

* * * * *
 *
 DIANA THOMAS,
 Appellant,
 *
 v.
 *
 President, UNIVERSITY OF
 WISCONSIN-SYSTEM, AND
 Administrator, DIVISION OF
 PERSONNEL,
 Respondent.
 *
 Case No. 81-410-PC
 *
 * * * * *

DECISION
 AND
 ORDER

NATURE OF THE CASE

This is an appeal pursuant to §230.44(1)(b), stats., of the denial of a request for reclassification of appellant's position from Word Processing Operator 2 to Word Processing Operator 3.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. At all relevant times the appellant has been employed in the classified service at the UW-Whitewater Word Processing Center in a position classified as Word Processing Operator 2 (WPO-2).

2. The duties and responsibilities of appellant's position include 60% acting as lead worker for a ½ time WPO position, reviewing submitted work and managing work flow, keeping records, recommending policy and procedure revisions to her supervisor, arranging for preventive maintenance and repair of machines, order and maintain inventory of supplies, etc., 30% production of typewritten, printed and stored information on the word processing equipment, 5% operation of the Word Processing Center/¹Computer Center communication link; and 5% related tasks.

3. A majority of the work performed at the UW-Whitewater Word Processing Center does not involve complex specialized copy as the term is used in the position standard for Word Processing Operator 2.

4. The position standard for Word Processing Operator (Respondent's Exhibit 4) includes the following descriptions and examples of work performed:

Word Processing Operator 1 (PR2-05)

This is entry or full performance level work of routine difficulty or full performance level work of moderate difficulty performing clerical and typing duties in a word processing center or comparable office setting using automatic word processing equipment on a production basis.

Positions allocated to this class in an entry level capacity are involved in production typing of correspondence, drafts, reports, records, graphs, tables, charts, forms and related copy. Positions in this allocation perform assignments requiring complex format considerations and machine programming setups a majority of the time. Work at the entry level is performed under immediate supervision.

Positions allocated to this class in an objective capacity will operate word processing equipment primarily for general correspondence and other line or straight copy typing which does not entail intricate machine set-up or unique formatting considerations a majority of the time. Work at the full performance level is performed under general supervision.

Word Processing Operator 2 (PR2-06)

This is full performance level clerical work of moderate difficulty typing in a Word Processing Center or comparable office setting using automatic word processing equipment on a production basis. Positions allocated to this class type a variety of charts, statistical reports, tabulations, forms, data processing or comparably complex specialized copy. A majority of the work involves non-line copy typing requiring complex format considerations and equipment programming operations. Also allocated to this classification are lead work positions responsible for leading Word Processing Operator(s) at the 1 level. Work is performed under general supervision.

Word Processing Operator 3 (PR2-07)

This is lead clerical work of moderate difficulty as a lead typist in a Word Processing Center or comparable office setting using word processing equipment on a production basis. Positions allocated to this class function as leadworkers responsible for work assignment and review of Word Processing Operator(s) at the 2 level. Work is performed under direction.

Word Processing Operator 1 - Work Examples

Operates word processing equipment in the completion of typing assignments from a variety of sources, including dictation equipment, handwritten copy or printed material, in accordance with established instructions.

Proofreads and corrects all completed assignments in terms of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

Maintains records and files of assignments.

Performs related clerical duties as assigned.

Word Processing Operator 2 - Work Examples

Types, proofreads and corrects all completed assignments in terms of spelling, grammar and punctuation, as well as proofreading the work of others.

Types material for publication purposes, with responsibility for footnotes and bibliography formats.

Types assignments involving complex legal, medical, data processing or comparable specialized terminology on a regular basis.

Types legal or medical manuscripts and reports requiring the use of special dictionaries, unique grammar and complex format considerations.

Works directly with user to develop special reports or other comparable items.

Plans, assigns and guides the work of lower-level employees.

Word Processing Operator 3 - Work Examples

Plans, assigns and guides the work of Word Processing Operator(s) at the 2 level.

Consults with users regarding policy and procedural issues of the unit.

Assists supervisor or develops work schedules and priorities.

Trains new operators in use of equipment.

Assists in developing, revising and implementing policies and procedures of the unit.

Types, proofreads and corrects all completed assignments in terms of spelling, grammar and punctuation, as well as proofreading the work of others.

Types material for publication purposes, with responsibility for footnotes and bibliography formats.

Orders Supplies.

5. Two other positions correctly classified at the WPO 3 level are as

follows:

a. Lead Worker - Outpatient Word Processing Center - UW-Madison, Center for Health Sciences. This position functions as a lead worker for five WPO2 positions in a variety of word processing functions involving difficult, complex medical terminology.

b. Lead Worker - UW-Madison, Center for Health Services, Medical School, First and Second Year Office. This position is responsible for the coordination and compilation of course materials used by the first and second year medical school curriculums and functions as the lead worker for two WPO positions. This position is responsible for overseeing the coordination and compilation of course books, handout materials and final exams. The work associated with this unit involves difficult, complex medical terminology.

6. The UW-System, Office of Personnel, Employee Relations, Staff Development and Payroll Services, acting on a delegated basis pursuant to §230.05(2)(a), stats., denied the request for reclassification of appellant's position from WPO 2 to WPO 3, in a letter dated September 21, 1981, Respondent's Exhibit 5.

7. The appellant's position is better described by the WPO 2 position standard than the WPO 3 position standard and is more properly classified as WPO 2 than as WPO 3.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This matter is properly before the Commission pursuant to §230.44(1)(b), stats.

2. The appellant has the burden of proving that the respondents erred in denying the request to reclassify her position from WPO 2 to WPO 3.

3. The appellant has not sustained her burden of proof.

4. The respondents did not err in denying the request to reclassify appellant's position from WPO 2 to WPO 3.

OPINION

In order for the appellant's position to qualify for classification as WPO 3, it must function as a leadworker "responsible for work assignment and review of Word Processing Operator(s) at the 2 level." See Respondent's Exhibit 4, p. 4. Accordingly, it would have to be determined that the work performed at the UW-Whitewater Word Processing Center may be categorized as "complex specialized copy" as set forth in the WPO 2 class description.

"Positions allocated to this class type a variety of charts, statistical reports, tabulations, forms, data processing or comparably complex specialized copy." Respondent's Exhibit 4, p. 4.

In arguing that the work of her unit meets this criteria, the appellant focuses on the words "charts, statistical reports, tabulations, forms..." and argues that this applies to much of the work of the unit. One difficulty with this contention is that the comparable language from the WPO 1 class description is somewhat similar: "correspondence, drafts, reports, records, graphs, tables, charts, forms and related copy."

To attempt to distinguish the level of complexity of work at the two levels (WPO 1 and WPO 2), UW-System personnel looked to both the examples of work performed in the position standard and the work performed by other correctly classified positions. This certainly is a legitimate approach to classification analysis, particularly considering the lack of clear delineation between the language of the WPO 1 and WPO 2 class descriptions cited above. Based on this comparison, it may be said that the work of the UW-Whitewater Word Processing Center is better described at the WPO 1 level rather than the WPO 2 level, and that as a lead worker, appellant's position is most appropriately classified as WPO 2.


ORDER

The action of the respondents is affirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Dated: April 2, 1982 STATE PERSONNEL COMMISSION

AJT:jmf


DONALD R. MURPHY, Chairperson


JAMES W. PHILLIPS, Commissioner

Parties

Diana Thomas
UW-Whitewater
800 West Main Street
Whitewater, WI 53190

Charles Grapentine, Administrator
DP
149 E. Wilson
Madison, WI 53702

Robert O'Neil, President
UW-System
1700 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706