STATE OF WISCONSIN	STATE PERSONNEL BOARD
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* *
	*
BETTY MARTIN,	*
	*
Appellant,	* A Pat
11 ,	
v.	*
	* OFFICIAIL
VIRGINIA HART, Chairperson,	*
Department of Industry, Labor	* OPINION AND ORDER
and Human Relations,	*
,	*
Respondent.	*
	*
Case No. 76-73	*
	*
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	: *

Before: JULIAN, Chairperson, STEININGER and WILSON, Board Members.

## OPINION

The Appellant has filed a letter of appeal dated April 27, 1976. The Respondent has taken the position that the Personnel Board has no jurisdiction of this appeal since there is nothing on the face of the letter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Board.

The Appellant's appeal letter accuses the Director of Project WIN of harassing her because of her race. By way of relief she has requested that he be placed somewhere where he would not have to come in contact with minority individuals. This appeal does not present any basis for an appeal to this Board. There is no allegation of a demotion, layoff, suspension, or discharge, S. 16.05(1)(e), Wis. stats., or that there has been an action or decision of the Director from which to appeal, S. 16.05(1)(f). Nor is there any other apparent basis for jurisdiction.

This Board's jurisdiction is determined by statute, and we must adhere strictly to those statutes. See <u>Mid-Plains Telephone</u>, <u>Inc. v. P.S.C.</u>, 56 Wis. 2d 780, 786 (1973). We do note that matters such as those alleged in the appeal letter appear to be appropriate for review through the grievance procedure and/or the Director of the Bureau of Personnel. There is an appeal route to the Board from a decision of the Director, S. 16.05(1)(f), and from third step decisions within the unilateral (i.e., non-contractual) grievance procedure, S. 16.05(7). Page 2 Martin v. Hart - 76-73

We add that this Board is not, under the current statutory scheme, a catch-all for any kind of complaint that involves personnel transactions or relationships, nor are we able to be the forum to review every kind of alleged insensitive or unjust act on the part of management or supervisory employes. For better or for worse, the legislature has seen fit to limit our jurisdiction to relatively specific kinds of personnel matters. We certainly have no choice but to observe strictly these statutory provisions. State employes may find it difficult to determine the appropriate forum for a particular complaint when he or she has to choose among possibilities including this Board, the Director of the Bureau of Personnel, non-contractual grievance procedures, and contractual grievance procedures. We recommend to employes, their representatives, the state as the employer, and the legislature, that the existing administrative structures for reviewing employes' complaints be streamlined and simplified.

## ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this appeal is dismissed. Dated August 24 , 1976. STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

Jr. . Chairperson