

OFFICIAL

OPINION
AND
ORDER

* * * * *
 LENA ROWE,
 Appellant,
 v.
 ZEL RICE, Secretary,
 Department of Transportation,
 VERNE KNOLL, Deputy Director,
 State Bureau of Personnel,
 Respondent.
 Case No. 77-5
 * * * * *

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

Nature of the Case

This is an appeal of the denial of a reclassification request pursuant to Section 16.05(1)(f), stats. At the prehearing conference the parties stipulated to the following issue:

"Is the appellant appropriately classified as a Clerk 2 or Clerk Coordinator or Clerk 3 or Clerk 4?"

Findings of Fact

The appellant at all relevant times has been employed by the Department of Transportation, Division of Motor Vehicles, Application Pre-Audit Unit, as a clerk classified as a Clerk 2. Her work basically consists of the coordination, auditing, sorting and routing of registration applications submitted by the Milwaukee district office, the La Crosse sub-unit and approximately 18 driver's license examination stations. The auditing involved here is of a basic nature. For example, this involves checking a group of forms against a list to ensure that all the forms are there, checking individual forms to ensure that all the necessary spaces are completed and that the information found there is consistent with related or

attached forms, routine rubber-stamping of checks, the reconciliation of register tapes against applications and checks, and checking for the correctness of fee entries for relatively basic transactions. While this group of examples is not exhaustive of all of the auditing tasks performed by appellant, it is representative of the overall level of complexity.

Appellant does not have any supervisory, leadwork or training functions with the limited exception of some training of the employe who fills in for her in her absence.

Conclusions of Law

The class specifications for Clerk Coordinator (Respondents' Exhibit 2) contain in part the following:

"Performs duties as described in the Clerk 2, Stenographer 2 and Typist 2 specifications and in addition performs the following leadworker functions"

This classification applies to positions which perform the same duties as set forth in the Clerk 2 specifications and additionally has leadworker functions. Since appellant has no leadwork functions, her position cannot appropriately be classified as Clerk Coordinator.

The definitions for Clerk 2 and Clerk 3 are somewhat similar:

"Positions allocated to this level perform journeyman clerical duties and responsibilities. Work is often varied and/or complex and is performed under direct supervision. Positions allocated to this level are responsible for making recommendations on procedures insofar as they affect the position's daily work." (Position Standard for Clerk 2, Respondents' Exhibit 1)

"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." (Position Standard for Clerk 3, Respondents' Exhibit 3)

The difference between journeyman and advanced clerical work is obviously a question of degree and relative comparisons. The type of work performed by appellant does not require the exercise of an appreciable amount of discretion. The

department compared appellant's position with that of other Clerk 3 positions and concluded that appellant's work involved a lower level of complexity. See, for example, Respondents' Exhibit 16 which is the position description of a permit application auditor classified as a Clerk 3. This position approves or denies applications for permits for Wisconsin and nonresident carriers and involves the review of applications, correspondence, and other documents for compliance with statutory requirements. The work done by appellant is relatively more rote and less complex.

The position standard for Clerk 4 (Respondents' Exhibit 4) describes "advanced supervisory and administrative clerical work" which is "typically specialized and complex." This work is more complex than that at the Clerk 3 level, and is not an appropriate classification for appellant's position.

Order

Respondent's action denying appellant's reclassification request is sustained and this appeal is dismissed.

Date September 15, 1977

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD


Laurene DeWitt, Chairperson