

STATE OF WISCONSIN

PERSONNEL COMMISSION

* * * * *

CAROL BOTZ,

Appellant,

v.

President, UNIVERSITY OF
WISCONSIN SYSTEM, and
Administrator, DIVISION OF
PERSONNEL,

Respondents.

Case No. 83-0063-PC

* * * * *

DECISION
AND
ORDER

NATURE OF THE CASE

This matter is before the Commission as an appeal from the denial of a reclassification request. The parties agreed to the following issue for hearing:

Whether or not the decision of the respondent denying the reclassification request of the appellant was correct.
Subissue: Should the appellant's position be reclassified to PA-1.

After the hearing, the parties filed briefs.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The appellant is employed by respondent University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Facilities Management Department as the key controller for the campus. The appellant's first-line supervisor is Mr. Don Wolter, Executive Director of the Facilities Management Department.

2. The appellant's duties as of March 1982 are accurately described on her position description, a copy of which is attached hereto as if fully set forth in this finding.

3. In performing her key control function, the vast majority of the actions taken by the appellant and the decisions she makes are made in

accordance to established policy and/or procedures and are relatively routine. If, in making the relatively few decisions in which significant discretion is involved, the appellant has a question, she may obtain the opinion of the Locksmith 3. If the Locksmith 3 and the appellant still had a question they could go to the appellant's supervisor, Mr. Wolters. Mr. Wolters is involved when a key change request is for an entire building. Such requests raise financial considerations as to the appropriate source for funding the requested work. Otherwise, the appellant makes the key control decisions.

4. The appellant sought reclassification of her position from the Clerical Assistant 2 level to the Program Assistant 1 level. The appellants request was denied in March of 1983 by the Office of Personnel, University of Wisconsin System. The appellant subsequently appealed the decision to the Personnel Commission.

5. The class descriptions for Clerical Assistant 2 and Program Assistant 1 read, in part, as follows:

CLERICAL ASSISTANT 2

This is lead and/or advanced clerical work of moderate difficulty in completing a variety of assigned clerical tasks consistent with established policies and procedures. Positions allocated to this level have some freedom of selection or choice among learned things, which generally follow a well-defined pattern. However, positions at this level are distinguished from the Program Assistant 1 level by the limited degree of personal or procedural control over the nature and scope of the tasks which they perform. The variety and complexity of decisions made at this level are limited. Positions may function as lead workers, directing lower-level positions as well as performing a variety of the more complex clerical operations. Receptionist positions which serve in an informative capacity as the primary or sole public contact for a state facility(s) are allocated to this level. A variety of secretarial functions may be incidentally performed for the professional staff for a small percentage of the time. Work is performed under general supervision.

PROGRAM ASSISTANT 1

This is work of moderate difficulty providing program support assistance to supervisory, professional or administrative staff. Positions allocated to this level serve as the principal support staff within a specific defined program or a significant segment of a program. Positions at this level are distinguished from the Clerical Assistant 2 level by their identified accountability for the implementation and consequences of program activities over which they have decision-making control. Therefore, although the actual tasks performed at this level may in many respects be similar to those performed at the Clerical Assistant 2 level, the greater variety, scope and complexity of the problem-solving, the greater independence of action, and the greater degree of personal or procedural control over the program activities differentiates the Program Assistant functions. The degree of programmatic accountability and involvement is measured on the basis of the size and scope of the area impacted by the decision and the consequence of error in making such decisions, which increases with each successive level in the Program Assistant series. Work is performed under general supervision.

6. The best comparables to the appellant's position in the University System are:

a. The position held by Linda Micek at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. Ms. Micek performs four major functions within Stout's Physical Plant Administration: General office duties (40%) including the provision of clerical services to building maintenance supervisors and writing up work orders; maintaining administrative budget records for seven physical plant departments (25%); key control (23%); and maintaining the physical plant capitol equipment inventory (10%). As to her key control responsibilities, Ms. Micek maintains records and files, makes initial approval of key requests, issues and collects keys, collects and disburses key deposit charges, assists in cutting keys, maintains keyroom supply inventory, performs key audits, provides secretarial assistance to the locksmith and issues a monthly report on Key Department activities.

b. The position held by Wanda Winsand at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. The position summary for Ms. Winsand's position reads as follows:

This position must handle general office functions for efficient operation of a Physical Plant Office, which includes acting as communication center for maintenance of campus buildings and grounds, dispatching and scheduling fleet, processing work orders, issuing keys, maintaining files and other related duties.

Approximately 50% of Ms. Winsand's time is spent in processing work orders received from various sources on the Eau Claire campus for monthly account transfers. Ms. Winsand spends 30% of

her time in the dispatching of fleet vehicles and coordinating related communications which requires knowledge of travel regulations. She also spends 15% of her time as the person in charge of maintaining key records and dispensing keys. Ms. Winsand's responsibilities in the key control area are substantially similar to Ms. Micek's.

7. Both Ms. Micek and Ms. Winsand are classified at the Clerical Assistant 2 level.

8. The positions performing the key control function at University of Wisconsin-Green Bay and University of Wisconsin-River Falls are both classified at the Program Assistant 1 level. However, the Green Bay position spends just 7% of her time in key control program while she spends 20% of her time coordinating the Workers' Compensation program at the campus (including the preparation of accident reports), 10% on maintaining budget records and 35% on the preparation and distribution of security incident reports. The River Falls position spends only 8% of her time on the key control function. The River Falls position serves as the secretary to the Physical Plant Director and as such is comparable to departmental secretaries in academic departments who are often classified at the PA 1 level.

9. The appellant's position fits within the class specification for the Clerical Assistant 2 and is comparable to other positions classified at the CA 2 level.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This matter is appropriately before the Commission pursuant to § 230.44(1)(b), Stats.(1981-82).

2. The appellant has the burden of proving that the respondents' decision denying her request to reclassify her position from the Clerical Assistant 2 level to the Program Assistant 1 level was incorrect.

3. The appellant has failed to meet that burden of proof.

4. The respondents' decision denying the appellant's reclassification request was correct.

OPINION

Both the Clerical Assistant 2 and Program Assistant 1 classification definitions are relatively broad and neither one appears to specifically exclude the appellant's position. The distinction between the two levels is stated in the PA 1 definition as follows:

Positions at this level are distinguished from the Clerical Assistant 2 level by their identified accountability for the implementation and consequences of program activities over which they have decisionmaking control. Therefore, although the actual tasks performed at this level may in many respects be similar to those performed at the Clerical Assistant 2 level, the greater variety, scope and complexity of the problem-solving, the greater independence of action, and the greater degree of personal or procedural control over the program activities differentiates the Program Assistant functions.

In light of the nature of the class descriptions, the Commission's review has focused on two areas: 1) the nature of the problem-solving, independence and control exercised by the appellant and 2) the other positions in the UW-System which perform key control functions.

In addition to the signed position description referred to in finding of fact #2, the appellant submitted a more detailed position description which she testified as also being accurate. That detailed PD indicated that the appellant generally followed straight-forward procedures in performing her key control functions. For example, the appellant described the procedure for issuing keys to faculty or staff:

1. Check authorization on key requests.
2. Issue only keys specified--if additional keys are issued, verify with authorizing personnel.
3. Fill out KIC [Key Issue Card] for each key issued (room, entrance, elevator, mailbox.)
4. Each KIC must be signed by person receiving key/s.
5. Name card -- each key(s) issued is listed on employee's name card. (If new employee, make out new card.)
6. Name cards are filed in name card file alphabetically.
7. KIC are then filed in vault--Building/Room files.

8. Completed request is filed--by Building/Department.

Testimony showed that the appellant cannot decide to issue a key unless the person making the request is authorized to receive the key. Examination of the appellant's official position description as well as her detailed PD show that a large percentage of her job duties involve the routine maintenance of records.

Those areas of responsibility which appear to involve some degree of discretion on the part of the appellant are functions that she may perform with some assistance from either the Locksmith 3 (Mr. Oscar Roethe) or Mr. Wolter. For example, the appellant describes task B4 (Develop keying system to meet the needs of occupants in remodeled areas) in her detailed PD as follows:

Using locks removed during remodeling (or extra locks on hand for that building) make sure locks installed in remodeled area will be on proper sub-master (if any,) Department Master (if any,) the building's master and the correct Campus Grand Master. (Work with Oscar on this).

This also appears to be true in respect to responding to lock change requests.

The appellant testified that she was accountable for the entire key control system and support filing system. Her supervisor testified that she was able to handle the total decisions in the keying area, without the supervisor having to be involved. Despite this testimony, the evidence clearly indicates that the vast majority of appellant's duties are routine in nature, are performed according to established policies and procedures and do not require the exercise of significant decision-making.

Much of the appellant's case focused on the 10% of her time spent performing routine locksmith work, either assisting the locksmith or covering for him in his absence (Goal C). The addition of the locksmithing

duties represents an obvious change from the appellant's prior (1980) position description. There was testimony to the effect that the appellant's locksmithing function was very important given the fact the Oshkosh campus employed just one locksmith. Nevertheless, approximately one-quarter of the time allocated to Goal C was spent in cutting duplicate keys which appellant acknowledged as being an uncomplicated procedure. The remaining 7 or 8% of her total time that the appellant spent performing routine locksmith work is not a sufficient portion of the appellant's duties to move her position out of the Clerical Assistant 2 level and into some other position.

The best comparables to the appellant's position appear to be the Micek (UW Stout) and Winsand (UW-Eau Claire) positions. Key control represents 23% of Ms. Micek's responsibilities and 15% of Ms. Winsand's duties, respectively. Both positions cut keys when needed, and, with the exception of the small amount of locksmith duties performed by the appellant, all three key control responsibilities appear to be comparable. The appellant argued that her key control function at UW-Oshkosh is more complicated than at other UW campuses because Oshkosh has six different key manufacturers and eight different campus grand masters for its various locks, while other comparable campuses had just one manufacturer and one campus grand master. However, the appellant failed to show how this distinction had an actual impact on the difficulty of her key control function rather than merely requiring some additional record keeping. Both Ms. Micek and Ms. Winsand perform other office functions for their campus' physical plants that are comparable to their key control functions. Comparison of the appellant's position with these two positions supports the respondents reclassification decision.

The appellant has failed to identify any comparable positions that would support reclassification of her position to the PA-1 level. The two positions at that level at UW-Green Bay and UW-River Falls are distinguishable in terms of their other duties. The Green Bay position is specifically given responsibility for coordinating the Worker's compensation program which includes preparing all necessary accident reports, documenting the incidents, conducting interviews, and compiling data for an annual OSHA report. The position also maintains budget records and assists in budget preparations. The River Falls position also serves as secretary to the Physical Plant Director, a position which in Oshkosh, at least as of 1980, was also filled at the PA 1 level.

For the reasons outlined above, the appellant has failed to meet her burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

The respondents decision denying the appellant's reclassification request is affirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

DATED: December 7, 1983 STATE PERSONNEL COMMISSION


DONALD R. MURPHY, Chairperson


LAURIE R. McCALLUM, Commissioner


DENNIS P. MCGILLIGAN, Commissioner

KMS:jab

Parties:

Carol Botz
Facilities Management
UW-Oshkosh
Oshkosh, WI 54901

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

Howard Fuller, Secretary
DER*
P. O. Box 7855
Madison, WI 53707

*Pursuant to the provisions of 1983 Wisconsin Act 27, published on July 1, 1983, the authority previously held by the Administrator, Division of Personnel over classification matters is now held by the Secretary, Department of Employment Relations.

POSITION DESCRIPTION

2

3/23/82

2/27
S. C. REC.

DER-PERS 10 (Rev. 1-78)
State of Wisconsin
Department of Employment Relations
DIVISION OF PERSONNEL

RECEIVED

1. Position No. 29946	2. Cert/Reclass Request No. 4-790	3. Agency 281
--------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------

4. NAME OF EMPLOYEE Carol Botz JUN 17 1983	5. DEPARTMENT, UNIT, WORK ADDRESS UW System UW-Oshkosh Facilities Management
6. CLASSIFICATION TITLE OF POSITION Personnel Clerical Assistant 2 Commission	
7. CLASS TITLE OPTION (To be Filled Out By Personnel Office)	8. NAME AND CLASS OF FORMER INCUMBENT
9. AGENCY WORKING TITLE OF POSITION Key Control	10. NAME AND CLASS OF EMPLOYEES PERFORMING SIMILAR DUTY
11. NAME AND CLASS OF FIRST-LINE SUPERVISOR Don Wolter; Director, Facilities Management	12. FROM APPROXIMATELY WHAT DATE HAS THE EMPLOYEE PERFORMED THE WORK DESCRIBED BELOW? April 14, 1980

13. DOES THIS POSITION SUPERVISE SUBORDINATE EMPLOYEES IN PERMANENT POSITIONS? Yes No IF YES, COMP AND ATTACH A SUPERVISORY POSITION ANALYSIS FORM (DER-PERS-84).

14. POSITION SUMMARY - PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW THE MAJOR GOALS OF THIS POSITION
This position is responsible for the maintenance of the UWO Key Control System with detailed responsibilities outlined below; and for assisting higher level locksmith with routine locksmith work.

15. DESCRIBE THE GOALS AND WORKER ACTIVITIES OF THIS POSITION (Please see sample format and instructions on back of last page)
-GOALS: Describe the major achievements, outputs, or results. List them in descending order of importance
-WORKER ACTIVITIES. Under each goal, list the worker activities performed to meet that goal.
-TIME %: Include for goals and major worker activities.

TIME %	GOALS AND WORKER ACTIVITIES	(Continue on attached sheets)
35%	A. Supervision and Maintenance of UWO Key Control System A1. Process key issuance and lock change requests. A2. Issue keys to authorized personnel. A3. Determine possible lock changes that are requested. A4. Check authorization on key requests. A5. Call back keys from faculty, staff and students when they leave the A6. Supervise student workers.	
45%	B. Maintenance of Complete Filing System on Locks and Key Issues B1. Maintain records of all keys issued. B2. Keep records of keying systems for all buildings showing key for each room, key combinations, and master and sub-master systems.	

16. SUPERVISORY SECTION - TO BE COMPLETED BY THE FIRST LINE SUPERVISOR OF THIS POSITION (See Instructions on Back of last page)
a. The supervision, direction, and review given to the work of this position is | | close | | limited | | general.
b. The statements and time estimates above and on attachments accurately describe the work assigned to the position. (Please initial and date attachments)
Signature of first-line supervisor _____ Date _____

17. EMPLOYEE SECTION - TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INCUMBENT OF THIS POSITION
I have read and understand that the statements and time estimates above and on attachments are a description of the functions assigned my position. (Please initial and date attachments)
Signature of employe Carol G. Botz Date 3/24/82

18. Signature of Personnel Manager _____ Date _____



- B3. Correlate all lock and key work with higher level locksmith.
- B4. Develop keying system to meet the needs of occupants in remodeled areas.
- B5. Maintain computerized key records.
- B6. Supervise student workers.
- B7. Initiate and maintain Office Assignment File.

10%

- C. Assist Higher Level Locksmith with Routine Locksmith Work
 - C1. Cut duplicate keys on key cutting machine.
 - C2. Assist in rekeying operations, including the repinning of locks.
 - C3. Maintain records.
 - C4. Inventory keys and spare parts.
 - C5. Cover for higher level locksmith in his absence, along with other support personnel.

10%

- D. Provision of Back-up Clerical Support for Fleet Operation and Facilities Management
 - D1. Schedule use of fleet vehicles.
 - D2. Issue keys and trip tickets for fleet vehicles.
 - D3. Check driving records and authorization on fleet vehicle requests.
 - D4. Maintain filing systems--student driver authorizations, fleet vehicle requests, Defensive Driving Course records, trip tickets, vehicle maintenance information, vehicle purchases and sales information, etc.
 - D5. Partial billing/revenue responsibilities--compute mileage, charges, gasoline and maintenance charges.
 - D6. Supervise student workers.
 - D7. Cover for secretary of the Director, in her absence.

CB 3/24/82