

Definitions

Systems Analyst - responsible for conferring with users to identify user requirements; assisting users in determining system requirements; proposing solutions to the problems; preparing and presenting system approach, conceptual design, resource requirements, cost/benefit analysis and overall project schedule to management for approval; and making written and/or oral presentations to user groups. They may also be responsible for preparing the detailed system and sub-system design; defining computer program/procedure specifications; defining administrative procedures; insuring that the system is tested and debugged; overseeing and coordinating the data conversion efforts and the general system implementation; and training user agency personnel in the operation of the system.

Applications Programmer - responsible for developing and writing computer programs; analyzing problems outlined by system analysts in terms of detailed equipment requirements and capabilities; designing logic and coding programs according to written requirements; preparing test data for trial runs; and verifying program logic by testing and debugging programs. They may also be responsible for preparing necessary documentations; evaluating and modifying existing programs to take into account changes in system requirements or equipment configurations; and conferring with systems analysis and systems planning personnel.

Analyst/Programmer - responsible for performing a combination of the functions identified under the Applications Programmer and Systems Analyst areas of specialization.

Class Descriptions

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SPECIALIST 3,
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SPECIALIST 3 - CONFIDENTIAL and
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SPECIALIST 3 - MANAGEMENT (PR1-13)

This is either an entry, progression, or objective level depending upon the following areas of specialization:

Applications Specialist -

Systems Analyst, Analyst/Programmer - Positions are allocated to this class as a progression level and perform systems analysis or analyst/programmer work of a more than routine nature under limited supervision.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SPECIALIST 4,
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SPECIALIST 4 - CONFIDENTIAL and
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SPECIALIST 4 - MANAGEMENT (PR 1-14)

This is either a progression, objective, advanced or project leader level depending upon the following areas of specialization:

Applications Specialist -
Systems Analyst, Analyst/Programmer - Position are allocated to this class as an objective (full performance) level and are responsible for performing a full range of systems analysis functions a majority of the time. Objectives, priorities and deadlines are normally established by a project leader who also reviews the work for technical soundness and conformance to objectives and priorities. Some assignments may be project in nature, but do not involve the ongoing coordination and review of the work of other objective level systems analysts or analyst/programmers. However, positions at this level may occasionally guide or instruct lower-level staff.

4. The primary emphasis of appellant's position is systems analysis. However, since 10-20% of appellant's position's time is devoted to applications programming, appellant's position is most appropriately regarded as an analyst/programmer.

5. The Department of Employment Relations (DER) approved an allocation pattern for the University of Wisconsin to use in assigning analyst/programmer positions to classifications within the MIS series. This allocation pattern provides in pertinent part:

MIS 3

This is developmental level analyst/programmer work. Under limited supervision, positions devote 50 percent time to analyzing systems needs, developing the logic, writing/revising code, testing and debugging, and documenting; 30 percent time is spent translating systems design space into the appropriate programming language; the remaining 20 percent time is spent enhancing data processing skills. At this level, positions become very systems analysis oriented. There is considerable user contact. The projects are of a complex nature. The systems analysis work is in the area of modifying existing programs. By the time positions reach this level, incumbents have reached a sophisticated level of programming expertise and are able to perform their duties at a much more proficient level with greater independence than their counterparts at the MIS level.

MIS 4

This is objective level analyst/programmer work. Incumbents function very independently in little need of guidance from higher level staff. Incumbents are very experienced in the work and have reached a very high level of skill. Incumbents can work at most levels of complexity and can carry out all technical phases of the project without direct supervision. They can do almost any kind of work in the department. Work at this level is

very responsible, and incumbents are accountable for what they do. Work at this level is mostly designing new systems, as opposed to MIS 3's, who modify existing systems.

Positions define user requirements and translate general design specifications into detailed system design specifications defining the proposed system. Approximately 70 percent time is devoted to defining user requirements, translating definitions into general design specifications; 20 percent time is spent translating the preceding into the appropriate programming language; the remaining 10 percent is devoted to enhancement of programming skills.

This allocation pattern is not inconsistent with the MIS position standard. Under this allocation pattern, the primary distinction between positions classified at the MIS 3 level and the MIS 4 level is that the systems analysis duties and responsibilities of an MIS 3 position primarily involve the modification of existing systems while those of an MIS 4 position primarily involve the design of new systems. Positions at both levels deal primarily with complex systems. The adaptation of a system, which has been designed elsewhere, for use in the area to which the particular position is assigned does not constitute the design of a new system.

6. In a memo dated February 15, 1985, (Appellant's Exhibit 13), appellant listed the projects her position had worked on from August, 1982 (the date appellant was appointed to the subject position) through February, 1985. Of the 19 projects listed, only two involve the design of a new system. These two projects are the work order system appellant's position worked on from May, 1983, to February, 1984, and the trouble reports system appellant's position worked on from August, 1984, through at least February 15, 1985. Appellant's position devotes a majority of time to work on complex systems.

7. The record does not support a finding that appellant's position's systems analysis duties primarily involve the design of new systems as required for classification at the MIS 4 level.

8. Appellant's position is more appropriately classified at the MIS 3 level.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This matter is properly before the Commission pursuant to §230.44(1)(b), Stats.

2. The appellant has the burden of proving that respondent's decision denying the reclassification of appellant's position from MIS 3 to MIS 4 was incorrect.

3. The appellant has failed to meet that burden.

4. Respondent's decision denying appellant's request for reclassification was correct.

OPINION

The language of the MIS 3 and MIS 4 class descriptions is very general (see Finding of Fact #3). For this reason, it is useful to review the allocation pattern approved by DER for assigning analyst/programmer positions at the University of Wisconsin to classifications within the MIS series (see Finding of Fact #5). This allocation pattern indicates that positions at both the MIS 3 and MIS 4 levels work primarily with complex systems. It is clear from the record that appellant's position spends the majority of time working with complex systems. The primary distinction drawn by this allocation pattern between positions at the MIS 3 and MIS 4 levels is that the systems analysis duties and responsibilities of an MIS 3 primarily involve the modification of existing systems while those of an MIS 4 position primarily involve the design of new systems. It would be unreasonable to conclude that the adaptation of a system designed elsewhere to the needs of the Department of Physical Plant Services constitutes a design of a new system. Such a situation is clearly much better described

as the modification of an existing system. Since very few of the projects undertaken by appellant's position involve the design of a new system, the duties and responsibilities of appellant's position fail to satisfy a necessary requirement for classification at the MIS 4 level and the Commission concludes that appellant's position is more appropriately classified at the MIS 3 level.


ORDER

The decision of the respondents denying the appellant's request for the reclassification of her position is affirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Dated: January 9, 1986 STATE PERSONNEL COMMISSION


DENNIS P. MCGILLIGAN, Chairperson


DONALD R. MURPHY, Commissioner


LAURIE R. McCALLUM, Commissioner

LRM:jmf
SHG/2

Parties:

Christine M. Inkman
UW-Milwaukee
Physical Plant Services
P. O. Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Katharine C. Lyall
Acting President, UW
1700 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive

Howard Fuller
Secretary, DER
P. O. Box 7855
Madison, WI 53707