected.

The class specifications for Motor Vehicle Operator 1 (PR 3-05) include the language "responsible manual labor in the operation of state owned vehicles" where employes typically "operate and maintain a motor truck."

The Shipping and Mailing Clerk 1 level (PR 3-04) is identified in the class specifications as:

". . . routine manual and clerical work in a shipping and mailing operation. Under close supervision or guidance, employes in this class perform routine mail handling and processing, pick-up and delivery of inter-office or campus mail, and assist in the shipping and mailing of letters, packages, parcels and other materials."

The Shipping and Mailing Clerk 2 level (PR 3-05) is identified in the class specifications as:

". . . lead work guiding a small, relatively simple shipping and mailing room or campus mail operation . . . leading workers in routine mail handling and processing, pick-up and delivery of inter-office or campus mail and shipping and mailing letters, packages, parcels and other materials."

The Shipping and Mailing Clerk 3 level (PR 3-06) is identified in the specifications as "responsible lead work in a large and/or complex shipping and mailing operation."

Conclusions of Law

As was noted above, the stipulated issue in this case is whether the appellants' positions are more properly classified as Motor Vehicle Operator 1 or Shipping and Mailing Clerk 3. A comparison between the duties and responsibilities of the positions and the class specifications reveal that while the Motor Vehicle Operator 1 classification is not a perfect fit it is more appropriate than Shipping and Mailing Clerk 3. The appellants' positions function 50% in "responsible manual labor in the operation of state owned vehicles." The other 50% clearly falls within the Shipping and Mailing Clerk 1 level, which is at a lower salary range than Motor Vehicle Operator 1, involving routine mail handling and processing, pick-up and delivery of inter-office or campus mail, and assistance in shipping and mailing of letters, packages, parcels and

other materials. The record in this case does not support a conclusion that the appellants function as lead workers in a large and/or complex shipping and mailing operation.

On this record, we conclude that the definition of "lead worker" urged by respondent is appropriate:

"An employe responsible for the guidance, training, work review, instruction on procedure, and general assistance to one or more employes in his work unit." (Board's Exhibit 5)

Appellants' mutually cooperative functioning with the other employe on the vans certainly does not fall within the categorization of lead work. It is further concluded that the type of input into and limited control over the functions of the mail room employes does not qualify as "lead work." On this record it is concluded that lead work involves an ongoing responsibility for the employe or employes being lead beyond the relatively limited and specialized functions performed by these appellants. Many employes performing work of a relatively specialized nature that interacts with a number of units will provide some guidance to, and review of, other employes, but this does not necessarily create a lead worker relationship. Compare NLRB v. Southern Bleachery & Print Works, Inc., 257 F. 2d 235, 239 (4th Cir. 1958), defining lead worker as one "who exercises the control of a skilled worker over less capable employes"

This case presents the anomalous but not altogether unusual situation where the appellants perform exactly the same duties as their partners on the vans but are classified at a lower level and are paid less. On paper their colleagues, whose positions are classified as Shipping and Mailing Clerks 3, should be acting as lead workers. In practice, this kind of working relationship has proved unworkable and has not been followed.¹ It is possible that these Shipping and


¹The bureau of personnel's Chief of the Classification, Compensation, and Surveys Section testified that these Shipping and Mailing Clerks 3 would be considered to have more responsibility than the appellants since they would be liable in the first instance for a problem or deficiency in the team's functions.

Mailing Clerks 3 are overclassified,² but their overclassification does not entitle appellants, who do not meet the basic criteria set forth in the class specifications for Shipping and Mailing Clerk 3, to reclassification to that level. See Prissel v. Wettengel, Wis. Pers. Bd. 73-174 (6/16/75).

Order

The action of the respondent denying the reclassification requests of these appellants is sustained, and this appeal is dismissed.

Dated 3-13, 1978 STATE PERSONNEL BOARD


James R. Morgan, Chairperson

²There was evidence that these employees were "grandfathered" and that if vacancies occurred in these positions now they would not be filled at the Shipping and Mailing Clerk 3 level.