



and the appropriate pay increment placement. The evaluation was based on the standards contained in the Bureau of Personnel's teacher classification schedule (see Resp. Ex. 2). According to that schedule, the highest teaching level possible contains the following requirements:

"Teacher Level 6 - Master's Degree and certification plus 42 semester credits, which is defined as:

"A Master's Degree (which the employing department has determined is appropriate for the position) from an accredited college or university and certification as a teacher by the Department of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education plus 12 additional relevant credits approved by the employing department, with no teaching or other work experience necessary.

(or)

"A Bachelor's Degree from an accredited college or university and certification as a teacher by the Department of Public Instruction or the State Board of Vocational Technical and Adult Education plus 42 additional relevant credits approved by the employing department, with no teaching or other work experience necessary." (Resp. Ex. 2, p. 134)

Since relevant credits are viewed as those credits "relevant to the teaching position occupied or being filled" (Resp. Ex., p. 131), many of appellant's secondary administration credits were deemed irrelevant and went unrecognized for classification purposes. His Master's Degree in Secondary Administration was likewise determined to be inappropriate for the position and went unrecognized. Accordingly, the appellant received no credit for his Master's Degree and only 22 3/4 credits for his graduate course work with the result that he did not qualify at the Teacher 6 level.

The next level (Teacher 5) required only an appropriate Master's Degree or a Bachelor's Degree with 30 relevant credits. With an inappropriate Master's degree and only 22 3/4 relevant credits, appellant did not qualify.

At the Teacher 4 level, the relevant credit requirement was still 24 and the appellant was again unable to qualify. At the Teacher 3 level, the appellant easily met the required 12 relevant credits and he was classified at that level.

Because the appellant exceeded the minimum requirements for the Teacher 3 level, he was eligible for certain pay increments under the standards contained in the classification scheme:

"Beginning Pay

"The basic pay for teachers shall be at one of the pay increments for the appropriate teacher level. Hiring rates may be up to and including the fourth pay increment for the Teacher level 1 and the eighth pay increment for the remaining teacher levels when the appointing authority determines that the applicant's teaching or other relevant experience exceeds the minimum requirements for the teacher level involved. For purposes of determining pay increment placement, no reevaluation of teaching or other relevant experience will be permitted after the original appointment, except to correct an error." (Resp. Ex. 2, p. 136)

Based on his 3 years teaching experience, the appellant was awarded 3 pay increments. He received no pay increments for his 4 years experience as a principal.

The appellant was then offered and accepted the position as a Teacher 3 with 3 pay increments. Subsequently he earned additional relevant credits and, on March 15, 1976, was reclassified as a Teacher 4.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The appellant argues that his initial classification at the Teacher 3 level was in error. His argument is based on two independent grounds. One, that his Master's Degree is "appropriate for the position" and he should have received credit for it. Second, that he was improperly denied certain of his credits since those credits are relevant to his position. The

success of either argument automatically qualifies the appellant for a classification higher than that of his original Teacher 3 classification. We conclude that the appellant has failed to discharge his burden of proof on either argument and, therefore, that his initial classification at the Teacher 3 level should be upheld.

The appellant's position requires no administrative responsibilities to make his Master's in Secondary Administration "appropriate for the position." Yet he argues that his Master's is "appropriate for the position" because it gives him the potential for promotion to supervisory teaching positions which furthers the State's policy of encouraging promotions from within the classified service. This argument ignores the definition of the term "position" as the "group of duties and responsibilities" of an employee. Wis. Adm. Code Pers. 1.02(8). This does not make reference to the promotional potential of an employee. Since his Master's Degree is unrelated to the duties and responsibilities, the appellant performs, his degree is not appropriate for his position.

Appellant's second argument is that certain of his courses were rejected as irrelevant and credits denied when in fact those courses were relevant to his position. The appellant has shown that the courses for which credit was denied provided him with insight into his job and covered some of the same subject areas as courses determined to be relevant to his position. That showing is not sufficient, however, to demonstrate that the respondent erred in evaluating the relevancy of the courses and denying the appellant credit for certain of his courses. The rejected courses were listed as administration courses rather than education courses and the

Appellant has not shown that the courses aided his development as a teacher rather than as an administrator. True, the administrative courses covered some of the same subject areas as the education courses. But the treatment of the subject areas has not been shown to be related to the appellant's development as a teacher other than for the value of the insight into his position gained by his perspective as an administrator. The respondent could properly refuse to find such insight to be relevant to the position's duties and responsibilities.

Our affirmation of the appellant's initial appointment at the Teacher 3 level still leaves the question of the proper pay increment placement within that classification. The appellant argues that a de facto policy existed under which one pay increment was awarded for each year of prior, relevant experience. Under such a policy, he argues that he should have received 7 pay increments--3 for his years of teaching experience and 4 for his years as a principal. Instead, as his confirmation letter (see Appellant's Ex. 1) indicates, the appellant received credit for his teaching experience but no credit for his 4 years as a principal.

Regardless of whether a de facto policy existed for the awarding of pay increments as described by the appellant, it is concluded that in any event, the appellant was not improperly denied credit for his 4 years as a principal based on the criterion of relevancy and, thus, he received the appropriate number of pay increments. As a principal, the appellant was in frequent contact with both students and parents, evaluated teacher's performance, and had input into the decision on the content of the courses to be taught. While respondent's contention that such experience is relevant to the teaching position is understandable, it is clear that much of an individual's experience is interrelated in the development of the personality, and it cannot be concluded


O'Rourke v. Carballo  
Case No. 76-129  
Page Six

that respondent erred in his decision that such experience did not relate to teaching physical education or recreation for purposes of administering the pay plan.

ORDER

Respondent's action is affirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Dated: 10-12, 1977. STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Morgan, Chairperson