

\*\*\*\*\*

LINDA PEKOL,

Appellant,

v.

VERNE KNOLL, Deputy Director,  
Bureau of Personnel,

Respondent.

Case No. 75-100

\*\*\*\*\*

NANCY ANTHONY,

Appellant,

v.

VERNE KNOLL, Deputy Director,  
Bureau of Personnel,

Respondent.

Case No. 75-101

\*\*\*\*\*

KATHERINE CICIVA,

Appellant,

v.

VERNE KNOLL, Deputy Director,  
Bureau of Personnel,

Respondent.

Case No. 75-102

\*\*\*\*\*

KATHRYN LONGSETH,

Appellant,

v.

VERNE KNOLL, Deputy Director,  
Bureau of Personnel,

Respondent.

Case No. 75-103

\*\*\*\*\*

**OFFICIAL**

OPINION  
AND  
ORDER

\* \* \* \* \*  
 DONNA ANNETT,  
                   Appellant,  
 v.  
 VERNE KNOLL, Deputy Director,  
 Bureau of Personnel,  
                   Respondent.  
 Case No. 75-104  
 \* \* \* \* \*

Before: DEWITT, Chairperson, WILSON, MORGAN, WARREN and HESSERT, Members.

Nature of the Case

This case is the consolidated appeal of the denials of reclassification requests from Typist 3 positions to Technical Typist 2 positions.

Findings of Fact

Appellants were all permanent employees in the Word Processing Center of the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations (DILHR) classified as Typist 3 prior to April, 1975. In April, 1975, the Appellants' supervisor filed reclassification requests seeking to have each Appellant reclassified from Typist 3 to Technical Typist 2.

The reclassification request was denied in a memorandum on June 5, 1975, and again denied in a memorandum on August 25, 1975. (Respondent's Exhibit 7)

In the period between perfecting the appeal and holding the hearing, Appellants Longseth and Arnett terminated their employment in the Word Processing Center. The remaining Appellants continue to be employed as they were prior to April, 1975.

The evidence adduced at the hearing established that there were no differences in the work of each individual Appellant that would require separate findings of fact for any of the Appellants. For purposes of this appeal, the work of Appellants is considered to be the same for each Appellant.

Appellants are the senior employees in the Word Processing Center. They operate I.B.M. Selectric "Mag-Card II" automatic typewriters. Their assignments are the most complex work which is handled in the Word Processing Center. Appellants do all the high priority work, all the data processing typing and all the rush work. In addition, Appellants type handbooks and manuals for use in various DILHR programs and projects.

At the time the reclassification requests were submitted, Appellants spent the following time on the following tasks:

- 35% typing legal initial determinations relating to unemployment compensation claims
- 30% typing various reports for distribution to different DILHR organizations
- 20% typing manuals for various DILHR programs
- 10% setting up and typing organization charts for the Job Service Program
- 5% typing biennial budget requests and related matters

The exact percentages may vary slightly from one Appellant to another, however, these times are representative of the work of all Appellants prior to the filing of the reclassification request. Appellant Anthony did slightly less typing and had 5% of her time allocated to supervisory backup work.

Since the filing of the reclassification request, and prior to the hearing, Appellants' work changed somewhat. Appellants began to type less initial determinations, and somewhat more data processing material in the form of reports and manuals.

Appellants at the time of the hearing spent 85%-90% of their time typing reports, handbooks and manuals.

The "Mag-Card II" typewriters which Appellants use have interchangeable type balls or elements. In their work, Appellants change the elements. The elements

which they change to and from do not contain different characters or symbols. They only difference in the various elements are type face style and size.

The only specialized characters which Appellants are called upon to type are:

"Z" with a hyphen: Z

Zero with a slash: Ø

Small b with a slash: b

Greater than and less than signs: > , <

Appellants are able to type all these symbols without any specialized type elements. An element with those special characters is now available, and that element is a standard alphabet element with those few special symbols in the place of other optional symbols which are typed by shifting to upper case and typing on the keys which would give numerals in the lower case setting.

These special symbols are used only in the data processing work prepared by Appellants.

Appellants have significantly more responsibility than other employees in the Word Processing Center and perform significantly more complex work.

#### Conclusions of Law

In an appeal of a denial of a reclassification request, the burden is on the Appellants to prove that the decision of the Director was incorrect.

The Technical Typist classification series is intended to cover positions "performing unusually difficult and complex typing . . ." The work performed must possess certain distinctive characteristics. Persons performing work best described by the Typist series are excluded from the Technical Typist series.

For a position to be allocated to the Technical Typist 2 level, the position must possess the following characteristics:

- "1. The material typed must be so complex as to require a special typewriter equipped with a customized key board or interchangeable key bars.
2. A substantial portion of the total typing must be for publication purposes.
3. The typing as described above must constitute a major portion of the positions total duties and responsibilities." Technical Typist 2 Position Standard.

Typists who use an automatic typewriter the majority of their time are by definition allocated to the Typist 3 class. (Typist 3 Classification Factors)

Typist 2 level typists are expected to type material which is complex and varied, requiring close attention to detail.

". . . Comprehensive statistical tables containing many headings and sub-headings are typical of material typed at this level.

The terminology of the material is often of a specialized nature . . . . The terminology used may be from one or more specialized fields.

The terminology may be technical in nature consisting of mathematical equations and formulae, but special keys or key boards are not required . . ." Typist 2 Position Standard.

Personnel classification is not an exact science. A job rarely fits exactly within one position standard. However, an employee is not entitled to reclassification because some aspect of the work performed fits within a higher classification. The correct classification depends on a weighing of the total picture of the job performed.

There is no question but that Appellants perform complex and advanced typing work. Appellants use IBM Selectric model typewriters, which have interchangeable type elements as standard equipment. However, the typing performed by Appellants

is not so specialized that special type elements are required to perform the typing. Appellants are able to type their work without resorting to special type elements. The fact that they use different sizes and styles of type elements does not change the nature of the material which Appellants type. The bulk of Appellants' typing is English writing. The typing of complex technical material is allocated to the Typist series. Appellants have not sustained their burden to prove that the action of the Director was incorrect and that they were incorrectly classified as Typist 3's. Accordingly, the action of the Director will be affirmed.

The Board does think it advisable to make further comment concerning the entire clerical series position standards, although the issues for hearing related solely to the appropriateness of appellants' positions' classifications based on the existing position standards. The standards appear to require review. Changes in office machinery and in office management over the past ten years makes an updating of the clerical series mandatory. Widespread use of typewriters such as the Mag Card I and II make classification determinations based on interchangeable type or automatic machines unworkable. The Board would suggest consideration of re-structuring of the clerical position series to provide for more meaningful distinctions between positions which now fit within the confines of existing classifications.

Order

The action of the Director is hereby affirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Dated June 17, 1977.

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

  
Laurene DeWitt, Chairperson