

\* \* \* \* \*

MARIAN ABRAMS, MARY ADLER, and  
 JOYCE WILLS,

Appellants,

v.

MANUEL CARBALLO, Secretary, Department  
 of Health and Social Services, and  
 VERNE KNOLL, Deputy Director, State  
 Bureau of Personnel,

Respondents.

Case No. 75-136

\* \* \* \* \*

# OFFICIAL

## OPINION AND ORDER

Before: DeWitt, Morgan, Warren and Hessert, Board Members.

### NATURE OF THE CASE

This appeal involves the denial of reclassification requests pursuant to s. 16.05(1)(f), Stats. At the hearing their attorney authorized the withdrawal of the appeals of Ms. Adler and Ms. Wills. The following findings and conclusions relate only to Ms. Abrams, who was denied a requested reclassification from Clerk 3 to Management Information Technician 1.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

The appellant at all relevant times has been employed by the Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Family Services, Research and Analysis Section. The primary function of her position has been to provide clerical support to the direct services reporting system regarding children committed or receiving services from the Division of Family Services. This involves the handling of various forms received from the districts and regions where children are committed or receiving services. She transfers the information from these forms to cards for the data processing section. This

involves the transfer of data from the forms to numbers for the cards-- e.g., a particular county would be given a particular number that could ultimately be used in the data processing process. She also cross checks the forms for accuracy and completeness. In some cases the appellant performs the converse function of translating numerical codes from a computer printout into written words.

She also compiles data from various forms which is integrated into various periodical reports. She makes suggestions concerning the modification of the system. She maintains files and does limited typing and receptionist work.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The position standard for Clerk 3 (Respondents' Exhibit 15) contains the following definition:

"Positions allocated to this level perform work requiring advanced clerical and beginning level supervisory skills. Work at this level is typically varied and/or complex and is performed under general direction. Positions allocated to this level make recommendations on policies and procedures affecting the immediate work area."

This description covers the work performed by appellant in the position described in the above findings.

The class specifications for Management Information Technician 1 (Respondents' Exhibit 17) contain the following definition:

"This is responsible work aiding higher level management information technicians or specialists in a variety of data processing and/or management information activities in an edit and workflow capacity. Employees in this class perform varied duties such as scheduling, editing, keeping output records and maintaining libraries."

Abrams, et al. v. Carballo and Knoll  
Case No. 75-136  
Page Three

Appellant's position does not function in an "edit and workflow" capacity. The term "edit" was utilized by the respondents, in analyzing this transaction in its technical sense. See Respondent' Exhibits 10 and 19: "to modify the form or format of data." It is concluded that this is an appropriate definition of this term in this context and that appellant's position does not perform work that falls within this definition.

It is noted that apparently some confusion has been generated in this matter by the use of the term "edit" in appellant's position description, Respondents' Exhibit 2. It is concluded that this usage is not compatible with the technical meaning of the term.

ORDER

The respondents' actions and decisions denying this reclassification request are affirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Dated: September 15, 1977.

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

  
Laurene DeWitt, Chairperson