



correspondence. She also acts as receptionist, disseminates information, maintains case classification ledgers, coordinates various office functions, develops and maintains case record files and periodically instructs and supervises CETA project typists.

5. Appellant is the clerical office manager of her unit field office. Her immediate supervisor is located in another city. Supervision is minimal. She keeps current on all Bureau policy and practices, advises the professional staff of such changes, and utilized this information in processing documents, monitoring the case classification point system and investigation report time tables.

6. In the absence of professional staff, appellant has sole responsibility of the office, answering inquiries and interpreting Bureau policies and practices.

7. The position held by appellant is best described by the Typist, position standard and her duties best fit the classification of typist.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This case is properly before this Commission pursuant to s.230.44(1)(a), of the Wisconsin Statutes.

2. The burden of proof is on the appellant to show that respondent incorrectly reallocated her position to Typist instead of Program Assistant 1.

3. The appellant failed to present sufficient evidence to meet the burden of proof.

#### OPINION

It is manifest from the evidence that appellant's main responsibilities in her unit was that of typist and clerical support. It is equally clear that appellant, who had worked in that office for seventeen years had gained immeasurable experience and knowledge, was well versed in policy and practices and utilized such information to the utmost in making that office run efficiently. There is

no question that she assisted in implementing the program and mission of that office. This Examiner, however, is persuaded by the evidence that appellant is more correctly classified as a typist. The typist classification includes positions which perform officer clerical duties, stenographic skills and programmatic activities found in a small office or organizational unit. In contrast, Program Assistant 1 positions are characterized by carrying out and accountability for complete phases of program functions. Persons on these latter positions normally assist a program head or person who is responsible for the entire program area of the unit and engage in problem-solving and considerable independent unstandardized actions.

The evidence supports the position that appellant is not the assistant to the field unit supervisor of the Bureau of Community Corrections, but rather the clerical support for the unit.

ORDER

The action of respondent is affirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Dated April 23, 1981


STATE PERSONNEL COMMISSION

DRM:mgd  
Parties

Ms. Beatrice Rotter  
1110 S. 8th Street  
Manitowoc, WI 54220

Mr. Charles Grapentine  
Division of Personnel  
149 E. Wilson St.  
Madison, WI 53702

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon H. Brehm, Commissioner

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Donald R. Murphy, Commissioner