

STATE OF WISCONSIN

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

* * * * *

PATRICIA BENGIS,

Appellants,

v.

JOHN WEAVER, President, University
of Wisconsin, and VERNE H. KNOLL,
Deputy Director, State Bureau of
Personnel,

Respondents.

Case No. 77-9

* * * * *

OFFICIAL

OPINION AND ORDER

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

NATURE OF THE CASE

This is an appeal pursuant to sec. 16.05(1)(f), Stats., of a denial of a reclassification request. The parties stipulated to the following statement of issue:

"Whether or not appellant's position should properly be classified as Shipping and Mailing Clerk 1, Shipping and Mailing Clerk 2, Typist 2 or Typist 3?"

FINDINGS OF FACT

The appellant at all relevant times has been employed as a receptionist at Tripp Hall, UW-Madison, with a classification of Typist 2. In this position, she sells meal and laundry tickets, rents refrigerators and cots, accounts for the money she handles, answers the phones, responds to questions from visitors, and does other related receptionist duties. Other duties and responsibilities are related to the postal sub-station at Tripp Hall.

The postal unit is operated by the appellant with the assistance of a part-time seasonal LTE and part-time student employes. The appellant provides training and supervision to the student employes. While her guidance and review of the work of the LTE is so minimal that the appellant is not actually performing a lead work function as to her, appellant's supervisor has organized the work unit in a manner that places this responsibility on the appellant.

The mail-related functions performed by appellant include the sale of stamps, envelopes, and post cards; weighing letters and packages and determining the amount of postage required by referring to simple charts and tables; preparing, collecting for, and dispatching registered and insured mail; preparing daily and quarterly sales reports; dispatching cash to the post office by registered mail; ordering and receiving stamps by registered mail; receiving and sorting incoming mail directed to the residents; sale of postal money orders with related simple bookkeeping functions; collection and distribution of U.S. and campus mail for university housing administrative offices in Schlichter Hall.

In this operation appellant utilizes two postage scales and a money order imprint machine. In order to obtain access to the incoming mail, the appellant must tip over mail bags weighing approximately 35 pounds and drag them along the floor to spill the mail over the floor. Approximately 4 or 5 times a week she weighs packages weighing in excess of 20 pounds. She has very infrequently wrapped packages as a service for students who have not properly wrapped them before coming to the counter. The appellant works under close supervision inasmuch as her work is not complex and is performed pursuant to detailed guidelines. The appellant does not, and has never, performed any typing in this position. She has had the opportunity, which she has not exercised, to type during certain periods of the academic year when she is in a non-work status.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

It is concluded that appellant's position is not properly classified as Shipping and Mailing Clerk 2. Referring to the definition section of the class specifications (Appellant's Exhibit 2), appellant does not "function under limited supervision or guidance," does not pick up inter-office or campus mail and delivers only limited amounts of this mail and to one location (Schlichter Hall) only. She is involved in some "routine mail handling and processing," and some shipping and mailing letters, packages, parcels and other materials. Referring to the examples of work performed it is further concluded that appellant's activities as found above relate to the specific examples as follows:

"Plans, guides, and assists in the pick up and delivery of inter-office or campus mail and the sorting, wrapping, weighing, metering and routing of other mail, packages and parcels."

Appellant is not involved in the pick up of inter-office or campus mail and delivers it only to Schlichter Hall. She does sort and weigh, but does not wrap, meter or route other mail, packages and parcels. (It is concluded that the package wrapping appellant does as set forth in the findings is too limited in terms of scope and frequency to be construed as "wrapping" as the term is used in these specifications.)

"Lift and handle large mail containers and heavy cartons."

The appellant does not do this.

"Make out freight bills and other shipping bills."

The appellant does not do this.

"Operate postage meters, scales and other simple mail room equipment."

The appellant does operate scales and a money order imprint machine.

"Operate, set up and maintain large complex multistation inserting equipment."

The appellant does not do this.

"Operate set up and maintain large complex multipurpose labeling machines."

The appellant does not do this.

"May train and guide other employes in equipment operations."

The appellant does not do this.

"Keep records and make reports."

The appellant does do this.

"May hand stuff envelopes, tape and label packages."

The appellant does not hand stuff envelopes and the limited wrapping of packages she does do is too incidental to be construed as taping and labeling packages as the terms are used in these specifications.

It is not unusual for an employe to have some duties and responsibilities identified at a higher level. The limited nature of the appellant's work which falls within the class specifications for Shipping and Mailing Clerk 2 preclude classification of appellant's position at that level.

With respect to the definition section for Shipping and Mailing Clerk 1 specifications (Appellants Exhibit 1), it is concluded that appellant's work as set forth in the findings does involve some routine mail handling and processing, no pickup but some delivery of inter-office or campus mail (to Schlichter Hall), and some shipping and mailing of letters, packages, parcels and other materials.

With respect to the examples of work performed, it is further concluded that appellant's activities as found above relate to the specific examples as follows:

"Sort, wrap, weigh, meter and route mail, packages, and parcels."

Appellant does sort and weigh but does not wrap, meter or route mail, packages and parcels.

"Pickup and deliver inter-office or campus mail."

Again appellant's only involvement here is limited delivery to Schlichter Hall.

"Lift and handle large mail containers and heavy cartons."

Appellant does not do this.

"May hand stuff envelopes, tape and label packages."

Appellant does not do this.

"May make out freight bills, UPS bills, postage figures, etc."

Appellant does not make out freight or UPS bills but does do basic bookkeeping which may be construed as "postage figures."

"May receive, store and distribute a stock of printed material."

The appellant does not do this.

"May operate postage meters, scales and other simple mail room equipment."

Appellant does operate scales and a money order imprinting machine.

It is concluded that although appellant does do some work identified at the Shipping and Mailing Clerk 1 level, her involvement in this area is not substantial enough to warrant classification at this level.

The Typist 2 position standard (Appellant's Exhibit 3) contain the following definition:

"Positions allocated to this level perform journeyman level typing and related clerical duties as described by the Clerk 2 standards under direct supervision."

It was found that appellant does not do any typing but has had the opportunity to do typing during certain periods of the academic year. In any event, it cannot be concluded that this classification is appropriate because the Clerk 2 standards are not in the record.

Bengs v. Weaver and Knoll
Case No. 77-9
Page Six

The position standard for Typist 3 (Appellant's Exhibit 4) has this definition:

"Positions allocated to this level perform advanced clerical and typing duties under general supervision."

One of the classification factors incorporates by reference the clerical duties and responsibilities as described by the Clerk 3 standard. Since the appellant does not perform advanced typing duties and the Clerk 3 standards are not in the record, it cannot be concluded that this is an appropriate classification.

Since the appellant has the burden of proof, it is concluded that the respondents must be sustained in their denial of appellant's reclassification request.

ORDER

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

Dated: September 15 1977.

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD


Laurene DeWitt, Chairperson