

* * * * *
 CATHLEEN ROGERS, ET AL. *
 Appellant, *
 v. *
 Administrator, DIVISION OF *
 PERSONNEL, *
 Respondent. *
 Case No. 79-PC-CS-738 *
 * * * * *

OFFICIAL

DECISION AND ORDER

NATURE OF THE CASE

This case is an appeal from the reallocations of appellant's positions as a result of a state-wide survey of clerical positions conducted and implemented by the Administrator of the Division of Personnel in the Department of Employment Relations. A hearing on the merits was conducted before a Hearing Examiner appointed by the Commission.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Appellants were at all times relevant herein employes in the classified civil service in the state Department of Transportation, Division of Motor Vehicles.
2. As a result of a state-wide survey of clerical positions, all appellants' positions were reallocated to Word Processing Operator 1.
3. Appellants filed a timely joint appeal of the reallocation decision.
4. The primary task performed by appellants for 90% of their working time is the production of typed copy from work submitted by employes of the Bureau of Regulation and Licensing. (Appellant's Exhibit 4.)
5. The work produced by appellants goes out directly to the public without being proof-read by the individuals who submitted the work to the appellants for typing.

6. The appellants proof-read the copy which they produce in order to check it for content accuracy as well as for typographical errors.

7. The appellants have received the same basic motor vehicle law course as have employes classified as Motor Vehicle Representatives and other classified employes.

8. Appellants type motor vehicle title application forms, handwritten composed letters, pattern letters, hearing notices, budget information and the like. Some of the typing involves preliminary work setting the word processing machines into formats used in data processing operations but the formats are routine and are used on a recurrent basis.

9. Appellants do not spend a majority of the time doing custom word processing work involving close work with the users of the services in order to produce unique and complex non-line copy.

10. Word Processing Operator 1 positions at the objective capacity performance level produce line or straight copy which does not entail intricate machine set-up or unique formatting considerations a majority of the time.
(Joint Exhibit 1.)

11. Word Processing Operator 2 positions function a majority of the time producing non-line copy requiring complex format considerations and equipment programming operations, including production of charts, statistical reports, tabulations, forms and the like. (Joint Exhibit 1.)

12. Appellants perform work which is not included in the Word Processing Operator 1 classification, specifically the proof-reading and correction of content in typed copy which they produce.

13. The nature of the typed copy produced by appellants is not at the level

of complexity required for classification at the Word Processing Operator 2 level.

14. Even though not all of appellants' duties fall squarely within the description of Word Processing Operator 1, that classification is the most appropriate for appellant's position.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This appeal is properly before the Commission pursuant to s.230.44(1)(a), Wis. Stats.

2. The burden is on appellants to show by a greater weight of credible evidence that the decision of the Administrator to reallocate their positions to Word Processing Operator 1, was incorrect.

3. Appellants have failed to carry their burden of persuasion.

4. The decision of the Administrator to reallocate appellants' positions to Word Processing Operator 1 was correct.

OPINION

An individual position in the classified civil service need not fit the class description in every detail in order to be properly classified. Due to the large number of positions and the variations in operations of the numerous work units statewide, it is not possible to have a classification system based on exact fit. Rather, the system operates on the theory of "best fit" of individual positions within existing position standards and class descriptions.

In this appeal, the appellants have shown that some of their duties, the correction of errors in copy content, are not included in their assigned classification. They have not shown, however, that those duties in fact are included in the higher classification they are seeking. The higher classification differs from the actual classification not in terms of the contested duties, but in terms of

the complexity of the typed copy produced. Complexity refers to the technical complexities involved in production of copy, not to the complexities involved in correcting copy content. Neither the class description nor the examples of performed given for Word Processing Operator 1 or 2 show correction of copy content to be classification factor accounting for differences in classification levels. The record in this appeal shows that the best fit for the nature of typed copy production done by appellants is at the Word Processing Operator 1 level. The checking of copy content for accuracy is not at this time part of the classification factors for the positions.

ORDER

The decision of the Administrator to reallocate appellants' positions to Word Processing Operator 1 is correct, and is hereby affirmed, and the appeal is dismissed.

Dated December 17, 1980

STATE PERSONNEL COMMISSION

Charlotte M. Higbee / mek
Charlotte M. Higbee, Chairperson

Donald R. Murphy / mek
Donald R. Murphy, Commissioner

Gordon H. Brehm / mek
Gordon H. Brehm, Commissioner

AR:mgd

Parties: Cathleen Rogers
Paula Beerbohm
Jean Cencic
Mary Kenny
Margaret Jelle
Rhonda Anderson
Aeneas Hodgson

Berdean Hess
Albertina Renlund
Regina Andrewjeski
Jeanne Ruchti
Room 100
Hill Farms State Office Bldg.
Madison, WI 53707

Charles Grapentine
Division of Personnel
149 East Wilson Street
Madison, WI 53702