

May 13, 1974. Appellant wrote a letter of appeal which was received by this Board's office May 16, 1974.

Appellant's immediate supervisor is Nancy Onken, a Purchasing Assistant. Appellant is responsible for the complete stores function for the Physical Sciences Laboratory. His position, however, is not supervisory although he occasionally has limited term employees working under him.

Appellant's duties and responsibilities have changed to an extent since he became an employee of the state. The complexity of the job has increased. The number of items in the store inventory has risen from approximately 2,000 to over 6,300 items. The dollar value of the inventory has grown from approximately \$22,000 to \$126,000.

Incidental to his Storekeeper duties, he has also become responsible for a certain amount of account examining and bookkeeping work. He makes out various reports and identifies various items which come in on a shipment or which are to be distributed to the research projects.

III. Conclusion

The Personnel Board has jurisdiction over an appeal arising out of a reclassification request under Section 16.05 (1) (f), Wisconsin Statutes. The appeal was timely filed since the notice that the request was denied was dated on May 13, 1974 and the letter of appeal was received on May 16, 1974. (Section 16.05 (2), Wis. Stats..)

Appellant's Position Is Properly
Classified As Storekeeper II.

Appellant alleges that since his duties and responsibilities have both increased and changed that his position is not properly classified as Storekeeper II (SR 1-8). We find that the class specification for Storekeeper II (SR 1-8) adequately reflects the duties and responsibilities of his position.

The definition of the Storekeeper II (SR 1-8) position as found in the class specification states:

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 store operation including estimating, requisitioning, receiving, storing, issuing and maintaining inventory records and may also do 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 operations 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 superiors for conformance to rules and regulations governing the requisitioning, purchasing, issuing or shipping of supplies and materials.

Appellant's position falls within this specification generally except that he performs no lead work except occasionally when there are L.T.E. workers. However, Robert Belongia, Bureau of Personnel, Personnel Analyst, testified that despite Appellant's lack of lead work his position was properly classified as Storekeeper II. Appellant's position involves control over a large volume of turnover in inventory and is complicated by the nature and variety of the items which are critical in the type of functions the laboratory performs. (February 14, 1975, Hearing Transcript, page 164, hereinafter cited as Tr.)

Appellant alleges that the additional bookkeeping and accounting duties are substantial and not within the class specifications of Storekeeper II (SR 1-8). It is true that if Appellant devoted all of his time performing these duties, his position would probably be better classified as Accounts Examiner II (SR 1-6). (Tr., page 166.) However, he does not spend all his time doing these tasks.

Furthermore and perhaps more importantly, these tasks fall within the scope of the duties of the Storekeeper II class specification. Inherent in his running the complete stores operation is the responsibility of keeping adequate and accurate records of all transactions. If this were not so, it would be impossible for a person who was in charge of a stores operation to be really aware of the flux of inventory.

Appellant is obviously performing his work very well. His performance ratings have consistently been outstanding. However, in looking over the whole scope of duties which he performs, we find that Appellant's position is properly classified as a Storekeeper II.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the action of Respondent is affirmed.

Dated August 29, 1975.

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD


Percy L. Julian, Jr., Chairperson