

* * * * *

COLLEEN L. ZETTLER,

Appellant,

v.

SECRETARY, Department of Health
and Social Services and DEPUTY
DIRECTOR, Bureau of Personnel,

Respondent.

Case No. 77-210

* * * * *

OFFICIAL

OPINION AND ORDER

Before: James R. Morgan, Calvin Hessert and Dana Warren, Board Members.

NATURE OF THE CASE

This is an appeal pursuant to §16.05(1)(f), stats., of the denial of a request for reclassification from Storekeeper 1 to Storekeeper 2.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The appellant is an employe in the classified service at the Taycheedah Correctional Institution in a position classified as Storekeeper 1.
2. Appellant's duties and responsibilities include the provision of supplies by estimating stock needs, determining the best means of purchase, and purchasing; the receipt, storing, and issuance of supplies; maintenance of issue records for inventory control; the submission of required reports, and the supervision of a subordinate stock clerk.
3. The appellant works under general supervision.
4. Taycheedah Correctional Institution is significantly smaller than the other institutions in the division of corrections, in terms of resident population, size of inventory, annual inventory turnover, and monthly turnover.

5. Taycheedah Correctional Institution has a more varied inventory than either the Wisconsin Correctional Institution or the Kettle Moraine Correctional Institution.

6. The class specifications for Storekeeper 1 (Respondents' Exhibit 1) contain the following definition:

This is responsible lead work guiding the activities of a departmental or large divisional stores unit or functioning as the assistant to the supervisor of one of the largest stores or warehouse units. Under limited supervision positions in this class are responsible for the complete stores operations of a department or large division or unit with a wider variety and larger turnover of items than is characteristic of the lower class. Positions allocated to this class who assist Supervisors 3 in the operation of one of the largest stores units are responsible for a major function within the unit. Employees in this class have their work reviewed by administrative supervisors although the day to day operation is the employees responsibility. The work usually involves the guidance of others.

7. The class specifications for Storekeeper 2 (Respondents' Exhibit 2) include the following definition:

This is responsible lead work directing the operations of a large state institutional or departmental stores or warehouse. Under general supervision employees in this class are responsible for the complete stores operation including estimating, requisitioning, receiving, storing, issuing and maintaining inventory records and may also be a limited amount of local purchasing. Positions allocated to this level differ from those allocated to the lower storekeeper level in that they involve a more complex stores operation as characterized by the volume of turnover, nature and variety of items as well as the lead worker role and duties performed by the storekeeper. The work is performed with considerable latitude in the operation of the stores unit. Work is subject to review by administrative supervisors for conformance to rules and regulations governing the requisitioning, purchasing, issuing or shipping of supplies and materials.

8. The duties and responsibilities associated with appellant's position is not at the level of complexity required by the Storekeeper 2 class specifications.

9. As of mid-October, 1977, when the reclassification was denied, the Bureau of Personnel required an institutional population of from 200-220 to be categorized as a "large" institution.

10. As of mid-October, 1977, the Taycheedah Correctional Institution population was 183.

11. Respondents denied appellant's request for reclassification from Storekeeper 1 to 2 and she filed an appeal with the Personnel Board within 15 days of receipt of notice thereof.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Personnel Board has jurisdiction over this appeal pursuant to §16.05(1)(f), Wisconsin statutes.

2. The burden of proof with respect to the reclassification decision is on the appellant. See Alderden v. Wettengel, Wis. Pers. Bd. 73-87 (6/2/75); Lyons v. Wettengel, Wis. Pers. Bd. 73-36 (11/20/74).

3. The appellant has failed to establish that the respondents erred in denying her reclassification request.

4. The respondents' decision to deny appellant's request for reclassification from Storekeeper 1 to Storekeeper 2 was not incorrect.

OPINION

The class specifications for Storekeeper 2 state that the differentiation between positions at this level and positions at lower levels is that the former "involve a more complex stores operation as characterized by the volume of turnover, nature and variety of items . . ." The Taycheedah Correctional Institution was under the population level required for a "large" categorization by the

Bureau of Personnel. Additionally, Taycheedah had significantly less inventory and inventory turnover than the other institutions. While the variety of the Taycheedah inventory was greater than that at the Wisconsin Correctional Institution (Fox Lake) or Kettle Moraine Correctional Institution, this is only one factor.

The appellant argued that institutional and inventory size and volume are inappropriate classification factors, since it is no more complicated, for example, to order 6 units rather than 3. In the Board's opinion size and volume are appropriate classification criteria.¹ A larger institution with more transactions normally will have a greater range of individual problems and generally, more complexity and more responsibility. This or similar principles have been recognized repeatedly by this board.

The appellant pointed out that there had been a Storekeeper 2 at Taycheedah at least through 1970, when the population and inventory was less than now. Standing alone, without additional information about other institutions and other relevant circumstances existent at that time, this fact is of little significance. Even if one were to infer from this that the current allocation pattern constitutes a departure from a previous allocation pattern this would not render incorrect the respondent's decision here in the context of the other evidence before the board.

1. Usually other factors also will enter into a classification decision.


Zettler v. DHSS & Bur. of Pers.
Case No. 77-210
Page Five

ORDER

The actions of the respondents are affirmed and this appeal is
dismissed.

Dated: April 11, 1978

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD


James R. Morgan, Chairperson